

國立彰化師範大學

文學院學報

NCUE JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES



第廿七期

中華民國一一二年五月

Volume 27, May 2023

國立彰化師範大學

文學院學報

第廿

七期

發行者

陳明飛 國立彰化師範大學

編輯委員會

總編輯

黃聖慧 國立彰化師範大學

主編

王曼萍 國立彰化師範大學
王麗雁 國立彰化師範大學

校外編輯委員

王清煌 國立虎尾科技大學應用外語學系
紀文章 朝陽科技大學傳播藝術系
蔡佩桂 國立高雄師範大學跨領域藝術研究所
林聰明 逢甲大學
蔡雅琴 國立嘉義大學外國語文學系
林潤華 國立東華大學台灣文化學系
蔡幸芝 國立台灣藝術大學當代視覺文建碩博士班
鄭朱雀 國立中興大學外文系
陳彥豪 國立台北大學應用外語學系
黃聖松 國立成功大學中國文學系
林巾力 國立台灣師範大學
連清吉 日本長崎大學
陳金水 美國華盛頓大學

校內編輯委員

黃儀冠 國立彰化師範大學
趙玉芝 國立彰化師範大學
陳清目 國立彰化師範大學
蕭韻華 國立彰化師範大學
溫婷惠 國立彰化師範大學
李華彥 國立彰化師範大學
邱湘雲 國立彰化師範大學

編輯助理

蔣品潔 國立彰化師範大學
張為舜 國立彰化師範大學

NCUE Journal of Humanities

Vol.27

Publisher

CHEN, MING-FEI *National Changhua University of Education*

Editorial Committee

Editor-in-Chief

HUANG, SHENG-HUI *National Changhua University of Education*

Issue Editor

WANG, MAN-PING *National Changhua University of Education*
WANG, LI-YAN *National Changhua University of Education*

External Editorial Board

WANG, QING-HUANG *National Formosa University*
CHI, WEN-CHANG *Chaoyang University of Technology*
 TSAI, PEI-KUEI *National Kaohsiung Normal University*
LIN, TSONG-MING *Feng Chia University*
 TSAI, YA-CHIN *National Chiayi University*
LIN, JUN-HUA *National Dong Hwa University*
 TSAI, HSING-CHIH *National Taiwan University of Arts*
CHENG, CHU-CHUEH *National Chung Hsing University*
CHEN, YANE-HAO *National Taipei University*
HUANG, SHENG-SUNG *National Cheng Kung University*
NIKKY-LIN *National Taiwan Normal University*
REN, SRIKICHI *Nagasaki University*
CHAN, KAW-WING *University of Washington*

Institutional Editorial Board

HUANG, YI-KUAN *National Changhua University of Education*
CHAO, YU-TZE *National Changhua University of Education*
CHEN, CHING-MU *National Changhua University of Education*
HSIAO, YUN-HUA *National Changhua University of Education*
WEN, TING-HUI *National Changhua University of Education*
LI, HUA-YEN *National Changhua University of Education*
CHIU, HSIANG-YUN *National Changhua University of Education*

Managing Assistants

CHIANG, PIN-JOU *National Changhua University of Education*
CHANG, WEI-SHUN *National Changhua University of Education*

國立彰化師範大學文學院學報

第廿七期

目錄

博物館教育理念的轉變	蔡幸芝	1
蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉相關議題評析	陳俊偉	13
《貝爾武夫》：「好客」與「不好客」背後的動機	應芳瑜	33
「我看見黑暗中的苦難」：《凱爾斯的秘密》中的怪物之眼	鄭瑋凡	49

NCAE Journal of Humanities

Volume 27

Contents

Changes in Educational Philosophy for Museums	TSAI, HSING-CHIH	1
Su Shi ' Zhuge Liang's Discuss ' Related topics Comment	CHEN, JUN-WEI	13
Beowulf: Motivations behind Hospitality and Inhospitality	IN, FAN-YU	33
“I’ve Seen Suffering in the Darkness”: The Monster’s Eye in The Secret of Kells	CHENG WEI-FAN	49

博物館教育理念的轉變*

蔡幸芝**

提要

本文從變動性、整體性及多元性的觀點，檢視並辯駁博物館教育潛存不合時宜的迷思，進而指出博物館需要傾聽公眾心聲，擴大公眾服務的對象及管道勢在必行，並從四個面向重新詮釋博物館教育作為公眾服務的核心價值及特點：（一）博物館不只是教育理論的直接應用，而是涉及跨學科理論的轉化運用；（二）博物館教育不只是學校教學活動的延伸，而是向所有人發出的邀請；（三）博物館不是傳遞意義的單向過程，而是詮釋意義的對話過程；（四）博物館教育必須與展覽共同發展，並將整個博物館視為教育的體現。

關鍵字：博物館教育、公眾服務、詮釋

* 感謝匿名審查委員的審查意見並按建議增修。

** 國立臺灣藝術大學 通識教育中心 副教授
(到稿日期：2023 年 3 月 27 日；通過刊登日期：2023 年 4 月 23 日)

Changes in Educational Philosophy for Museums^{*}

TSAI, HSING-CHIH^{**}

Abstract

This article examines and refutes the outdated myths of museum education from the perspectives of variability, integrity and diversity, and then points out that museums need to listen to the voice of the public, and reinterprets the core value and characteristics of museum education as a public service from four aspects : (1) It involves the transformation and application of interdisciplinary theories rather than the direct application of educational theories; (2) It is not just an extension of school teaching activities, but an invitation to the public; (3) It is not a one-way process of transmitting knowledge, but a dialogue process of interpreting meanings; (4) It should take the entire museum itself as the embodiment of education.

Key words: education museum, public service, interpretation

^{*} I would like to thank the reviewers for their comments and suggestions, which helped me in improving the quality of the paper.

^{**} Associate Professor of General Education Center, National Taiwan University of Arts.

導論

如果博物館接住自己拋出的迴力鏢，尚且停留在笛卡兒式的獨白裡；唯有博物館一把接住觀眾擲來的變化球，才算立足於關係多變的現實，也唯有認同觀眾與博物館一同在變動世界中變動、在異聲交流中交流，博物館才成為活的有機體。筆者欲強調流變不止的觀點，旨在打破一種靜態思維、一種客觀超然態度所預設的主客二分及導致客體化對象的疏離關係。當我們意識到變動的事實，寓於變動世界中的博物館也就不再合適探求普效性定義的問法，而是承認我們在瞬息萬變捕捉到的，是博物館呈現其暫時性的特徵。法國哲學家 Foucault 有段描述，貼切道出一般觀眾參訪博物館的印象：

博物館和圖書館已成異質空間，時間未曾停止構築而達其頂峰，因此在 17 世紀，乃至 17 世紀末，博物館和圖書館一直是某種個人選擇的體現。相反地，一個聚積所有東西的概念，構成某種一般檔案庫的想法，將一切時間、時代、形式和品味都收納於一個場所的渴望，一個將所有時間構建於同一個場所，這個場所本身是在時間之外的理念，在某個不變場所中組織起某種時間的永恆無限之積累的想法，所有這一切均屬於我們的現代性。博物館和圖書館都是 19 世紀西方文化裡典型的異質空間。

Foucault, 1999: 352

Foucault 以異質空間（heterotopias）的概念，捕捉到西方博物館及圖書館在變異中的特徵——從早期私人蒐藏欲望的投射，轉變成現代文化建制意識形態的權力展現，後者以高度複雜的組織及論述，將分屬不同時空之物精心重組、併置、疊加，在時間中構建超出時間之外、異物聚積的奇幻之所。場所與藏品相互輝映，在美國藝術史學者 Hamilton（1975: 98）看來交相構成，「陳列包括稀有、珍貴、充滿異國情調的神秘物品，與神聖歷史相關的藝術品或自然標本的大教堂聖器室或貴族的珍寶室。」一方面，博物館對稀世珍寶的「蒐藏、保存和研究」（Alexander, 1979: 10）樹立博物館的權威；另一方面，稀世珍寶亦形塑了早期博物館地位崇榮的形象。珍稀之物得以延續流傳，致力於典藏及維護工作的博物館功不可沒，卻需在此基礎上推進藏品的用途更勝競逐藏品質量的思考。一如高瞻遠矚的美國博物館學者 Dana（1917: 17）所言：「博物館的工作，也可說是責任，是去瞭解什麼樣的展品以何種形式展示，並配合何種印刷品或解說，才可以滿足社會的特定需要和目標。」換言之，「藏品」的價值並不僅僅取決於珍稀性，而在「藏品」具有實現為「展品」的教育性，意即藏品的去原脈絡除了保存、典藏及研究用途，更重要的目的是善加再脈絡化，發揮面向公眾的教育功能，藏品才得以重生，博物館才有存在的價值。曾任加拿大葛藍波博物館（Glenbow Museum）館長兼博物館管理學者 Robert Janes 將此稱做「哲學性的轉移」（philosophical shift）：「藏品管理」轉變為「公共服務和溝通」為核心的管理哲學，他提到：「博物館收藏本身並非目的，而是為了達成目的不可或缺的手段。」（轉引自 Weil，張譽騰譯，2015，頁 43）意即今日博物館已從關注物轉移到關注人的問題。筆者認為可以更精確地說，

博物館歷經觀念上的轉變：「從藏品到展品」、「從展品到一般大眾」、「從一般大眾到差異化的參觀者」的重心位移。時至今日，無論世界各地博物館的規模、性質及自我定位殊異有別，教育已認可為所有博物館共同的使命，服務公眾才是博物館的價值所在。

一、博物館教育的迷思與辯駁

誠如上述博物館應當視為活的有機體，在某種層面上也在表明生命世界是人造的博物館重新思考其教育理念的導師。從生態學角度，多樣性生物在每一層級都結合為循環不止的整體，而一個整體是無法完全用個別生物的運作清楚解釋整體的變化。如果我們忽略博物館作為存在變動世界中的一個整體，切斷其外部與內部因素應有的關連與調節，則容易產生四個迷思：第一，博物館教育是教育理論的直接應用；第二，博物館教育是學校教學活動的延伸；第三，博物館教育可以與展覽分別運作；第四，博物館教育是傳遞意義的單向過程。前兩項關連博物館對教育理念及其教育對象的簡化，後兩者則反映博物館對組織運作及溝通模式的僵化。然而，迷思與辯駁之間不是涇渭分明的對立，亦非簡單的思想替換，而是一種黑格爾式辯證關係中的統合，朝向兼容並蓄、更廣袤的理路前進。此故，當以整體性及變動性的觀點，辯駁博物館教育的迷思，進而闡釋博物館教育的理念轉變。

二、博物館不只是教育理論的直接應用，而是涉及跨學科理論的轉化運用。

博物館教育可以單純視為實務操作而無需理論嗎？想像眼前所見是 1976 年在波蘭挖掘出土、遠溯至 3500 年前的布洛諾西陶罐（Bronocice pot），罐面上描繪最早出現輪子的馬車圖案。它引起藝術性的賞析、審美經驗之餘，亦喚起參觀者思考遠古人類早就懂得運用滾輪的智慧。但是，圖案上的輪子不只是一個滾動的圓盤，它同時蘊含著滾輪與長軸結合成馬車的動力學知識。易言之，實務與理論在思維上看似可分，實質上構成一體兩面的整體。一方面，理論涉及概念化的過程，所有實踐都需置於概念的形式中才能理解其意涵。另一方面，實務是具體化的表現，一切理論都有待實務的檢驗才彰顯其價值。正因實務有其經驗的侷限，理論則有驗證的空間；理論的訓練有助培養縝密的思考，縝密的思考則有助完善我們的實踐。因此，博物館的研究成果實與博物館實務工作構成博物館教育的整體。此外，博物館教育並不只於教育本身，而是盤根錯節於各種層面的作用中。批判教育學的提倡者 Giroux (1993: 73) 認為，「教育必須被理解為一種認同的產物，此認同與某種特殊形式的知識與權力的排序、再現及合理化有關。」意即博物館教育涉及教育理論之外，也涵蓋自然、社會、人文領域等跨學科理論的整合、轉化及運用。正如 Hooper-Greenhill (2007) 在〈博物館：學習與文化〉一文中提及博物館正在經歷新時代的挑戰，並通過評估及哲學思想的鏈結重新定位，文化、社會的新觀念及新政策挑戰博物館重新思考目的及重設教育理論。

就此，博物館教育涉及跨學科理論的整合，不僅意指博物館的教育工作需要人文、社會、自然科學等不同專業的共同參與、及多元視域的呈現日趨明顯，更意味著博物館也提供不同專業在參與過程中打破自身視域本位的特殊性，從而共同形成一種自內運動的大視域，此大視域超出現有學科的界限而包容著多元視域相互理解的契機。以奧地利著名的維也納美景宮博物館（Belvedere Museum Vienna）為例，該館於 2018 年成功整合藝術史家、博物館學者、心理學家及電腦科學家等跨學科團隊，運用眼動儀、腦電圖及深度訪談等方法追蹤博物館觀眾的參觀行為，奠基於研究成果之上重新安排常設展的展示與展品，大幅提升觀眾的參訪體驗（Reitstätter 等，2020）。此外，博物館面對參觀者與展品之間的互動策略，從被動吸收展品資訊轉變為幫助人們連結自身經驗以主動探索展品內涵，強調使用簡明易讀的說明來激發觀眾創建自己對展品的意義。德國哲學家 Gadamer（1986: 441）就曾以不同視域融合於博物館舉例說道：「一尊古代神像，過去豎立於神廟中並不是作為藝術品而給人以某種審美的反思性快感，當它現在陳列在現代博物館立於我們面前之時，仍然包含該神像由之而來的宗教經驗的世界。此一神像就具有了富有意義的效果，即它的那個世界也屬於了我們的世界。」意即在博物館的脈絡下，一件從古代走向我們的神像的詮釋不僅能有宗教的觀點、歷史的觀點，亦形塑、影響著我們所在世界的視域並包容著藝術的觀點及其他種種開創性的詮釋。因而，「博物館的角色不再侷限於物件的保存：也必須分享並持續重新詮釋物件。」（Price, 2002）

三、博物館教育不只是學校教學活動的延伸，而是向所有人發出的邀請。

博物館教育汲取許多教育專家從學校教育發展而來的「教與學」的新穎模式，仍需通過轉化的過程而非直接應用。不僅在於博物館教育的對象及範圍更加寬廣多元，博物館與學校的教育型態也存在差異，兩者構成互異的對比。相較於學校教育具有明確的組織型態及篩選機制，諸如課堂教室、學習進度、分級編組、成績考核、紀律規定等特性，博物館教育呈現富有彈性、機遇性的聚散型態：不同背景的參觀者按其自身的節奏在空間的移動中自主學習，重視潛移默化的長遠影響、情意發展及人文素養的陶成。然而，這並不意味著博物館教育勝過學校教育。當參觀者理解一件博物館展品解說的內容，即預設了系統性的學校教育已發揮作用。反之，原先出現在教科本上的文物及作品圖片，以真實原件呈現在博物館參觀者面前，亦蘊含博物館教育增進了參觀者先備知識的體驗深度。因此，學校教育與博物館教育彼此無可替代且相互充實，卻不能只是將博物館教育當作學校教學活動的延伸，而是向所有人發出的邀請。如同美國博物館協會（American Association of Museums, 1992: 10）在 1992 年發表第一份以博物館教育為主要內容的報告《卓越與平等—博物館的教育及公眾面向》中聲明：博物館要成為致力提供公眾服務和教育的機構，並提出三個關鍵概念：第一，博物館

應當將教育作為每一個博物館公眾服務的首要任務。第二，博物館教育能因應社會變遷而有多元化的呈現方式。第三，博物館教育要能以差異化的參觀者需要來發展。在筆者看來，這份聲明的弦外之音，提醒我們博物館儘管沒有學校教育明訂的篩選機制，卻可能存在種種背離公眾平等近用博物館資源的無形障礙。社會學家 Bourdieu 和 Darbel（1991）就曾大規模調查藝術類博物館的觀眾類型，研究顯示擁有較高文化資本並表露出中產階級的慣行及身份的人占絕大多數，暗示了「博物館為公眾服務」流於口號。除非博物館採取更積極作為以排除影響公眾參觀意願的障礙，而非將參觀博物館看成純屬個人意願的選擇，博物館才可能成為具包容性、真正歡迎所有人參與其中的場所。

當博物館教育以公眾服務為首要任務，拓展博物館觸及公眾的多元管道及變通做法至關緊要。許多博物館善用社群媒體及數位科技延伸虛擬性的公眾服務，目的在為使用者搭建不受時空侷限的感知地圖，擴增其對展覽及展品更加豐富的想像及視野，形塑參觀者與環境、與他人、與歷史文化相關知識的積極互動和想法。古希臘哲學家 Aristotle 在《形上學》中將「虛擬」(virtuel) 看作一種能夠過渡到行動的潛能。換言之，虛擬不是現實的對立面，而是一部份尚未處於活動中的現實。就此而論，博物館運用虛擬實境與公眾互動、開放公眾使用博物館數位典藏資料庫及建置線上學習平台等，不但不會導致公眾就此滿足於虛擬性的博物館經驗，反而有助公眾朝向體驗實體博物館之潛能的實現。再者，不少博物館招募志工加入教育活動，儘管有現實層面的考量，但是在理念上，亦有擴大社會大眾對博物館教育的認識與直接參與，藉助公眾服務公眾，擴大博物館公眾服務影響力的意涵。此外，博物館主動與其他不同類型的機構共同協力，規劃適合不同型態參與者的教育推廣計畫，將博物館的人力、物力及專業資源積極帶進社區、偏鄉部落、醫療院所、矯正機構等，服務相對難以近用博物館的個人與群體，並在不斷溝通、磨合與調整的過程中發展更加長久、多元且創新的服務模式。從倫理學的維度思考，正是博物館意識到其服務對象不只是博物館內的觀眾，還擴及博物館外、甚至遠離博物館的公眾，才表示博物館向公眾的差異性做出無條件的開放與回應，進而落實博物館恢復與建立其公眾服務的社會責任。

四、博物館教育必須與展覽共同發展，並且整個博物館都是教育的體現。

當教育成為博物館公眾服務的核心任務，應如何理解博物館教育與博物館其他職能之間的關係？是否博物館在典藏、保存及展示上獲得成就，就實現了博物館的教育功能？是否教育活動是排除在展覽規劃之外、相應而生的導覽、講座及工作坊而已？儘管一般博物館的組織編制設有教育部門，教育部門卻絕非與博物館教育劃上等號。一旦將博物館教育僅僅當成各種教育活動的場次安排及總和，並將教育成果置於可受支配及預期的框架內思考，便是站在教育之外理解教育，而察覺不到我們無時不刻就身處於教育的機會中，無視博物館教育的力量無所不在，也忽略不同背景參與者在互動交流的過程中，將創造不可預期、無法複製且變化無窮的成果。Falk 和 Dierking(2016: 84)一再提醒博物館有更多隱性的學習經驗：「博物館專業人員想知道參觀者學到什麼，

但傳統上卻以很狹隘的方式定義學習。例如他們檢視參觀者從展覽和說明牌獲得的學習，這是博物館經驗很重要卻也僅是單一的面向。博物館專業人員忽略了一些比較隱性的參觀者經驗。」意即我們應該摒棄範圍偏狹且立場孤離的教育看法，事實上，博物館經驗並非純粹基於參觀展覽的孤立行為，花在拍照、休憩、購物與設施使用的過程都構成一系列相關連的社交禮儀及機會教育。整個博物館都是實踐教育的場域，展覽、展示及各種活動都是教育工作，因而各個環節必須共同規劃及協調運作，且連同博物館的建築、環境及各種服務設施都是博物館為參觀者精心打造的教育體現。

正因博物館具有實物展示於特殊脈絡及空間變化的特點，尤其能引發置身其中的參觀者產生整體性的感知體驗——不僅是認知上亦是情感上的好奇心及想像力，因而博物館可有更多啟發參觀者好奇心與想像力的空間運用。英國地理學家 Hetherington (1997: 215) 如此談論博物館的展間佈局：「博物館像分類機器一樣，必須利用空間效果的分布來處理異質性」。此不只是表現在展覽和建築物的空間組織有其特定功能與效果，展間的空間亦如是。然而，單調的、定型化的方式理解特定空間的特定功能，也可能造成參觀經驗趨於乏味、司空見慣，限制了我們對空間運用的想像。法國社會學家 de Certeau (2002: 117) 則指出另一種對空間的看法：「場所是為了人類的某種需要而組織的空間」、「空間只由移動元素的相交所組成」。就此而論，博物館邀請參觀者在迎賓大廳集體做瑜珈、親子觀眾夜宿博物館、國際會議廳變身週末音樂會的場地等等，由參觀者的偶然聚合及離散的活動足跡中使互異的事件發生，目的在打破場所自身的規範性，以使用方式的變化多端，賦予博物館原有空間截然不同的用途，創造性地詮釋博物館空間意義富含新的可能。

五、博物館不是傳遞意義的單向過程，而是詮釋意義的對話過程。

如今，「博物館教育」(museum education)更常以「博物館學習」(museum learning)的方式表達，顯現對博物館教育功能的理解產生觀念上的變革。「學習」一詞意味著博物館不再自居為傳遞意義的權威，而是越來越關注博物館參觀者的學習過程，意即博物館從參觀者的需要去思考及創造一個愉悅的學習環境，以協助參觀者建構自我的意義。Roberts (1997: 132) 曾批評過去博物館教育被視為專家學者通過展示物件傳遞意義給無知參觀者的單向過程，現在的博物館教育不再是「博物館如何教導觀眾；而是觀眾用什麼方式使用博物館，而這些方式是具有個人重要性的。」Roberts 的看法說明了博物館與參觀者之間的關係產生變化。從博物館的態度而論，已從教導者轉變為協助者的角色。從參觀者的定位而論，博物館使用者不再被看成無差別化、被動且無知的接受者；相反地，來者都是深具高度個人特色、主動出擊並各具不同先備知識的參與者。此外，意義並非在展覽中被設定與等待發現，而是在展覽與參觀者的交互關係中產生與創造。Gadamer 的詮釋學適切地說明了一切意義都是詮釋的作用，意即是在無止盡的來回對話中形成：「我們必須藉由細節理解整體，並且藉由整體理解細節。」(Gadamer 2006: 117) 在此動態的詮釋循環過程中，觀者是以其前見、即置於歷史的

視域中理解作品；另一方面，觀者必須保持開放的態度以理解作品的訴說，意即觀者傾聽作品沒有明說、卻在其中開顯出來的東西。因而，觀者與作品是在各自視域相互融合中，在歷史效果和開放性的擺盪關係中建構更廣袤卻相對變動不止的意義。

此外，從博物館學習者皆有其先備知識與詮釋策略而言，博物館參觀者易習慣探索本來就對他們有意義的特殊經驗與作品，這些經驗只會加強自己原本既有的認知，就無法擴展他們的知識範圍與視域。相反地，假如我們想理解他人的見解，就不能盲目地堅持我們自己對於事情的前見解。這並不是說，當我們傾聽某人講話或閱讀博物館的展覽論述時，必須忘掉所有關於內容的前見解和所有我們自己的見解，而是要求自己對他人的和文本的見解保持開放的態度，即把他人的見解放入與我們自己整個見解的關係中，或者把我們自己的見解放入他人整個見解的關係中思考。轉換視角，其結果就是無論對一件展品、一種見解或一個文本的詮釋，都否定了主客二分的關係，而是認為，意義產生於對話交流的變動過程中生成，而明說的意義又是以未說的、非語言方式編碼的默會知識為根據的理解與解釋，而博物館教育正能提供參觀者潛伏學習的最佳體驗。

六、結語：傾聽公眾心聲的博物館教育

舊教育從上而下強迫注入，新教育注重個殊性的培養與表現；舊教育仰賴外在的規訓，新教育鼓勵自主的活動；舊教育從教科書和教師學習，新教育從經驗學習；舊教育從反覆練習學得孤立的能力與專門技術，新教育把能力與專門技術的學習當作達成有直接而強勁吸引力的目標之手段；舊教育為遙遠的未來作準備，新教育則充分運用當前的生活機會；舊教育要求學習靜態的目標和材料，新教育力求認識變遷的世界。

Dewey, 1997: 19-20

教育學家 Dewey 闡明傳統教育與進步教育背後的理念差異，亦是博物館教育範式轉變的寫照。當「教育作為博物館的核心功能已獲認可。」(Hein, 1998: 3)

博物館的觀眾範式從「博物館對社會大眾的期望」(museum's expectation of the public) 轉變為「社會大眾對博物館的期待」(public's expectation of museum) (Weil, 張譽騰譯, 2015:29) 就意味著博物館教育首要洞悉「是誰的博物館教育」？因而對參觀者（甚至是非參觀者）進行量化及質性兼備的觀眾研究越顯重要，也越能促進博物館認識到各種展覽與活動對參觀者的影響，進而將參觀者的需求差異納入展覽及活動設計的過程，以形成良性循環的發展。再者，觀眾願意在博物館中學習，是出於他們的參觀經驗能與自己的生活經驗相結合，並擴展其視野，引發記憶、發現和想像，因而博物館應當更看重觀眾研究作為創造有利使用者學習環境的基石，為參觀者創造「沈浸於經驗中無意識且自然的學習方式。」(Claxton, 1999: 67; Sotto, 1994: 96)，而不再認為只需將博物館展品置於「正確」的展示位置即可激發學習。

再者，參觀者在博物館中的學習是動態而豐富的歷程，是高度個人化、以遊戲和渴望為重而非尋找被禁止、被規訓的預定終點 (Usher, 1997: 17)，亦是認知、情意及

五感統合的整體性經驗。相較於對身體經驗的不信任，而將感覺視為一種不可靠的學習方式（Prior, 2002: 91），認知心理學家 Csikszentmihalyi 及 Hermanson（1999）主張「學習經驗涉及整個人，包括智識上的、感覺及情感的機能」，而真正驅動持續不斷學習的動能「在本質上是情感性的。」（Claxton, 1999:15-16）。Sotto（1994: 98）也認為「由於投入情感，默會的學習是如此強而有力。」因為個人情感會對他人產生感染力，情感的投入表明在某種情況下的接受和參與，Fay（1996: 27）的研究則表明：「知道不是由經驗本身所組成，而是把握到那個經驗的感覺所組成。」因此，可以說，即使參觀者對博物館展品一無所知，其直接可感受到的形色、氣味、聲音、質地等引起的反應已為參觀者與展品建立最初的關係，認知心理學家也進一步證實情感及情緒是與認知表現有強大關連，往往一個激起我們強烈情感的事物更能夠促進記憶與學習過程（Eysenck & Keane, 2020）。我們牢記在心的往往是持續作用中的知覺體驗，更勝於理性推論所羅列的各種細節。Falk & Dierking（2016: 114）在探討博物館經驗中亦指出：「學習是一個在社會、環境與個人脈絡下持續吸收和調節資訊的積極過程。學習不僅僅包括吸收信息；它需要在個人心理結構對資訊加以積極調和，以容許其於日後使用。學習應被視為發生在互動經驗模式裡所定義的三種脈絡的焦點之動態過程：每一個學習例證都具有特殊脈絡的印記。」可以說，博物館提供視覺豐富的展品，有助參觀者探索與記憶相關的情感，而激發正向情感與創造力可成為博物館最有價值的公共服務之一，不少機構已建置相關部門或中心研發創意遊戲來促進參與者的情感與記憶動能。

最後，筆者引用古希臘哲學家 Socrates 的格言：「心智並非是被填滿的容器，而是被點燃的火炬。」（轉引自 Malone, 2003: 136），強調博物館教育應採取「變動性」、「整體性」及「多元性」的觀點。當博物館中的學習越是重視激發參觀者的好奇心、思辨力及想像力，就越要包容創造性的混亂與紛爭是開放社會的特徵與更高共識的必經過程。博物館應當幫助公眾運用博物館資源站在當代問題的浪頭上，成為公眾突破思想框架、尋求新體驗的交流場所。同時，博物館提供一個展覽的論述或活動的意義不再是唯一的詮釋，意義應是產生自並屬於不同參觀者的詮釋之中，而不同參觀者的詮釋則取決於其前見與敞開視域的體驗之中。正如德國哲學家 Schopenhauer（2015: 45）所說：「人都把自己視野的極限當作世界的極限。」卻不表示你因而可以將自己的偏見合理化，反而是隨時去檢視自己的思考極限並對不同意見（尤其是反對意見）開放態度，才能擴大自己的視野和/或改變自己的想法。正因如此，博物館應當成為一個安全且包容的場所，推動遺產認知、學習發展、社會包容、健康和福祉議論的交流平台，為消除偏狹誤解、對立衝突關係的化解發揮影響力。

參考文獻：

- Alexander, E. (1979) *Museum in Motion: An Introduction to the History and Functions of Museum*, American Association for State and Local History.
- American Association of Museums. (1992) *Excellence and Equity: Education and the Public Dimension of Museums*, Washington D.C.: American Association of Museums.
- Bourdieu, P. and Darbel, A. with Schnapper, D. (1991) *The Love of Art: European Art Museum and Their Public*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Claxton, G. (1999) *Wise Up: The Challenge of Lifelong Learning*, Bloomsbury, London.
- Csikszentmihalyi, M. and Hermanson, K. (1999) Intrinsic motivation in museums: why does one want to learn? In Hooper-Greenhill, E. (ed.) *The Educational Role of the Museum*, second edition, Routledge, London, 146-160.
- Dana, J. (1917) *The New Museum: vol.2*, Woodstock: Elm Tree Press.
- de Certeau, M. (2002) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press.
- Dewey, J. (1997) *Experience and Education*. Simon & Schuster, New York.
- Eysenck, M. W., & Keane, M. T. (2020). *Cognitive Psychology: A Student's Handbook*. New York: Routledge.
- Fay, B. (1996) *Contemporary Philosophy of Social Science: A multicultural Approach*, Blackwell, Oxford.
- Falk, J and Dierking, I. (2016) *The Museum Experience*, Routledge, London and New York.
- Foucault, M. (1999) 'Of Other Spaces: Utopias and Heterotopias' in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, Neil Leach(ed.), Routledge, London.
- Gadamer, H. (1986). *Hans-Georg Gadamer - Gesammelte Werke: Hermeneutik II*, Bd. 2, Tübingen.
- Gadamer, H. (2006) *Truth and Method*, translation revised by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, Continuum Publishing Group.
- Giroux, H. A. (1993) *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*. Routledge, New York & London.
- Hamilton, G. (1975) *Education and scholarship in the American museum*, In Lee S. (ed.) *On Understanding Art Museum*, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall, 1975.
- Hein, G. (1998) *Learning in the Museum*, Routledge, London.
- Hetherington, K. (1997) 'Museum topology and the will to connect', *Journal of Material Culture* 2, 199-218.
- Schopenhauer, A. (2015). *On the Suffering of the World*, Simon and Schuster.
- Sotto, E. (1994) *When Teaching Becomes Learning: A Theory and Practice of Teaching*, Cassell, London.
- Price, C. (2002) *Bodies building*, *Museums Journal*, 102(4), 17.

- Prior, N. (2002) *Museums and Modernity: Art Galleries and the Making of Modern Culture*, Berg, Oxford and New York.
- Reitstätter, L., Brinkmann, H., Santini T., Specker, E., Dare, Z., Bakondi, F., Miscená, A., Kasneci, E., Leder, H., & Rosenberg, R. (2020). The display makes a difference: A mobile eye tracking study on the perception of art before and after a museum's rearrangement. *Journal of Eye Movement Research*, 13,6.
- Roberts, L. C. (1997) *From Knowledge to Narrative: Educators and the Changing Museum*. Smithsonian, Washington and London.
- Usher, R., Bryant, I and Johnston, R. (1997) *Adult Education and the Postmodern Challenge: Learning Beyond the Limits*, Routledge, London and New York.
- 約翰·杜威著，單文經譯注（2015），《經驗與教育》，台北：聯經。
- Weil, S. E., 張譽騰譯（2015），《博物館重要的事》，台北：五觀。
- 約翰·福克、琳·迪爾金著、林潔盈、羅欣怡、皮淮音、金靜玉（譯）（2010）。《博物館經驗》。臺北市：五觀藝術。

蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉相關議題評析

陳俊偉*

摘要

蘇軾於〈諸葛亮論〉非常強調要全其「仁義」，反對諸葛亮「仁義、詐力雜用」，之後還「失機」、錯失了進攻曹魏政權的契機。其論點置諸傳統的諸葛亮相關論述場域中，具有相當特殊的地位。然而，翻新出奇的同時亦陷入標新立異的危機，致使該文的諸多論述頗有值得商議的空間。例如將身份不同的曹操視作諸葛亮的對照組、論述諸葛亮時往往過度強調其負面形象、趁曹操過世之際離間曹丕兄弟的「失機」說未免樂觀等等。後世雖不乏迴響，但亦有反對其說法者，尤其明代王世貞甚至以專文一一進行批駁。鑒於目前研究尚未較完整地梳理該文，及其相關言論、評價；本文即試圖較周全地進行探討，尤其著眼於蘇軾該文立論的特殊處，透過追溯史料以思量論述之得失。

關鍵詞：諸葛亮、三國史、歷史散文、王世貞〈書蘇子瞻〈諸葛亮論〉後〉

* 國立金門大學通識教育中心兼任助理教授
(到稿日期：2022 年 6 月 21 日；通過刊登日期：2022 年 8 月 18 日)

Su Shi ' Zhuge Liang's Discuss ' Related topics Comment

CHEN, JUN-WEI**

Abstract

Su Shi ' Zhuge Liang theory ' emphasizes the moral point of view, and criticized Zhuge Liang missed the opportunity attack Cao Wei regime. The argument is quite special status, also quite amazing. However, it also has negative effect. The opposition is more obvious, especially in the Ming Dynasty Wang Shih-chen even special article to refute him. In view of research is fragmented, we attempted to thoroughly explore the content. Focus on the central idea and view of history. Through tracing historical practice, consider the gains and losses.

Keywords:Zhuge Liang, the history of Three Kingdoms, historical prose, Wang Shih-chen ' Zhuge Liang's Discuss comment '

** Adjunct Professor, Center for General Education, National Quemoy University.

一、前言

南宋(1127-1279)羅大經曾在《鶴林玉露》卷九〈東坡文〉，指出北宋(960-1127)蘇軾(子瞻，號東坡居士，1037-1101)行文的特色：「《莊子》之文，以無為有；《戰國策》之文，以曲作直。東坡平生熟此二書，故其為文，橫說豎說，惟意所到，俊辯痛快，無復滯礙。」¹該語若視作蘇軾的史論散文之形容，自係屬貼切的描述。這種「惟意所到」的特徵，同時表現在蘇軾於嘉祐二年(1061)、二十五歲時考前所獻進的〈諸葛亮論〉。

現存《蘇軾文集》的各類史論散文，數量方面應有百餘篇之多。〈諸葛亮論〉雖不似〈留侯論〉、〈賈誼論〉等名篇較廣泛地受到關注，然而傳統亦時常提及該文²。一來是因為蘇軾探討的主要對象，為歷代皆頗受關注的三國(184-280)蜀漢(221-263)名臣諸葛亮(孔明，181-234)；二來係因該篇於蘇軾史論散文之中，終究還是頗具特色與代表性。是故現今學者探討蘇軾史論散文中的儒家政治思想時列舉之³，論蘇軾歷史人物論的特色時列舉之⁴，探討蘇軾史論散文的作法分析、可議之處時也列舉之⁵。

本文則專論蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉一文。著眼於該文中心思想、歷史觀點的特殊之處，涉及其寫作策略；同時追溯著三國史史料，藉此逆推蘇軾歷史判斷的根據，試圖察見其推論的得失。另外，明代(1368-1644)王世貞(1526-1590)曾撰寫〈書蘇子瞻〈諸葛亮論〉後〉⁶一文，專門指謫蘇軾該文內容之不當，頗值得關注。對於蘇軾論述的偏失俱備獨到見解，有助於讀者理解該文，正文中將另闢一節進行闡釋。藉由以上，嘗試較圓滿地理解蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉。

¹ [宋]羅大經撰，《新刊鶴林玉露》(南京：鳳凰出版社，2012年，和刻本中國古逸書叢刊)，頁387。

² 清代(1644-1911)朱璘《識時務論》：「自陳壽有『應變非其所長』之評，而袁宏輩和之；自蘇軾有『詐力、仁義雜取』之論，而秦觀等和之。孔明之才、之學，此所以歷千百餘年而尚無發明之者。」所謂「『詐力、仁義雜取』之論」係指蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉，該文當頗具影響力。出自其《諸葛丞相集》卷四附錄，引用自王瑞功，《諸葛亮研究集成》(濟南：齊魯書社，1997年9月)，頁622。

³ 胡建民，〈蘇軾人物史論與儒家政治思想〉，《創新》第5期(2013年)，頁100。

⁴ 樊德三，〈試論蘇軾歷史人物論的特色〉，《淮北煤師範學報》第2期(1985年)，頁102-103。

⁵ 謝敏玲，《蘇軾史論散文研究》(臺北：萬卷樓圖書有限公司，1990年5月)，頁108-110、224-226。

⁶ 吳佳展曾稍事闡釋該文，基本贊同王世貞的觀點，見氏，《王世貞史論散文研究》(東吳大學中國文學系碩士學位論文，黃登山先生指導，2007年5月)，頁54-56。

二、蘇軾觀點切入的特殊之處

〈諸葛亮論〉一文雖不乏蘇軾獨具慧眼的判斷，然而推新出奇的同時難免流於標新立異。這一刻意求新、求奇的企圖，從〈諸葛亮論〉本身著意的對照組設定方面即可察見。蘇軾主要係視曹操（155-220）作諸葛亮的對照者。關於這點，余明俠質疑：「首先，由於諸葛亮與曹操的身分不同，將兩人相比是不恰當的。」⁷又言：「其次，由於兩人的相差年齡很大，所處的時代、環境也顯然不同，因而不可同日而語。」⁸即指如是的對照組選擇本身是不妥當的，無論從身份考量，還是從時代環境檢視。其實後者的問題反倒較不嚴重，畢竟跨時代的歷史人物之比較實於傳統論述中經常見及，唯獨余氏的陳述也間接指涉了蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉一文於歷代探討諸葛亮的相關專文中之特殊處。

蘇軾該文之前論及諸葛亮的專篇著作，通常尋找的對照者本身大概都是一代名臣，無論是名相，抑或是名將。三國時期即有孫吳（229-280）張儼（?-266）〈諸葛亮與司馬懿論〉，以下還有西晉（266-316）張輔〈樂葛優劣論〉、東晉（317-420）習鑿齒（?-384?）〈側周魯通諸葛論〉、唐代（618-907）李翰撰寫〈三名臣論〉（三名臣指諸葛亮、管仲（725-645 B.C.）、樂毅）⁹等。

司馬懿（179-251）雖然被後來的西晉王朝追尊為高祖宣皇帝，唯其實際於曹魏（220-266）政權則是扮演著重要輔臣的角色；同諸葛亮一般皆受君王託孤遺詔¹⁰，且皆為政治家、軍事家：對比性最強烈。樂毅、管仲兩人乃是春秋時期名臣，前者攻陷齊國七十餘城，後者輔佐齊桓公稱霸，兩個熟典之主角皆是諸葛亮生平效法的前賢¹¹。周、魯則指約略同時期的孫吳名臣周瑜（175-210）、魯肅（172-217），兩人皆對其政權貢獻巨大¹²。論者撰寫單篇史論時，應有意識到身份是否與諸葛亮對稱的問題。畢竟，共通點為比較研究成立的基礎。換言之，如果要與諸葛亮進行評秤，一般論者的思考方式即是列置身份類似者優先。從這裏顯現出蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉與眾不同的地方：將

⁷ 見氏，〈必須全面客觀地評價諸葛亮的軍事成就——從北宋蘇軾的議論談起〉，《徐州師範大學學報（哲學社會科學版）》第34卷第1期（2008年1月），頁54。

⁸ 同前註，頁55。

⁹ 篇名之標示權且依據王瑞功，《諸葛亮研究集成》。

¹⁰ 司馬懿受魏文帝曹丕（187-226，220-226在位）、魏明帝曹叡（206-239，226-239在位）父子兩人各自遺詔託孤，東晉孫盛（307-378）《魏氏春秋》：「時太子（曹）芳年八歲，秦王九歲，在於御側。（魏明）帝執宣王手，目太子曰：『死乃復可忍，朕忍死待君，君其與爽輔此。』」宣王曰：『陛下不見先帝（魏文帝）屬臣以陛下乎？』」（《三國志·魏書·明帝紀》注引。〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》（北京：中華書局，2009年9月），頁114。

¹¹ 《三國志·蜀書·諸葛亮傳》：「（諸葛亮）身長八尺，每自比於管仲、樂毅，時人莫之許也。惟博陵崔州平、潁川徐庶元直與亮友善，謂為信然。」同前註，頁911。

¹² 《三國志·吳書·周瑜魯肅呂蒙傳》評曰：「曹公乘漢相之資，挾天子而掃羣桀，新濫荊城，仗威東夏，于時議者莫不疑貳。周瑜、魯肅建獨斷之明，出眾人之表，實奇才也。」同前註，頁1281。

君王身份的曹操視為名臣身份的諸葛亮之對照者。

身份不對稱固然是作者前提預設的錯誤，只是這一錯誤是一般人相當容易察覺的，蘇軾未必沒有發現。尤其考量到蘇軾本係蜀人，諸葛亮又為該地域最享富盛名的前賢，前人如何議論之信然有概要的理解¹³。然而作者卻又為之，成就如是特殊的對照組。不禁讓人思考，從寫作策略檢視該安排，蘇軾何故如此？其目的應與試圖強調「仁義」的主題思想相符。〈諸葛亮論〉開頭：

取之以仁義，守之以仁義者，周也。取之以詐力，守之以詐力者，秦也。以秦之所以取取之，以周之所以守守之者，漢也。仁義詐力雜用以取天下者，此孔明之所以失也。¹⁴

開宗明義先列舉兩種取天下與守天下的方式，取之、守之以「仁義」，或取之、守之以「詐力」。然而，蘇軾所論重心既是諸葛亮取天下的方式，焦點當在於取之以「仁義」、或取之以「詐力」處。認定周朝取之以「仁義」，漢朝則是取之以「詐力」，這兩個王朝歷代幾盡沒有否定法統的聲音出現，顯係兩種做法都是被蘇軾認可的。這裡也顯露出蘇軾正嘗試過度「單純化」周朝、漢朝取天下所使用手段的複雜性。僅就漢朝的建國而論，當初漢高祖劉邦（256-195B.C.，202-195B.C. 在位）除了以「詐力」抗衡項羽（232-202B.C.），尚運用自我形塑、標榜成仁義之師¹⁵的舉動（另外，漢朝守國其實是王霸雜用¹⁶，顯見該段論述確實有過度「單純化」歷史實況的傾向）。

先將兩個成功案例取天下的方式概念化後，再往光譜的兩極推遷、定位，如是方

¹³ 三蘇皆有議論諸葛亮的作品，其中蘇軾從早年至暮年皆有相關文字留存。詳見馬斗成，〈三蘇與諸葛亮〉，《歷史教學》第4期（2004年），頁71-74。

¹⁴ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》（北京：中華書局，1986年3月），頁112。

¹⁵ 例如劉邦得到關中地區民心，就是行仁義之舉，且廢除法家苛政。《史記·高祖本紀》：「漢元年十月，沛公兵遂先諸侯至霸上。秦王子嬰素車白馬，係頸以組封皇帝璽符節，降軹道旁。諸將或言誅秦王。沛公曰：『始懷王遣我，固以能寬容；且人已服降，又殺之，不祥。』乃以秦王屬吏，遂西入咸陽。欲止宮休舍，樊噲、張良諫，乃封秦重寶財物府庫，還軍霸上。召諸縣父老豪傑曰：『父老苦秦苛法久矣，誹謗者族，偶語者棄市。吾與諸侯約，先入關者王之，吾當王關中。與父老約，法三章耳：殺人者死，傷人及盜抵罪。餘悉除去秦法。諸吏人皆案堵如故。凡吾所以來，為父老除害，非有所侵暴，無恐！且吾所以還軍霸上，待諸侯至而定約束耳。』乃使人與秦吏行縣鄉邑，告諭之。秦人大喜，爭持牛羊酒食獻饗軍士。沛公又讓不受，曰：『倉粟多，非乏，不欲費人。』人又益喜，唯恐沛公不為秦王。」後來征討項羽則是標榜為義帝報仇的正義大纛，同傳：「董公遮說漢王以義帝死故。漢王聞之，袒而大哭。遂為義帝發喪，臨三日。發使者告諸侯曰：『天下共立義帝，北面事之。今項羽放殺義帝於江南，大逆無道。寡人親為發喪，諸侯皆縞素。悉發關內兵，收三河士，南浮江漢以下，願從諸侯王擊楚之殺義帝者。』」〔西漢〕司馬遷撰，《史記》（臺北：廣文書局，1962年9月，影印乾隆四年校刊），頁169、171。

¹⁶ 《漢書·元帝紀》：「宣帝作色曰：『漢家自有制度，本以霸、王道雜之，奈何純任德教，用周政乎！且俗儒不達時宜，好是古非今，使人眩於名實，不知所守，何足委任！』」〔東漢〕班固撰，《漢書》（東京都：汲古書院，1972年7月，和刻本正史），頁91。

才有機會突顯諸葛亮取天下時的方式不倫不類。〈諸葛亮論〉一開頭就不乏作者的巧思。接續著，該文第二段起始處承續首段尾末「雜用」一語說明：

曹操因衰乘危，得逞其姦，孔明耻之，欲信大義於天下。當此時，曹公威震四海，東據許、兗，南牧荊、豫，孔明之恃以勝之者，獨以其區區之忠信，有以激天下之心耳。¹⁷

這裡涉及曹操、諸葛亮的比較，藉此彰顯雙方的差異。後半段即言道諸葛亮唯一勝過曹操的條件就僅有「忠信」。這一「忠信」指稱的內容涵意應當接近於首段的「仁義」，總之就是概念上訴諸道德原則。

前段如是對照諸葛亮、曹操的作法，後文又有再進行發揮，先行徵引如下：「曹、劉之不敵，天下之所共知也。言兵不若曹操之多，言地不若曹操之廣，言戰不若曹操之能，而有以一勝之者，區區之忠信也。」¹⁸這裡雖提及「曹、劉」兩個政治集團的代稱，但從前文不難看出實際就是在評量曹操、諸葛亮兩人掌握的一切政治資源之高下。兵源、地廣的差距是客觀存在的事實，毋須再議。唯獨「言戰不若曹操之能」這點，就涉及個人主觀的評價問題，該處亦可以察見將曹操與諸葛亮並置的必要性：突顯出諸葛亮取天下唯一勝過曹操的政治資源，即「仁義」、「忠信」等道德原則。陳壽撰寫的《三國志》畢竟還是具有權威性，其「評曰」論曹操：

漢末，天下大亂，雄豪並起，而袁紹虎視四州，強盛莫敵。太祖運籌演謀，鞭撻宇內，擊申、商之法術，該韓、白之奇策，官方授材，各因其器，矯情任算，不念舊惡，終能總御皇機，克成洪業者，惟其明略最優也。抑可謂非常之人，超世之傑矣。¹⁹

十分正面且高度地推崇了曹操，不僅擊敗袁紹(?-202)以一統當時的第一戰區北方，所謂「該韓、白之奇策」、「惟其明略最優」云云，標誌了這位「超世之傑」過人的軍事才能。

軍事才能這點，卻是陳壽認為諸葛亮較不擅長的地方，《三國志·蜀書·諸葛亮傳》：

諸葛亮之為相國也，撫百姓，示儀軌，約官職，從權制，開誠心，佈公道；盡忠益時者雖讎必賞，犯法怠慢者雖親必罰，服罪輸情者雖重必釋，遊辭巧飾者雖輕必戮；善無微而不賞，惡無纖而不貶；庶事精煉，物理其本，循名責實，虛偽不齒；終於邦域之內，咸畏而愛之，刑政雖峻而無怨者，以其用心平而勸戒明也。可謂識治之良才，管、蕭之亞匹矣。然連年動眾，未能成功，蓋應變將略，非其所長歟！²⁰

¹⁷ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁112。

¹⁸ 同前註。

¹⁹ 《三國志·魏書·武帝紀》。〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁55。

²⁰ 《三國志·蜀書·諸葛亮傳》。同前註，頁934。

雖然高度評價了諸葛亮諸面向，但是依然指出其「應變將略，非其所長」，軍事才能的評比顯係不及曹操。

曹魏集團固然還有一人也具適切性，即司馬懿。唯獨置司馬懿為對照者，雖也可、或可證成諸葛亮取天下僅有「一勝」的命題，雙方身份更顯對稱。唯獨若套入諸葛亮「言戰不若」「某某」「之能」一語，又較諸曹操缺乏說服力，反而更難逼顯出僅有「一勝」。蓋司馬懿雖然地廣、兵多，卻始終與遠道來征的蜀漢軍隊對峙難解。不僅早有論者認定諸葛亮之戰場表現實更勝於司馬懿²¹，還有不少史料可以說明司馬懿不如、或畏懼諸葛亮²²。因而僅就突出「仁義」、「忠信」乃是諸葛亮取天下唯一憑藉的這件事情之功能性而論，反倒不及曹操適宜。

三、蘇軾舉例之合理性與「失機」一事探析

蘇軾將曹操視為諸葛亮的對照者，可能還有一點考量即是諸葛亮於曹操過世的建安二十五年（220）之後，基本上沒有做出什麼嚴重違反「仁義」之事（至少就傳統論述檢視），因而較難挑剔瑕疵。將這兩人並提，雙方重疊的時間點大致在諸葛亮接受後

²¹ 《三國志·蜀書·諸葛亮傳》注引吳大鴻臚作《默記》，其〈述佐篇〉論亮與司馬宣王書曰：「……孔明起巴蜀之地，蹈一州之土，方之大國，其戰士人民，蓋有九分之一也，而以貢贄大吳，對抗北敵，至使耕戰有伍，刑法整齊，提步卒數萬，長驅祁山，慨然有飲馬河、洛之志。仲達據天下十倍之地，仗兼併之眾，據牢城，擁精銳，無禽敵之意，務自保全而已。使彼孔明自來自去。若此人不亡，終其志意，連年運思，刻日興謀，則涼、雍不解甲，中國不釋鞍，勝負之勢，亦已決矣。……今仲達之才，減於孔明，當時之勢，異於曩日，玄德尚與抗衡，孔明何以不可出軍而圖敵邪？」這篇即前文稱引張儼〈諸葛亮與司馬懿論〉一文。〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 935-936。

²² 這方面史料應以習鑿齒之記載最傳神，《三國志·蜀書·諸葛亮傳》注引的《漢晉春秋》：「乃使（司馬懿）西屯長安，督張郃、費曜、戴陵、郭淮等。宣王使曜、陵留精兵四千守上邽，餘眾悉出，西救祁山。郃欲分兵駐雍、郿，宣王曰：『料前軍能獨當之者，將軍言是也；若不能當而分為前後，此楚之三軍所以為黥布禽也。』遂進。（諸葛）亮分兵留攻，自逆宣王于上邽。郭淮、費曜等徼亮，亮破之，因大芟刈其麥，與宣王遇于上邽之東，斂兵依險，軍不得交，亮引而還。宣王尋亮至于鹵城。張郃曰：『彼遠來逆我，請戰不得，調我利在不戰，欲以長計制之也。且祁山知大軍以在近，人情自固，可止屯於此，分為奇兵，示出其後，不宜進前而不敢逼，坐失民望也。今亮縣軍食少，亦行去矣。』宣王不從，故尋亮。既至，又登山掘營，不肯戰。賈栩、魏平數請戰，因曰：『公畏蜀如虎，奈天下笑何！』宣王病之。諸將咸請戰。五月辛巳，乃使張郃攻無當監何平於南圍，自案中道向亮。亮使魏延、高翔、吳班赴拒，大破之，獲甲首三千級，玄鎧五千領，角弩三千一百張，宣王還保營。」又：「楊儀等整軍而出，百姓奔告宣王，宣王追焉。姜維令儀反旗鳴鼓，若將向宣王者，宣王乃退，不敢逼。於是儀結陳而去，入谷然後發喪。宣王之退也，百姓為之諺曰：『死諸葛走生仲達。』或以告宣王，宣王曰：『吾能料生，不便料死也。』」〔晉〕陳壽撰；〔宋〕裴松之注：《三國志》，頁 925-926、927。該書向來「尊襄陽」（諸葛亮乃襄陽寓賢）大於「尊晉」，相關研究可詳見王文進，〈習鑿齒與諸葛亮神話之建構〉，《臺大中學報》第 38 期（2012 年 9 月），頁 71-120。

來的蜀漢昭烈帝、先主劉備（161-223，221-223 在位）「三顧茅廬」之後（207），至曹操過世之間。容易引導讀者聚焦在這段時期左右。只是，蘇軾嘗試列舉諸葛亮年輕時有重大道德瑕疵的兩次案例（涉及到盜竊、侵略他人領地的問題），本身則頗值得再議。

諸葛亮若能完全執行「仁義」之道，發揮這項曹操較缺乏的優勢，可以獲取什麼樣的政治效應？蘇軾接續：

夫天下廉隅節概慷慨死義之士，固非心服曹氏也，特以威劫而強臣之，聞孔明之風，宜其千里之外有響應者，如此則雖無措足之地，而天下固為之用矣。且夫殺一不辜而得天下，有所不為，而後天下忠義士樂為之死。²³

蘇軾認為若能全其「仁義」之道，則那些於曹操集團武力威脅下而不得不臣服的「死義之士」，終將「千里之外有響應者」。結尾處「且夫殺一不辜而得天下，有所不為，而後天下忠義士樂為之死」云云，正說明蘇軾認定取天下時仰憑「仁義」者應遵守的王道高標²⁴，即「殺一不辜」亦「有所不為」，唯獨如此「後天下忠義士」才會「樂為之死」。究其實，縱使諸葛亮皆全行「仁義」，這些「死義之士」究竟可以發揮多少效用也值得懷疑，蘇軾態度相當地樂觀。而且，十分強調「仁義」的重要性，劃出了諸葛亮應遵守的高標，這一高標也反映出蘇軾對諸葛亮要求之苛刻。

蘇軾再來列舉兩件諸葛亮不符合該高標的做法，交待諸葛亮乃是「仁義詐力雜用」，以及何故取天下失敗：「劉表之喪，先主在荊州，孔明欲襲殺其孤，先主不忍也。其後劉璋以好逆之至蜀，不數月，扼其吭，拊其背，而奪之國。此其與曹操異者幾希矣。」²⁵這兩個案例頗有討論的空間。第一個案例的記載見《三國志·蜀書·先主傳》：

（建安）十二年，曹公北征烏丸，先主說（劉）表襲許，表不能用。曹公南征表，會表卒，子琮代立，遣使請降。先主屯樊，不知曹公卒至，至宛乃聞之，遂將其眾去。過襄陽，諸葛亮說先主攻琮，荊州可有。先主曰：「吾不忍也。」乃駐馬呼琮，琮懼不能起。琮左右及荊州人多歸先主。²⁶

諸葛亮固然建議攻下襄陽，蘇軾則改用相對嚴重的字眼——「襲殺」二字稱之，詮釋方面俱備加重渲染史事的嫌疑。需要注意的是，諸葛亮縱使有此建議，劉備集團終究沒有選擇該策。這也不禁讓人懷疑，既然沒有實踐，那麼該次事件對於諸葛亮的「仁義」形象究竟能有多少減損？以致於「忠義士」們失望？其次，誠如程頤：「若劉表子琮將為曹公所并，取而興劉氏可也。」²⁷劉琮既然已經「遣使請降」、投降於漢賊，

²³ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁 112。

²⁴ 北宋程頤（1032-1085）：「王者如天地之無私心焉。行一不義而得天下不為。」〔宋〕程顥、程頤撰，《二程遺書》（上海：上海古籍出版社，1995 年 2 月），頁 245。

²⁵ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁 112。

²⁶ 〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 877。

²⁷ 〔宋〕程顥、程頤撰，《二程遺書》，頁 245。

誠如清代黃以周（1828-1899）：「降賊臣操，是琮有可攻之道也。」²⁸劉備集團實已經俱備攻下襄陽的正當性；且黃氏又云：「先主駐馬呼琮，琮懼不能起，是琮有易動之勢也。」²⁹這一情勢判斷，也符合當時客觀境況。另外，王世貞則從急迫性切入，後文一併續論。

第二個案例的記載表面上看似對於蘇軾立論最為有利，蘇軾似乎也意識到該案例最俱備違背道德危機的可能性³⁰，於是又補充：「孔明遷劉璋，既已失天下義士之望，乃始治兵振旅，為仁義之師，東嚮長驅，而欲天下響應，蓋亦難矣。」³¹這裡很容易發現，蘇軾未免有將劉備集團攻佔蜀地一事的負面效應之歸屬，從劉備身上盡皆改置於諸葛亮。諸葛亮〈隆中對〉雖有替劉備規畫復漢藍圖：

益州險塞，沃野千里，天府之上，高祖因之以成帝業。劉璋闇弱，張魯在北，民殷國富而不知存恤，智能之士思得明君。將軍既帝室之胄，信義著於四海，總攬英雄，思賢如渴，若跨有荊、益，保其巖阻，西和諸戎，南撫夷越，外結好孫權，內脩政理……³²

誠如明代趙南星（1556-1627）：「先主之取益州，孔明之本謀也。」³³但是真正實踐之者，也就是「不數月，扼其吭，拊其背，而奪之國」者、趁其「以好逆之至蜀」時發動侵略者依然是君王劉備。

實際出謀規劃戰略者則是龐統（179-214）³⁴。又，決定「遷劉璋」者理所當然還

²⁸ 盧弼注引。〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔南朝宋〕裴松之注，盧弼集解，錢劍夫整理，《三國志集解》（上海：上海古籍出版社，2009年6月），頁2345-2346。

²⁹ 同前註，頁2346。

³⁰ 《諸葛忠武侯全書》卷三引用明代劉定之（1409-1469）：「談者率謂武侯伯仲伊、呂，惟詐取劉璋為瑕。」當見一般論者所持的常調。劉定之則維護：「予以紂命文王為方伯，得專征伐，武王遂以伐紂，後世不以為過。劉璋雖漢宗，竊據一隅，不能信大義於天下，又不能自保其國，直更始、劉盆子等。昭烈取以基為恢復，有何不可。」〔明〕王士驥輯，薛案評，《諸葛忠武侯全書》（臺南：莊嚴文化事業有限公司，1996年8月，四庫全書存目叢書影印安徽省圖書館藏明崇禎十一年吳天挺刻本），史部第84冊，頁226。

³¹ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁112。

³² 〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁912-913。南宋（1127-1279）錢時（1175-1244）：「跨有荊、益，是亮素定之規模也。久假荊州於權而不歸，偽附劉璋於蜀而奪之國。兩地雖皆，漢比之盜賊，不足多道。然以詐取之，則固未可。九合諸侯，一匡天下，亦不如是也。」僅就「偽附劉璋」的部份，應先行說明是諸葛亮的「規模」，這樣才是相對之下較切合實況的敘述。〔宋〕錢時撰，《兩漢筆記》（臺北：臺灣商務，1969-1970年，四庫全書珍本初集），卷十二，葉20。

³³ 〔明〕趙南星撰，《味檠齋文集》（上海：商務印書館，1936年6月，叢書集成初編），第12冊，頁551。

³⁴ 例如《三國志·蜀書·龐統傳》注引《九州春秋》：「統說備曰：『荊州荒殘，人物殫盡，東有吳孫，北有曹氏，鼎足之計，難以得志。今益州國富民彊，戶口百萬，四部兵馬，所出必具，寶貨無求於外，

是劉備，不是諸葛亮。除了蘇軾，尚有其他宋人也把該次戰役——蜀漢前期整體、甚至應當主要屬於劉備的負面形象之部份，盡數歸屬諸葛亮名下。例如朱熹（1130-1200）〈諸葛孔明大綱資質好〉有段對話：「毅然問孔明誘奪劉璋似不義，曰：『便是後世聖賢難做，動着粘手惹腳。』」³⁵整個劉備集團攻奪蜀地的戰役中，諸葛亮從未「誘奪」過劉璋（?-220）。即使是最後誘導劉璋投降、獻出成都一事，皆是劉備自己為之³⁶。這裡或許也反映了古人、或宋人在討論特定歷史議題時，容易集體持有的誤解或偏見。

蘇軾在完成其否定諸葛亮之「仁義詐力雜用」的論述後，接續則將話題轉向「失機」的主題。其「機」乃係指：「曹操既死，子丕代立，當此之時，可以計破也。」³⁷也就是利用曹操過世的契機。蘇軾續言：

何者？操之臨終，召丕而屬之植，未嘗不以譚、尚為戒也。而丕與植，終於相殘如此。此其父子兄弟且為寇讎，而況能以得天下英雄之心哉！此有可間之勢，不過捐數十萬金，使其大臣骨肉內自相殘，然後舉兵而伐之，此高祖所以滅項籍也。孔明既不能全其信義，以服天下之心，又不能奮其智謀，以絕曹氏之手足，宜其屢戰而屢卻哉！³⁸

「操之臨終，召丕而屬之植」一事似不見史載，恐為人情推論下的理所當然之猜想。大抵蘇軾之立論是從曹操過世後，曹丕、曹植（192-232）兄弟之間關係依舊惡劣的這點著手。認定如是既不「得天下英雄之心」、自有「可間之勢」，只要「捐數十萬金」即可「使其大臣骨肉內自相殘」，再趁此機會「然後舉兵而伐之」。

蘇軾的「可間之勢」說，後人認為未免過於天真，明代茅坤（1512-1601）：「行文

今可權借以定大事。」備曰：『今指與吾為水火者，曹操也，操以急，吾以寬；操以暴，吾以仁；操以譎，吾以忠；每與操反，事乃可成耳。今以小故而失信義於天下者，吾所不取也。』統曰：『權變之時，固非一道所能定也。兼弱攻昧，五伯之事。逆取順守，報之以義，事定之後，封以大國，何負於信？今日不取，終為人利耳。』備遂行。」又，《三國志·蜀書·龐統傳》：「益州牧劉璋與先主會涪，統進策曰：『今因此會，便可執之，則將軍無用兵之勞而坐定一州也。』先主曰：『初入他國，恩信未著，此不可也。』璋既還成都，先主當為璋北征漢中，統復說曰：『陰選精兵，晝夜兼道，徑襲成都；璋既不武，又素無預備，大軍卒至，一舉便定，此上計也。楊懷、高沛，璋之名將，各仗彊兵，據守關頭，聞數有賤諫璋，使發遣將軍還荊州。將軍未至，遣與相聞，說荊州有急，欲還救之，並使裝束，外作歸形；此二子既服將軍英名，又喜將軍之去，計必乘輕騎來見，將軍因此執之，進取其兵，乃向成都，此中計也。退還白帝，連引荊州，徐還圖之，此下計也。若沈吟不去，將致大困，不可久矣。』先主然其中計，即斬懷、沛，還向成都，所過輒克。」同前註，頁 955。

³⁵ 〔宋〕黎靖德編，《朱子語類》（臺北：文津出版社，1986 年 12 月），第 8 冊，頁 3236。

³⁶ 《三國志·蜀書·馬超傳》：「先主遣人迎（馬）超，超將兵徑到城下。城中震怖，璋即稽首。」又，注引魚豢《典略》：「（劉）備聞超至，喜曰：『我得益州矣。』乃使人止超，而潛以兵資之。超到，令引軍屯城北，超至未一旬而成都潰。」〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 946、947。

³⁷ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁 112。

³⁸ 同前註，頁 112-113。

好，而以間疏丕、植為謀，終似畫餅。」³⁹十分簡潔地批判之。又如今人樊德三：「所提的『離間』曹氏兄弟的設想，也過於天真，就曹丕與其他兄弟當時的力量懸殊情況看，究竟能有多大作用也很難說。」⁴⁰若僅論曹丕、曹植勢力之消長，差不多符合當時概況。據《三國志·魏書·文帝紀》：「建安十六年，（曹丕）為五官中郎將、副丞相。二十二年，立為魏太子。」⁴¹建安二十二年（217）曹丕成為曹操的指定接班人，曹植的政治資源即逐步減少。據《三國志·魏書·曹植傳》：「（曹）植嘗乘車行馳道中，開司馬門出。太祖大怒，公車令坐死。由是重諸侯科禁，而植寵日衰。」⁴²又有：「太祖既慮終始之變，以楊脩頗有才策，而又袁氏之甥也，於是以罪誅脩。植益內不自安。」⁴³先是「植寵日衰」，再「慮終始之變」以誅除曹植的黨羽，這四年之間曹操顯係開始有鞏固曹丕成為繼任者的總總作為。如果曹植在曹操過世後有所異志，單憑其於朝中的威望、勢力，很容易被消除殲滅。

反而較有可能引發曹氏兄弟內鬩的機會，非如蘇軾之言於曹植身上，策反擁有一定軍力的曹彰（?-223）還較有可能。《三國志·魏書·曹彰傳》：「太祖東還，以彰行越騎將軍，留長安。太祖至洛陽，得疾，驛召彰，未至，太祖崩。」⁴⁴注引《魏略》：「彰至，謂臨菑侯植曰：『先王召我者，欲立汝也。』」植曰：『不可。不見袁氏兄弟乎！』」⁴⁵魚豢《魏略》的這段記載，表現出曹植之識大體，置國家於個人利益之上。縱使《魏略》記載未必可信，曹彰不滿曹丕即位一事當是確定的，《三國志·魏書·劉司馬梁張溫傳》：「時鄴陵侯彰行越騎將軍，從長安來赴，問達先王璽授所在。」⁴⁶可為參證。當然，「捐數十萬金」即試圖引發曹魏內亂，這一設想本身恐過於天真，故不僅招來「畫餅」之譏，次節徵引之王世貞還有更多的批判。

蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉最後一段總結全文，並開始針對唐代呂溫(711-811)〈諸葛武侯廟記〉⁴⁷提供的戰略設想進行反思。藉由批判前人論述的缺失，無形中有確立、彰顯一己之優越性的敘述效果：

故夫敵有可間之勢而不間者，湯、武行之為大義，非湯、武而行之為失機。此仁人君子之大患也。呂溫以為孔明承桓、靈之後，不可彊民以思漢，欲其播告天下民，且曰：「曹氏利汝吾事之，害汝吾誅之」。不知蜀之與魏，果有以大過

³⁹ 高海夫主編，《唐宋八大家文鈔校注集評》（西安：三秦出版社，2004年10月），頁5207。

⁴⁰ 見氏，〈試論蘇軾歷史人物論的特色〉，頁102。

⁴¹ 〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁57。

⁴² 同前註，頁558。

⁴³ 同前註。

⁴⁴ 同前註，頁556。

⁴⁵ 同前註，頁557。

⁴⁶ 同前註，頁481。

⁴⁷ 該文：「桓靈流毒，在人骨髓。武侯乃欲開張季世、興振絕緒，諭之以本、臨之以忠，使人思漢，亦不可得也。向使武侯奉先主之命告天下曰：『我之舉也，匪私劉宗，唯活元元。曹氏利汝乎，吾事之；曹氏害汝乎，吾除之。』」其實就是將人民視為首出的觀點。〔唐〕呂溫撰，《呂衡州文集附考證》（上海：商務印書館，1935年，叢書集成初編），頁111。

之乎！苟無以大過之，而又決不能事魏，則天下安肯以空言竦動哉？嗚呼！此書生之論，可言而不可用也。⁴⁸

「非湯、武而行之為失機」，蓋指涉諸葛亮既然已經使用詐力於前，又不能把握「可間之勢」，是故「失機」。接著蘇軾反駁了呂溫的看法，即呂溫認為「桓靈之後」難以再「彊民以思漢」⁴⁹，應向民眾布告：「曹氏利汝吾事之，害汝吾誅之。」蘇軾這裡敏銳地注意到了曹魏、蜀漢兩陣營勢如水火（尤其是蜀漢以復漢凝聚內部，更不可能放棄這一旗幟），不似孫吳跟其他兩陣營的關係可親可疏：是故呂溫該語為「空言」。蘇軾的批評是正確的，這一段批駁也讓〈諸葛亮論〉一文於文末的文氣更顯騰躍。

接續著，蘇軾還續道蜀漢、諸葛亮雜用詐力，並沒有「大過」（應指「仁義」方面大幅超過）於曹魏政權。因而，認定呂溫的說法是「書生之論」、「可言而不可用」。平心而論，呂溫確實卻於樂觀，只是蘇軾於文末結尾處的詞語使用方面未免有些口不擇言，王世貞反思〈諸葛亮論〉時即常常用「書生」一語反過來定調蘇軾。

四、王世貞〈書蘇子瞻《諸葛亮論》後〉評議

面對蘇軾〈諸葛亮〉一文，王世貞撰寫專文〈書蘇子瞻《諸葛亮論》後〉糾駁之。這篇文章的特色之一，係大量徵引〈諸葛亮論〉的原文再提出自己的意見；雖有糟糠之處，但提出頗多觀點皆頗具建設性。其主要就蘇軾提出的取劉琮、攻劉璋、「失機」三點進行攔截。開頭：

蘇子瞻以「仁義、詐力雜用而取天下」為孔明之所以失，而謂「劉表之喪，昭烈在荊州，孔明欲襲而取其孤，昭烈不忍；其後劉璋以好逆之至蜀，不數月，扼其吭、拊其背而奪之國，其與曹操異者幾希矣。曹劉之不敵，天下之所知也，言兵不若曹操之強，言地不若曹操之廣，言戰不若曹操之能，而有以一勝之者，區區之忠信也。孔明遷劉璋，既已失天下義士之望，乃始治兵振旅，為仁義之師，東向長驅，而欲天下響應，難矣。」凡蘇子之持論甚至而事甚美。雖然，吾以為蘇子書生也，不識理勢，且又不讀書，不攷其時事。⁵⁰

先行歸納蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉一文的「雜用」之說，緊接再簡單批評其持論是「書生」之言——雖然事情設想甚美，卻不符理勢、不考時事。蘇軾批判呂溫的態度、語調，遭到後世的王世貞複製。

接續著，王世貞開始依序針對諸葛亮建議取襄陽一事，以及攻佔劉璋領地一事分別進行評議。先行徵引前者如下：

⁴⁸ 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》，頁113。

⁴⁹ 當時民心思漢的程度如何，回顧各家說法及現今研究，當予人見仁見智之感。唯獨劉備集團確實是以此為政治資本，因而呂溫方於此點作文章。

⁵⁰ 〔明〕王世貞撰，《讀書後》（臺北：臺灣商務，1976年，四庫全書珍本六集），卷二，葉19上。

夫荊州用武之地，孔明之初見昭烈已言之。昭烈不得荊州，不可以抗曹氏；曹氏不得荊州，不可以滅昭烈而扼江左之上游。然則曹氏未嘗一日而忘荊州與昭烈也。昭烈以左將軍領豫州牧，劉表僅鎮南將軍領荊州牧，其位在表上。特以羈旅相依，粗具契誼，非有君臣之分也。表，天子之一刺史，非世守之國也；表，兄也，昭烈，弟也，兄終弟及，非過也，取之固可，否則取之，而表琦為刺史，而身輔之以拒曹氏亦可。昭烈之不忍，固仁也；而孔明之計，非不義也。當陽之敗，幸而夏口尚有歸，又幸而孫權不與曹氏合耳。不然，昭烈之首已懸之許昌矣。吾故曰：蘇子不曉理勢也。⁵¹

這裡先是嘗試剝落劉備取荊州隱含著道德危機。交待劉備、劉表（142-208）兩人非君臣關係，劉表非「世守之國」，兩人之間亦可「兄終弟及」。然後王世貞再說明，只要取之之後再上表向來與劉備集團關係良好的劉表長子劉琦（?-209）為荊州刺史，不失為一個良好、可行的選擇。劉備不願意當下攻佔襄陽或許是有收買荊州人心之意⁵²，但是該舉本身確實頗符合仁義原則，不僅後世往往稱其「仁」，王世貞強調著劉備的「不忍人之心」。但是王世貞卻不認同意見與劉備相左就必屬「不義」。原因除了前文列舉上表劉琦為荊州刺史的做法，係屬一個妥善安排。又由於當時劉備集團的處境非常艱困危急，有猝然間險些遭到徹底殲滅的可能性⁵³，無怪乎劉備也遭後世批評其仁義之舉可謂不通權變⁵⁴。王世貞言下之意，似有暗指蘇軾似乎過於苛刻之意。

至於攻佔劉璋之蜀地一事，王世貞：

昭烈之入蜀，劉璋逆之，欲破張魯，孔明不在行也。其即會而欲掩劉璋者，龐統、法正也，而昭烈不忍也。既劉璋微覺之而不給軍食，所至以兵守關隘。昭烈欲歸荊州而跋尾之，不能且立槁矣。⁵⁵

強調諸葛亮不在行的部份，修正了蘇軾論述的偏失。接續著還強調當時劉備軍隊於蜀中實有進退兩難的處境⁵⁶。只是，劉備集團入蜀前早就有攻佔蜀地的企圖，甚至不惜付

⁵¹ 同前註，卷二，葉 19-20 上。

⁵² 盧弼注引清代黃以周：「至程子、朱子乃以先主之不攻劉琮為失權，後之論者，遂力斥先主之坐失機宜。……荊、益之取，定計於隆中，是先主未嘗忘情於荊也。以託孤而不忍，不過英雄善欺人，借此美語以籠絡荊周人士而已。劉璋何負於先主，先主卒襲而有之，是先主亦未見有愛於琮也。」〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔南朝宋〕裴松之注，盧弼集解，錢劍夫整理，《三國志集解》，頁 2345-2346。

⁵³ 《三國志·蜀書·先主傳》：「曹公以江陵有軍實，恐先主據之，乃釋輜重，輕軍到襄陽。聞先主已過，曹公將精騎五千急追之，一日一夜行三百餘裡，及於當陽之長坂。先主棄妻子，與諸葛亮、張飛、趙雲等數十騎走，曹公大獲其人眾輜重。先主斜趨漢津，適與羽船會，得濟沔，遇表長子江夏太守琦眾萬餘人，與俱到夏口。」〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 878。

⁵⁴ 又例如清代王綦緒〈取荊州論〉（1713-1784）批評：「昭烈之不取，婦人之仁也；武侯之取，王者之義也。」出自其手稿本《諸葛忠武集》（不分卷）之附錄，引用自王瑞功，《諸葛亮研究集成》，頁 650。

⁵⁵ 〔明〕王世貞撰，《讀書後》，卷二，葉 20 上。

⁵⁶ 劉備欲歸荊州、而反為進攻劉璋領地的原委，詳見《三國志·蜀書·先主傳》：「明年，曹公征孫權，

出與孫吳政權關係緊張的代價⁵⁷。之所以歸荊州時顯出踟躕狀，主因乃是劉璋已經有所警覺；既然侵略之企圖已在先，終究不能怪罪劉璋、埋怨他人。誠然，王世貞應當僅是想交待發動攻擊時還是有其當下的急迫性，藉此稍微提升一下正當性，這樣的說法多少也有助於減輕劉備集團的負面形象。王世貞續言：

劉璋，焉子也。焉不恤宗室之阽危而據險自固，朝貢俱廢，又擅造郊祀、乘輿、法物，非叛臣而何？璋之立，未請命也，曹氏之拜官，曹氏與國而已。仗義以討之，夫誰曰不宜？吾故曰：蘇子不讀書，又不攷其時事。⁵⁸

這段話語共分為指責劉璋之父劉焉（?-194）的不臣之心⁵⁹，以及劉璋之立乃是曹操所拜官⁶⁰：基本上就是在質疑劉璋政權存在的合法性。既然對方政權存在不太具正當性，吾人攻之則未為不義，此乃王世貞的思考理路。但是，「其後劉璋以好逆之至蜀」這點才是蘇軾批評的重點——即指趁著對方之善意受邀入蜀的情況下而奪取對方的領地，終非正道、係屬權謀——這點實無關乎對方身份。攻佔蜀地的急迫性、必要性，是不如當初諸葛亮建議取下襄陽的情況。若撇開蘇軾將負面形象盡歸諸葛亮這點是錯誤的（前文已經提及），單就劉備集團整體而論，蘇軾、王世貞各自的論述很難說誰必然正確、必然錯誤，只是從不同的角度觀看歷史。唯獨後起的王世貞之論，自然具有撼動前賢權威性的效果。

文章的最後，王世貞開始駁斥蘇軾提出的「失機」一說，攻訐蘇軾時抱持的語氣也越來越強烈。從「吾以為蘇子書生也，不識理勢，且又不讀書，不考其時事」一類，轉成為「妄庸人嚙語也」。這部份同時也是王世貞最不滿意蘇軾說法的區塊：

權呼先主自救。先主遣使告璋曰：『曹公征吳，吳憂危急。孫氏與孤本為唇齒，又樂進在青泥與關羽相拒，今不往救羽，進必大克，轉侵州界，其憂有甚於魯。魯自守之賊，不足慮也。』乃從璋求萬兵及資實，欲以東行。璋但許兵四千，其餘皆給半。張松書與先主及法正曰：『今大事垂可立，如何釋此去乎！』松兄廣漢太守肅，懼禍逮己，白璋發其謀。於是璋收斬松，嫌隙始構矣。璋敕關戍諸將文書勿復關通先主。先主大怒，召璋白水軍督楊懷，責以無禮，斬之。乃使黃忠、卓膺勒兵向璋。」〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 881-882。

⁵⁷ 《三國志·蜀書·先主傳》：「先是，益州牧劉璋綱維頹弛，周瑜、甘寧並勸權取蜀，權以咨備，備內欲自規，仍偽報曰：『備與璋託為宗室，冀憑英靈，以匡漢朝，今璋得罪左右，備獨竦懼，非所敢聞，願加寬貸。若不獲請，備當放髮歸於山林。』後備西圖璋，留關羽守，權曰：『猾虜乃敢挾詐！』」同前註，頁 1271-1272。

⁵⁸ 〔明〕王世貞撰，《讀書後》，卷二，葉 20 上。

⁵⁹ 《三國志·蜀書·劉二牧傳》「評曰」：「昔魏豹聞許負之言則納薄姬於室，劉歆見圖讖之文則名字改易，終於不免其身，而慶鐘二主。此則神明不可虛要，天命不可妄冀，必然之驗也。而劉焉聞董扶之辭則心存益土，听相者之言則求婚吳氏，遽造輿服，圖竊神器，其惑甚矣。」〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁 870。

⁶⁰ 《三國志·蜀書·劉璋傳》：「璋聞曹公征荊州，已定漢中，遣河內陰溥致敬于曹公。加璋振威將軍，兄瑁平寇將軍。」同前註，頁 868。

蘇子又曰：「曹操既死，子丕代之。當操之臨終，召丕而囑之植，未嘗不以譚、尚為戒也。而丕與植相殘如此，其父子、兄弟且為寇讐，而況能以得天下心哉！此有可間之勢，不過捐數十萬金，使其大臣、骨肉內自相殘，然後舉兵而伐之，此高祖所以滅項籍也。」愚以為蘇子蓋不特書生而已，一妄庸人嚚語也。夫自古捐金而間者，豈惟漢高？秦始之，於趙、魏亦有之矣。夫秦之間信陵、李牧，其勢固已如太山壓一卵，而當時信使、遊客，車相錯而無禁；高帝之與項籍，兩軍相拒不過數十里，信使、遊客亦不絕；而後皆得以行金而為間。今魏、蜀之使不通，而關譏若戟門，誰為之行金？兩國之臣非故交，誰為之通間？且夫丕嗣之三月而篡漢，篡之逾月而召植而囚之若孤豚；又其大臣，皆曹氏之心腹也；夫間必自隙入，所謂隙者安在也？夫守義而責其所當得之吳、蜀，廢義而言其必可乘之間，抑何前後翻覆也？吾故曰：蘇子者，一妄庸人嚚語也。⁶¹

王世貞提出了資訊交通的問題是具有建設性的，即「今魏、蜀之使不通，而關譏若戟門，誰為之行金」、以及「兩國之臣非故交，誰為之通間」等說法。至於「且夫丕嗣之三月而篡漢，篡之逾月而召植而囚之若孤豚」則有數字之誤。曹丕從即王位至篡漢共約八個月⁶²，曹植似亦未必被「篡之逾月」即監禁⁶³。此蓋王世貞的計算疏失。蓋其試圖說明可趁之機的時間相當短暫，因而諸葛亮未必能在此時間內完成離間流程；畢竟當時兩國首都距離相當遙遠，訊息往來實屬不易。這一思考點固然亦有建樹，突顯王世貞擅長從客觀條件限制省思歷史；至於數據有失要是一憾，蓋其隱約還是有著維護諸葛亮過切的心理存在。

文末處，王世貞還指責蘇軾「抑何前後翻覆也」，蓋指蘇軾指出「失機」一事的論點亦是「詐力」、詭道，何故前後標準不一。但這裡蘇軾應係指若已經不能「全其信義」，原本以「仁義」為主之道路既已參雜「詐力」而無法得到天下人心；不妨換個方式，趁著曹操過世的機會離間曹氏兄弟、製造曹魏內亂：不是蘇軾「前後翻覆」的問題。

五、餘論（代結語）

蘇軾論及歷史人物，大多願意別出心裁以撰文。樊德三：「他是『有為而作』，即

⁶¹ 〔明〕王世貞撰，《讀書後》，卷二，葉20下-21上。

⁶² 《後漢紀》：「二十五年春正月庚子，魏王曹操薨，謚曰武王。王寅，詔曰：『魏太子丕：……』二月丁未朔，日有蝕之。冬十月乙卯，詔曰：『……』庚午，魏王即皇帝位，改年曰黃初。」共計曹操過世至曹丕即皇帝位共距離約八個月。〔晉〕袁宏撰，李興和點校，《袁宏《後漢紀》集校》（昆明：雲南大學出版社，2008年6月），頁386-387。

⁶³ 《三國志·蜀書·曹植傳》：「文帝即王位，誅丁儀、丁廙并其男口。植與諸侯並就國。黃初二年，監國謁者灌均希指，奏『植醉酒悖慢，劫脅使者』。有司請治罪，帝以太后故，貶爵安鄉侯。」既已隔年，時間上應當超過逾月，至少應兩個月以上為是。〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》，頁561。

為了闡發自己某一獨到見解才去論史的。蘇軾的每篇歷史人物論的每一論點大多是翻新出奇之見，即或是附和之論，也有所發展。」⁶⁴由於不是單純為了論史而論史⁶⁵，不僅主觀色彩濃厚，亦予人雄辯滔滔乃至於理不勝詞之感。客觀性固然減損，作品的文學性則增加。透過本文的論析，相信可以理解〈諸葛亮論〉亦屬於此中一員。

關於後世對蘇軾該文的評論，傳統雖不乏有較能正面肯定者，例如南宋周密(1232-1298)〈三蘇不取孔明〉：「雖然，孔明豈可少哉！」⁶⁶尊重諸葛亮之餘，基本對三蘇批判諸葛亮的言論表示贊同。又有褒貶互參者，明代趙南星：「蘇子瞻謂『孔明仁義詐力雜用以取天下，與曹操異者幾希。』，其論固正，然未知先主、孔明之苦心也。」⁶⁷又且蘇軾嘗試推陳出新的同時，未免流於標新立異，部份論述也有如茅坤「終似畫餅」之譏，也使得後世王世貞甚至撰寫專文糾駁之。王世貞之看法自有不盡圓滿處，同時難免如同蘇軾一般有著意氣用事的語句。

只是平心而論，較諸顯係非為史論而史論的蘇軾，王世貞省視歷史時明顯較為重視史料的依據。嘗試提出不少確實的反駁論述與建設性的言論，態度是相對較客觀地揣摩古人處境；透過該文的論述，讀者也容易意識到蘇軾〈諸葛亮論〉之偏失。

尤其是考量到外在客觀環境限制這面向，確實是蘇軾該文較少發揮、關注之處。清代儲欣(1631-1706)：「夫孔明豈不欲按天下之輿圖，復高、光之文軌哉？亦限于勢而已矣。坡公千古通儒，而責備孔明處，似乎迂闊。」⁶⁸該語誠然。若從今日學術研究成果檢視該文，無疑缺乏了外在客觀環境限制（包含「勢」）的考量⁶⁹，因而論述難免會予以讀者「迂闊」的感受。

三國歷史人物之中，鮮少有人如諸葛亮可以得到歷代文人於道德面向推崇如此⁷⁰，誠如謝敏玲：「一般人讀諸葛亮〈出師表〉，莫不為其『鞠躬盡瘁，死而後已』的精神

⁶⁴ 見氏，〈試論蘇軾歷史人物論的特色〉，頁 105。

⁶⁵ 蘇軾其實是非常尊敬諸葛亮的，包括〈題三國名臣贊〉、〈范文正公文集敘〉、〈八陣碇〉、〈隆中〉、〈諸葛武侯畫像贊〉等作品，這些詩文篇章的分布時間從其早年至暮年，內容往往係同情、讚揚、尊崇諸葛亮。整體詳見馬斗成，〈三蘇與諸葛亮〉，頁 71-74。因而，有一種可能性是蘇軾所作未必是由衷之言，或為其試圖引人注目的應考策略之一環。

⁶⁶ 〔宋〕周密撰，張茂鵬點校，《齊東野語》（北京：中華書局，2004 年 5 月），頁 8。

⁶⁷ 該文後有言，顯見其態度乃是重視蘇軾所言符合道義。但是又認為取荊、益兩地，若從結果論檢視而非從手段論評議，則屬仁義之舉：「取宗室之孱子所必不能有之地，以安其身，而為匡復宗社之根本，豈非仁義之大者哉！」〔明〕趙南星，《味檠齋文集》，第 12 冊，頁 551、552。

⁶⁸ 高海夫主編，《唐宋八大家文鈔校注集評》，頁 5208。

⁶⁹ 諸葛亮未能取天下，有其外在環境限制的因素，今人論述可詳見潘柏年、林曉筠，〈〈隆中對〉缺失評議〉，《中國學術年刊》第 34 期（秋季號）（2012 年 9 月），頁 83-122。

⁷⁰ 除了諸多比較諸葛亮與其他歷史人物的文章中可以感受到此點，唐代詩歌之中亦早就形成了詠頌諸葛亮人格功業的傳統，詳見王潤農，《唐代詩歌中的三國圖像》（臺北：東吳大學中國文學系碩士論文，林宜陵先生指導，2013 年 4 月），第三章「唐代詩歌中隱含的尊蜀意識」，頁 41-76。蘇軾承此風氣之後而作該文，更顯得其文的論述態度與主流態度的差異。

所感動，因而認同孔明的忠心耿耿，也繼而認為孔明是仁義的象徵。」⁷¹並言：「唯獨蘇軾，敢論孔明因詐力而失天下，蘇軾的眼光確與眾不同，推陳出新。」⁷²此人竟然因為「仁義」之有虧、不全的緣故而未能取天下，此說實發前人所未發、頗具有新意，也在後世引發一些波瀾。不失為一篇有著獨特存在價值的文章。只是發抉佳處之餘，不足之處應當也要一一指陳為宜。

⁷¹ 見氏，《蘇軾史論散文研究》，頁 109。

⁷² 同前註。

引用書目

傳統文獻

- 〔西漢〕司馬遷撰，《史記》（臺北：廣文書局，1962年9月，影印乾隆四年校刊）。
- 〔東漢〕班固撰，《漢書》（東京都：汲古書院，1972年7月，和刻本正史）。
- 〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔宋〕裴松之注，《三國志》（北京：中華書局，2009年9月）。
- 〔晉〕陳壽撰，〔南朝宋〕裴松之注，盧弼集解，錢劍夫整理，《三國志集解》（上海：上海古籍出版社，2009年6月）。
- 〔晉〕袁宏撰，李興和點校，《袁宏《後漢紀》集校》（昆明：雲南大學出版社，2008年6月）。
- 〔唐〕呂溫撰，《呂衡州文集附考證》（上海：商務印書館，1935年，叢書集成初編）。
- 〔宋〕周密撰，張茂鵬點校，《齊東野語》（北京：中華書局，2004年5月）。
- 〔宋〕程顥、程頤撰，《二程遺書》（上海：上海古籍出版社，1995年2月）。
- 〔宋〕錢時撰，《兩漢筆記》（臺北：臺灣商務，1969-1970年，四庫全書珍本初集）。
- 〔宋〕蘇軾撰，〔明〕茅維編、孔凡禮點校，《蘇軾文集》（北京：中華書局，1986年3月）。
- 〔宋〕黎靖德編，《朱子語類》（臺北：文津出版社，1986年12月）。
- 〔宋〕羅大經撰，《新刊鶴林玉露》（南京：鳳凰出版社，2012年，和刻本中國古逸書叢刊）。
- 〔明〕王士騏輯，薛宗評，《諸葛忠武侯全書》（臺南：莊嚴文化事業有限公司，1996年8月，四庫全書存目叢書影印安徽省圖書館藏明崇禎十一年吳天挺刻本）。
- 〔明〕王世貞撰，《讀書後》（臺北：臺灣商務，1976年，四庫全書珍本六集）。
- 〔明〕趙南星撰，《味檠齋文集》（上海：商務印書館，1936年6月，叢書集成初編）。
- 高海夫主編，《唐宋八大家文鈔校注集評》（西安：三秦出版社，2004年10月）。

近人論著

- 王文進，〈習鑿齒與諸葛亮神話之建構〉，《臺大中文學報》第38期（2012年9月），頁71-120。
- 王瑞功，《諸葛亮研究集成》（濟南：齊魯書社，1997年9月）。
- 王潤農，《唐代詩歌中的三國圖像》（臺北：東吳大學中國文學系碩士論文，林宜陵先生指導，2013年4月）。
- 余明俠，〈必須全面客觀地評價諸葛亮的軍事成就——從北宋蘇軾的議論談起〉，《徐州師範大學學報（哲學社會科學版）》第34卷第1期（2008年1月），頁54-60。
- 吳佳展，《王世貞史論散文研究》（臺北：東吳大學中國文學系碩士學位論文，黃登山先生指導，2007年5月）。
- 胡建民，〈蘇軾人物史論與儒家政治思想〉，《創新》第5期（2013年），頁98-101。
- 馬斗成，〈三蘇與諸葛亮〉，《歷史教學》第4期（2004年），頁71-74。
- 潘柏年、林曉筠，〈〈隆中對〉缺失評議〉，《中國學術年刊》第34期（秋季號）（2012

年 9 月), 頁 83-122。

樊德三,〈試論蘇軾歷史人物論的特色〉,《淮北煤師範學報》第 2 期(1985 年),頁 101-107。

謝敏玲,《蘇軾史論散文研究》(臺北:萬卷樓圖書有限公司,1990 年 5 月)。

《貝爾武夫》：「好客」與「不好客」背後的動機

應芳瑜*

摘要

《貝爾武夫》的盛宴一方面表現出「好客」，另一方面則表現出「不好客」。貝爾武夫的故事發生在西元六世紀斯堪地納維亞半島。當時居住在丹麥的丹麥人和居住在蓋特蘭的蓋次人越過名為卡特加特（丹麥語）的海峽進行互訪活動。本研究引用相關資料—德希達的形而上學之差異論、馬塞爾·莫斯的送禮理論，一些聖經故事和怪物研究來探討《貝爾武夫》文本之中的本地人與外國人之間以及人類與怪物之間的界限。本文旨在闡明主方的「好客」和「不好客」背後的動機。《貝爾武夫》的盛宴表面上是「好客」，其實是基於互利互惠；「不好客」的行動亦是考量部落利益而採取的策略。主方對客方的「不好客」可能會引起客方的嫉妒，而嫉妒是萬惡之源之一。蓋次部落對噴火龍表現出「不好客」的立場與行為，同樣地，丹麥部落對格倫德爾也表現出「不好客」的立場與行為。在《貝爾武夫》文本之中，噴火龍和格倫德爾皆為異族，語言和外表明顯與人類不同，兩者皆被視為怪物；然而，蓋次人和丹麥人是互相來往、互通有無、文化交流、而且語言相通，雙方互相表現「好客」的立場與行為；但是，「好客」背後的動機不單純只是友誼，還有權力、財富、榮譽、地位、同盟抗敵之考量。本文主張「好客」盛行於在同質文化，其手段較為複雜，較容易顯現於人類社會之中，「好客」的程度取決於共同利益的程度，而「不好客」則是普遍存在於人類社會和怪物社會。

關鍵詞：好客、不好客、盛宴、部落利益和共同利益、外國人

* 應芳瑜博士，現為弘光科技大學國際溝通英語系助理教授。研究專長包括英美文學、翻譯、磨課師、專業英文、英語教學。

(到稿日期：2022 年 10 月 15 日；通過刊登日期：2023 年 2 月 19 日)

Beowulf: Motivations behind Hospitality and Inhospitability

In, Fan-Yu**

Abstract

Feasts in *Beowulf* show hospitality on the one hand and inhospitality on the other hand. The story in *Beowulf* is set in pagan Scandinavia in the sixth century. At that time the Danes in Denmark and the Geats in Geatland crossed the strait named Kattegat (in Danish) to visit each other. This study draws on relevant resources—Derrida's metaphysics of *différance*, Marcel Mauss's theory of gift giving, and some biblical stories to examine the boundaries between locals and foreigners and between humans and monster-like creatures in *Beowulf*. Banquets in *Beowulf* are a sign of hospitality on the surface. However, beneath the surface it has been prepared owing to the Danes' reliance on foreign support for their attempt to defeat a powerful monster-like enemy. The article aims to clarify the hosts' motivations behind their hospitality and inhospitality. Banquets in *Beowulf* show hospitality on the surface, but it is based on mutual interests. In a similar sense, inhospitality is a strategy that takes tribal interests into account. Hosts' inhospitality to visitors may cause jealousy which is one of the sources of evils. The Geats show inhospitality to the dragon as the Danes do it to Grendel. This article argues that hospitality tends to prevail in homogeneous cultures, and its means are more complex, and it is more common to exist in complicated human society. The degree of hospitality depends on the degree of mutual interests, while inhospitality is more likely to exist in both human society and monster's society.

Keywords: Hospitality, inhospitality, feasts, tribal and mutual interests, and foreigners.

** Dr. In Fan-Yu is an assistant professor in the Department of English for Global Communication, Hungkuang University, Taiwan. Her research specialty includes English and American literature, translation, MOOCs, ESP, and TESOL.

Introduction

There are theories, biblical stories, and theoretical discussions about hospitality and inhospitality. This article will draw on Derrida's metaphysics of *différance*, Marcel Mauss's theory of gift giving, and some biblical stories and monster studies to explore hospitality and inhospitality in *Beowulf*. One of the meanings of *différance* in Derrida's words is "L'autre sens de différer, c'est le plus commun et le plus identifiable: ne pas être identique, être autre, discernable, etc." (46). Translated into English, the above sentence means that the other meaning of differing is the most common and the most identifiable: not being identical, being different, discernible, etc. Derrida's metaphysics of *différance* in terms of language in his own words is "dans la langue il n'y a que des différences" (49). Derrida asserts in "La Différance" that in language there are only differences. Indeed, differences between languages can be the origin of inhospitality. The current study focuses on language differences and its ensuing incompatibility that cause inhospitality. Andrew Shepherd emphasizes "the very notion of an ethical relationship between the Self and the Other" (40). In his book, *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality*, the gift of the other refers to "God's gift of election and blessing" (Gen 21: 8) and "the gift of Christ—a genuine gift, not earned, but offered freely" (Shepherd 122, 215). Paradoxically, Andrew Shepherd denotes, "sharing the mind of Christ, each should seek each other's interest" (215). When each seeks each other's interest, there is a conflict of interest. The Self may show inhospitality due to a conflict of interest with the Other. David Grumett comments on Andrew Shepherd's book, saying that "the shared Jewish acceptances" include "God may be known only indirectly" and "God can never provide grounds for ignoring our communities, especially those members at the margins" (367). In other words, the marginalized should be taken care of. To further explore the difference between the chosen and the marginalized, Grumett interprets Derrida's metaphysics of *différance* that "every act of hospitality or giving conceals violence and trespass, and that acts and texts remain open to unending deconstructive reinterpretation" (367). Andrew Shepherd explicates that the community of covenant people constituted by God's gift give witness to God's gracious actions of creating the world in the hospitality of the Triune God (209). God's creation of the world is a gift, showing hospitality to humans. Reminiscent of Levinas, Derrida raises the question about genuine hospitality. To answer this question, Derrida juxtaposes two forms of hospitality, which are invitation and visitation, in another terms, the host and the guest, or the locals and the foreigners. He argues that hospitality begins with the question: "must we ask the foreigner to understand us, to speak our language, in all the senses of this term, in all its possible extensions, before being able and so as to be able to welcome him into our country?" (Derrida 15). Moreover, "If he was already speaking our language, with all that that implies, if we already shared everything that is shared with a language, would the foreigner still be a foreigner" (Derrida 15). Speaking the same language and sharing

what can be shared as a tribe can be regarded as the signs of homogeneity. When homogeneity comes to existence, the boundary between the host and the guest becomes vague, so does it between locals and foreigners.

In addition to hospitality, the current article also deals with the issue of inhospitality. Instead of using the word, inhospitality, Derrida uses the term “no hospitality” (Derrida 55). He explains, “No hospitality, in the classic sense, without sovereignty of oneself over one’s home, but since there is also no hospitality without finitude, sovereignty can only be exercised by filtering, choosing, and thus by excluding” (Derrida 55). To be specific, sovereignty is beyond everything. Without sovereignty, neither hospitality nor inhospitality exists. With sovereignty, one of the ways to exclude those who cannot be homogenized is to show inhospitality to them, using the tactics such as ignorance, no invitation, no sharing, and the worst tactic, marginalization. The incompatible and the interracial may be seen by the sovereign as those who should be filtered, marginalized, and excluded.

This article aims to explore motivations behind hospitality and inhospitality in *Beowulf*. In this epic, there are two sharp contrasts—hospitality and inhospitality. What marks the boundary between hospitality and inhospitality? The boundary marker could be the hoard keeper’s will. When the hoard keeper is willing to share, he will show hospitality to visitors. When the hoard keeper is unwilling to share, he will show inhospitality to visitors. The hoard in *Beowulf* refers to treasures (Woolf 113). Beowulf is one of the hoard keepers in this epic. The hoard can be inherited or gained. Beowulf either inherits treasures from his ancestors or gains it by himself. He gains treasures from Hrothgar “according to his glory” (Slade 2146-2147) and “seven thousand hides of land” from Hygelac for receiving Beowulf’s gifts when he returns home from Denmark (Slade 2190-2196). Giving away treasures as a gift is seen as a sign of hospitality in *Beowulf* especially between the lord and his kinsmen. Beowulf is depicted as Hrothgar’s kinsman and half-Dane (Slade 1474, 2011) and Hygelac’s kinsman and nephew (Slade 462, 737, 758, 813, 914, 1530). In contrast, the hoard keeper’s reluctance to share food, beverage, or joyful moments may arouse visitors’ envy in the first place and hatred afterwards.

Whether the hoard keeper is willing or reluctant to share may be a matter of calculation. The elements of calculation in how the hoard keeper treats foreign visitors or pagans may need to be further explored. In *Beowulf*, there are three prominent hoard keepers. They are King Hrothgar, Hygelac, and Beowulf. As hosts, they treat visitors differently based on their calculation of tribal interests. Dissecting how differently they treat foreigners and other races may provide answers to the research question of this study, which is to explore the boundaries between locals and foreigners and between humans and monster-like creatures in *Beowulf*. Analyzing the causes of battles between the Danes and Grendel and between Beowulf and the fire-spewing dragon may clarify how such interracial violence is provoked. Violent episodes in *Beowulf* display the hoard keepers’ inhospitable attitude toward

uninvited guests. The inhospitality occurs because of conflicts of interest. The hoard keepers aim to keep their tribal interests, which are in conflict with what the uninvited guests intend to obtain. They collect different hoards such as food, drink, wine, gold, halls, or other treasures. These are their cherished interests for their existing kinsmen and future generations. The conflicts of interest incur a lot of conflict in different forms—war, fighting, violence, interracial hatred, isolation, or marginalization.

Motivations behind Hospitality in *Beowulf*

According to *Merriam-Webster* dictionary, hospitality means being “given to generous and cordial reception of guests” or “promising or suggesting generous and friendly welcome.” *Cambridge Dictionary* defines hospitality as “the act of being friendly and welcoming to guests and visitors” or “food, drink, entertainment, etc. that an organization provides for guests.” The banquets in *Beowulf* is like the systems of “total services” in which Marcel Mauss uses the potlatch for hosts and guests to be constantly fed to maintain a balanced and peaceful relationship (7). In *Beowulf*, the hosts forge hospitality for guests they have invited at four banquets, welcome banquet, pre-battle banquet, after-battle banquet, and homecoming banquet. The way they show hospitality to their guests is similar to the definitions of hospitality provided by *Merriam-Webster* and *Cambridge Dictionary* at least as far as a banquet should cover. To welcome Beowulf, the Danes hold a party where Hrothgar shows hospitality, saying, “Beowulf, my friend, you have traveled here / to favor us with help and to fight for us” (Heaney 457-58). At the pre-battle banquet, “An attendant stood by / with a decorated pitcher, pouring bright / helpings of mead” (Heaney 494-96). At the end of this feast, “Hrothgar wished Beowulf health and good luck, / named him hall-warden” and reminded him to “beware of the enemy” (Heaney 653-54, 660). At the after-battle banquet in the section of “Celebration at Heorot,” “Beowulf drank his drink” (Heaney 1024) and he receives treasures in reward of his victory. When Beowulf sails home, “he loaded the sea-boat, / bore in the bosom of his ship / the gleaming treasures” given by King Hrothgar (Slade 895-96). At the homecoming banquet, “Beowulf’s return / was reported to Hygelac as soon as possible” (Heaney 1970-71). Beowulf’s uncle, King Hygelac, welcomes Beowulf and shows him a sign of greetings. Kevin Crossley-Holland expounds on Beowulf’s kinship with Hygelac, in which Beowulf’s mother is King Hygelac’s sister (125). During the celebration of the death of Grendel, and the queen, Wealhtheow, speaks, “Enjoy this drink, my most generous lord; / raise up your goblet, entertain the Geats / duly and gently, discourse with them, / be open-handed, happy and fond” (Heaney 1169-72). In the section titled “Beowulf Returns Home,” after Hygelac’s lofty speech, Queen Hygd, “Haereth’s daughter[,] / moved about with the mead-jug in her hand, / taking care of the company, filling the cups / that warriors held out” (Heaney 1980-83) to welcome Beowulf

and his warriors as guests returning from a foreign country. Both the king and queen of the Geats and the Danes show hospitality in ways that fit their identities.

Hospitality can be based on mutual interest in different ways. Giving gifts is one of the ways to develop mutual interests. According to Marcel Mauss, a gift “obliges a person to reciprocate the present that has been received” (9). In other words, inequality exists in the relationship between the gift-giver and the gift-receiver. Catherine Clarke further explains that the “Maussian model asserts that the gift economy is a ‘total’ social phenomenon, in which the process of exchange and reciprocity is systemic, extending to every aspect of social and cultural life” (3). To reciprocate means to make a return for what is given or to make interchange. In *Beowulf*, King Hrothgar gives control of his mead-hall, Heorot, to Beowulf at a welcome feast to thank him for fighting Grendel, who attacks the Danes. To fortify mutual interests, Hrothgar says, “Beowulf, my friend, you have traveled here / to favor us with help and to fight for us” (Heaney 457-58). Hrothgar’s striking up a friendship with Beowulf is the first step of the development of their mutual interests. In this relationship, Hrothgar is the giver of gifts and at the same time he represents a weaker party, standing in an untenable position. No one in his tribe can defeat Grendel, so he must rely on the uninvited guest, Beowulf, from Geatland. In contrast, Beowulf is the stronger party, who is the recipient of gifts because he can extend help to the Danes. Though he is an uninvited guest, he receives warm hospitality from the host in banquet scenes.

However, hospitality may be involved with violence. Grumett interprets Derrida’s inference of hospitality, “every act of hospitality or giving conceals violence and trespass” (367). Derrida infers that paradoxical and corrupting law depends on the collusion between the violence of power on one side, and hospitality on the other (55). There is a savage and cruel incident before King Hrothgar treats Beowulf with hospitality. Grendel hears the sounds of joy from Heorot and then visits the high house when the night comes. He finds the Ring-Danes slumbering after the beer-feast, and among them he seizes thirty thanes and then he is proud in plunder (Slade 115-28). Obviously, Grendel is a perpetrator in this violent incident and the Danes are victims. Beneath the surface of Grendel’s violent attack is a feeling of deprivation. The sense of being deprived that Grendel feels when he hears and sees the feasts is hidden in this epic. According to Derrida’s explanation of ‘no hospitality,’ it is reasonable to infer that Grendel is the one who is not chosen and is excluded from the tribe of the Danes because he is not invited to join the feast. The ultimate reason why King Hrothgar invites Beowulf to the feast is to help the Danes to defeat Grendel. The upcoming violent act of slaying Grendel is hidden in the superficial kindness and happiness during the welcome banquet when the collusion between the violence of power represented by King Hrothgar on one side and the hospitality he forges for the savior of his tribe.

Hospitality can also be based on kinship that is what binds Beowulf with Hrothgar. However, this kinship involves neither blood relationship nor marriage. It is more like the bond between the king and his thanes in Anglo-Saxon legends. In exchange for the lord's protection and gifts, the thanes vow to fight for him. Pierre Bourdieu discusses the basis of gift exchange intended to transmute, by a disinterested exchange, the inevitable and inevitably interested relations imposed by kinship, neighborhood, or work, into elective relations of reciprocity (7). Beowulf's relationship with Hrothgar can be traced back to the latter's friendship with Ecgtheow, who is Beowulf's father. At the welcome banquet for Beowulf, Hrothgar speaks, "I knew him when he was a youth; / his old father was called Ecgtheow, / to whom gave into his home Hrethel of the Geats" (Slade 372-374). To develop kinship with Beowulf, Hrothgar entrusts "this strong-hall of the Danes" to Beowulf (Slade 655-657). The strong hall of the Danes is Heorot, which represents the achievements of King Hrothgar. It symbolizes power and honor because it is a place where Hrothgar, the ring-giver, rewards his thanes with various treasures, and they celebrate their victories and hold banquets. Jos Bazelmans notes, "Hroogar [Hrothgar] creates a de jure bond of kinship with Beowulf, with all its mutual rights and obligations, by adopting him as a son" (358). Unlike the blood kinship between Beowulf and Hygelac, who is Beowulf's uncle and the king of the Geats, Hrothgar relies on his friendship with Beowulf's father, giving gifts to Beowulf and empowering him to oversee his Heorot and his troop in hope that Beowulf can defeat the monstrous enemy. Beowulf is recognized as the famed kinsman of Half-Dane (Slade 2011). In the process of gaining Beowulf's help, Hrothgar show hospitality to Beowulf by hosting banquets, giving gifts, and forming a friendship with this young Geatish prince.

Hospitality is given to foreign guests of similar culture, especially those who speak the same language, with mutual interests. This assumption can be testified on a basis of how well the foreign guest can homogenize or adapt himself to the country he visits. If he can speak the same language as the people of the host country, he has overcome the barriers to integrate himself into the society of that country, like what Beowulf does in the Danish society. In *Beowulf*, the Danes and Beowulf communicate well, probably they speak the same language. When Hrothgar speaks of Beowulf's father, he shares his understanding of the history and culture of the Geats. When Beowulf attempts to solve a feud in Freawaru's political marriage, he displays his understanding of the conflict between the Danes and the Heathobards. Stanley Kahral mentions "women as the bond of kinship" in *Beowulf* (189). Hrothgar's daughter, Freawaru, is arranged to be married to Ingeld to end the blood feud in which Ingeld's father, Froda, was murdered by the Danes (Slade 2022-66). When Beowulf reports to King Hygelac his journey to the Scyldings, he mentions the failure of the blood feud because Ingeld, King of the Heathobards,¹ decides to revenge and divorce his bride.

¹ According to Ruth Johnston Staver, "The Heathobards appear to live south of the Danes, perhaps in

He learns about the blood feud when an old warrior tells Ingeld about how his father was slayed by the Danes in public at the banquet for the celebration of the death of Grendel (Slade 2047-52). The Danes, the Heathobards, and the Geats were neighboring tribes when *Beowulf* was composed possibly in the eighth century.² Ruth Johnston Staver mentions in her book where the Heathobards in *Beowulf* live, it is perhaps in the neck of the Danish peninsula or on the coast of modern Germany (91). The geographical positions of these three countries, Sweden, Denmark, and Germany, can give us a hint of the reason why the linguistic communication among the Danes and their foreign guests—the Geats and the Heathobards—goes well. As the prince of the Geats in Geatland (located in the south of Sweden now), Beowulf crosses the strait named Kattegat (in Danish) to visit the Danes in Denmark. The Heathobards were a branch of the Langobards or Lombards,³ possibly located in Lower Saxony, Germany now. The relation between Sweden, Denmark, and Germany has a long historical background because they are neighboring countries of the Baltic Sea. The exchanges between these countries might have started since the ships were invented. Therefore, languages might not be a problem for these characters, though from different tribes; they live in the places around the Baltic Sea, and as depicted in *Beowulf* they can verbally communicate. The Danes show hospitality to these foreign guests because they can communicate, using the language or languages they can understand. Derrida asserts that if a foreigner is speaking our language, with all that implies, if we have already shared everything that is shared with a language, would the foreigner still be a foreigner (Derrida 15). This assertion can be applied to the relationship between Hrothgar and Beowulf, but it cannot be applied to that between Hrothgar and Ingeld. In Beowulf's report to King Hygelac as he returns to Geatland that the Danish princess, Freawaru, will entertain her Danish countrymen soon after she marries Ingeld, the king of the Heathobards (Heffernan 92). James A. W. Heffernan raises the question, "Why does Beowulf tell of Heathobards murdering Danes, of hosts murdering their guests?" (93). This feast is not actually held in *Beowulf* because Ingeld rejects this political marriage and seeks revenge as soon as he learns about the fact that Danish warriors killed his father. Heffernan attempts to argue that "the lust for revenge among men can sabotage hospitality just as brutally as Grendel's invasion of Heorot" (93). Both Beowulf and Ingeld are foreign guests, receiving hospitality at the same banquet for the celebration of Beowulf's triumph over Grendel, but

the neck of the Danish peninsula or on the coast of modern Germany; and "*Beowulf* alludes to the history between the Danes and the Heathobards and predicts trouble" (91).

² Robin Melrose quotes, "The historian Dr. Sam Newton has argued plausibly, in *The Origins of Beowulf and the Pre-Viking Kingdom of East Anglia*, that it [*Beowulf*] was composed sometime during the reign of King Elfwald of East Anglia (713-749), who commissioned the 8th century *Life of Guthlac*" (98). Albrecht Classen notes that the Old English *Beowulf* appeared in ca. 8th -10th century (1539).

³ According to Robin Melrose, the king of the Heathobards, "Ingeld[,] is mentioned in *Beowulf* as a leader of the Heathobards (possibly a branch of the Langobards or Lombards) (97).

the former continues to receive hospitality from the Danes because of mutual interests, the latter becomes the enemy of the Danes because of blood feud.

Motivations behind Inhospitability in *Beowulf*

As compared to hospitality in *Beowulf*, inhospitability is shown in a more straightforward way. Inhospitability is quite similar to “no hospitality” in Derrida’s term. In my understanding, inhospitability means there is no hospitality, or hospitality is not shown. It is an antonym of hospitality. According to *Merriam-Webster* dictionary, it means “not showing hospitality.” There are many reasons for not showing hospitality to guests or visitors. The primary reason may be the issue of invitation. Is the visitor invited? If he is not invited, the host filters and chooses whether to welcome him or not. The foremost-uninvited visitors in *Beowulf* are Grendel, Grendel’s mother, and a fire-spewing dragon. No banquets are prepared for them, nor is hospitality shown to them. They are regarded as monsters, so the current study focuses on drawing on Jeffrey Andrew Weinstock’s perspectives of monsters, the binary opposition of the Self and the Other, and the biblical story of Sodom to explore what is hidden behind the hosts’ inhospitability shown to uninvited visitors in *Beowulf*. Brian Neil Peterson asserts, “Inhospitability is one of Sodom’s sins” (111). In the book of Ezekiel, God says, “Now this was the sin of your sister Sodom: She and her daughters were arrogant, overfed and unconcerned; they did not help the poor and needy” (Ezekiel 16:49). Sodom showed no hospitality for the poor in front of her house; she despised the Lord’s oath by breaking the covenant to share food or beverage with the poor. Unlike Hana Ghani’s study of the Other as a threat to the Self in *Beowulf* (55), this article asserts that the Self represented by the host shows inhospitability to the uninvited visitors because they are unable to share and communicate with monsters owing to language differences and incompatibility.

The focus on ‘difference’ in monster studies may conduce to the discovery of motives behind inhospitability. As an editor of his book, *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, Jeffrey Jerome Cohen makes clear that “these essays” in this book “argue that our fascination for the monstrous testifies to our continued desire to explore difference” (1). Jeffrey Andrew Weinstock further explicates the difference highlighted in Jeffrey Jerome Cohen’s *Monster Theory* that “Where difference is concerned, Cohen observes that representing another culture as monstrous ‘justifies its displacement or extermination by rendering the act heroic’” (64). In *Beowulf*, Beowulf’s defeating Grendel and Grendel’s mother is recognized as a heroic act because the Danes are eventually exempt from the monsters’ attack. The extermination of Grendel and his mother implies the extinction of the culture of Cain. Apparently, the monstrous appearance of Grendel and his mother is different from that of humankind. Beowulf calls Grendel “the terrible creature” (Slade 425). When he reports his

heroic deed to King Hygelac, he attributes Grendel's race to the evil one. He says, "There is need to boast--of Grendel's kinsmen, / evil upon the earth--of that clash at dawn, / he who lives the longest of that hateful race, enveloped in malice (Slade 2006-8). King Hygelac's condemnation of Grendel's race reveals not only his abhorrence but also his hope for the extinction of the evil culture and race of Cain. The incompatibility of the cultures of Cain and the Scyldings underlie subsequent enmities and detestation. From the beginning to the end of *Beowulf*, the language of Grendel is never uttered. A language is the epitome of a culture. When a particular power or authority silences a language, this phenomenon foreshadows the extinction of its culture. In short, two races with significant differences in language, mores, and bodily appearance must make tremendous efforts to identify each other. Inhospitability is shown when no such efforts are made.

Lack of kinship can be the first cause⁴ for hosts to show inhospitability. Why the Danes marginalize Grendel? Differences in some aspects could be the answer to this question. Grendel's appearance is obviously different from that of the Danes and the Geats. Grendel's habitat is significantly unlike where both tribes live. Both tribes cannot understand Grendel's conduct. Apart from these apparent, innate differences, the hatred accumulated in history has contributed to an even more irreconcilable estrangement. Cursed as the descendant of the Biblical Cain, Grendel does not belong to any systems of the kinship of Danes or Geats. According to Genesis 4, Cain was cursed because he killed his brother, Abel. Ruth Waterhouse notes in *Monster Theory: Reading Culture* edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen that *Beowulf* includes a palimpsest of Grendel, in that in 1073, Scribe A originally wrote that Grendel was proscribed "in chames cynne [because of Ham's kin]." The manuscript was altered from "chames" to "caines" ("because of Cain's kin") (26). This further asserts that Grendel was a descendent of the Cain.

Adam made love to his wife Eve, and she became pregnant and gave birth to Cain. She said, "With the help of the LORD I have brought forth a man." Later she gave birth to his brother Abel. Abel kept flocks, and Cain worked the soil. [...] Cain brought some of the fruits of the soil as an offering to the LORD. And Abel also brought an offering—fat portions from some of the firstborn of his flock. The LORD looked with favor on Abel and his offering, but on Cain and his offering, he did not look with favor. As a result, Cain was very angry, and his face was downcast. (Genesis 4: 1-5) While Cain and Abel were in the field, Cain killed his brother Abel. As a result, Cain was driven from the ground and then lived in the land of Nod, east of Eden under the lord's curse (Genesis 4:11, 16). Though Abel was the second son of Adam and Eve (Genesis 4:2), in Genesis 4 of the Amplified Bible, Eve said that she gave a birth to Abel with the help of the Lord.⁵ This story contains

⁴ According to Britannica, in philosophy, "the world that man observes with his senses must have been brought into being by God as the first cause."

⁵ Now the man, Adam, knew Eve as his wife, and she conceived and gave birth to Cain, and she said, "I have obtained a man (baby boy, son) with the help of the LORD." And [later] she gave birth to his brother Abel.

a hint 'kinship' because Abel is the son of the lord and Eve. In terms of kinship, the lord innately favors his son and shuns Cain, who is the son of Adam and Eve. In *Beowulf*, Grendel is described as "the wretched creature" that owns "the land of marsh-monsters" and dwells in darkness (Slade 105, 103-104, 87). The history of Grendel's ancestor, Cain, who was condemned and exiled for killing his younger brother, Abel, is mentioned in *Beowulf* (Slade 106-108). Like his ancestor, who was driven far away from mankind, Grendel is isolated from the joyful Danes. Kinship is the most primitive reason that drives the Danes and Hrothgar to shun Grendel by showing him inhospitality, not sharing anything with him.

No consanguinity may not be the sole reason that the host considers to show inhospitality. Hrothgar and Beowulf have no consanguinity. To rely on Beowulf's help, Hrothgar build comitatus with Beowulf. In Anglo-Saxon legends, comitatus refers to the relationship between the lord and his thanes and it represents honor, respect, and friendship. Thanes can sacrifice their lives for the lord, the ring-giver, who rewards their heroic acts. Nancy Susan Nelson explains comitatus ideal that "The roles of the women, as well as those of the men, reflect the values of the complex comitatus and its failings as a political system" in her dissertation (52). Hrothgar's daughter, Freawaru, serves as a peace-weaver at banquets (Nelson 68). As a peace-weaver showing hospitality, "Hrothgar's daughter distributed / ale to older ranks / in order on the benches" (Heaney 2020-21). After Beowulf slaughters Grendel, the Danes celebrate Grendel's death at Heorot. The "stewards did the rounds / with wine in splendid jugs, and Wealhtheow came to sit / between two good men, / uncle and nephew, each of whom / still trusted the other" (Heaney 1160-64). The Scylding queen, Wealhtheow, heartens the Geatish warriors by reminding her lord to raise his goblet to entertain these invited guests. Hrothgar's queen, Wealhtheow, fulfills her duty of urging her lord and guests to drink to forge a cohesive alliance between these two tribes. Paradoxically, the name of the Danish queen, Wealhtheow, in *Beowulf*, means "foreign slave" (Fell 66). Moreover, Freawaru is composed of two words—Frea and Waru, meaning a war resolver. The hostess, Wealhtheow, is a marginalized outsider in her name. Her daughter, Freawaru, is a political chip, sacrificing herself in the political marriage while her husband has a blood feud with her tribe. She is like gold or other forms of treasures, which can be exchanged for peace. Peter Baker notes that *Beowulf* is sufficient evidence that early medieval kings and their subjects were well aware of the difficulties for peace marriage and "it was thought sufficient that political marriage, like other peacemaking techniques (hostage-giving, oath-taking, god-parenting, payment of compensation and tribute) should work for a while" (166). Hrothgar gives Beowulf treasures for Beowulf's service to slay the monster and then Danes obtain peace. In view of comitatus that involves two genders, the boundary between hospitality and inhospitality becomes vague because both are strategies

Now Abel kept the flocks [of sheep and goats], but Cain cultivated the ground. The source of this citation can be found at
<https://www.biblegateway.com/passage/?search=Genesis%204&version=AMP;EXB>.

for gaining tribal interests. There is a political calculation beneath the superficial hospitality. In terms of tribal interests, the ultimate outcome of hospitality and inhospitality is slaughter or wars. In *Beowulf*, the difference between hospitality and inhospitality is the degree of complexity. Hospitality is more complex than inhospitality because it needs more arrangements such as feasts, banquets, giving gifts, giving treasures, giving women when exchanging them for peace.

Inhospitality in *Beowulf* is shown not only on land but also under water. Margaret Goldsmith mentions inhospitable land and sea presented by the *Beowulf* poet (138). Albrecht Classen argues that “Representing the rural world as an inhospitable place for living on account of those who live there can be seen in a text such as the Old English *Beowulf* (ca.8th-10th century)” (1539). He notes that the inhospitable places on the readers’ minds might be the sea and its waves—“the dwelling place of Grendel and his mother, and the location of the dragon’s lair” (1539). While staying in Denmark, Beowulf hears of many of the race of serpents, strange sea-dragon are exploring the lake (Slade 1425-26). As “the son of Edgetheow” and “glorious kinsman of Half-Dane,” “the kinsman of Hygelac,” Beowulf announces his eagerness for Grendel’s mother-slaying adventure (Slade 1473-75, 1528). He dives into the water “so many bizarre things / smelled in the deep, many sea-beasts / with battle-tusks tore at his army-mail, / the horrors attacked” (Slade 1508-12). The lake where Grendel’s mother dwells is the inhospitable water in which she is the hostess while Beowulf is the uninvited visitor, seeking to slay the hostess. The dragon in the second part of the epic finds “Hoard-joy” (Slade 2270) and seeks revenge by burning houses in Geatland and leaving no one alive because “a man in pride: he bore to his liege-lord / the gold-adorned cup, begged peace-truce / from his lord” (Slade 2313-14, 2281-83). According to Audrey L. Meaney’s findings, the “dragon’s lair is near water (lines 2242-3, 2411-12; however, many of the ‘Germanic’ dragons also lived near water; for example in *Beowulf* lines 895-6 Sigemund loads into a boat the treasures he has won by killing a dragon)” (60). Like the aged king of the Geats, Beowulf, the dragon is a hoard keeper. Unlike Beowulf, who wins treasure for his glory and heroic deeds, the dragon seeks happiness in collecting treasures. As a sea inhabitant, the dragon is more like the host at sea, whereas Beowulf is like an uninvited visitor who must protect his tribe by fighting the host at sea. Again, the tribal interests are the primary reason for showing inhospitality, as the sea and the lake become an inhospitable place for the uninvited visitor.

Conclusion

This article explores the motivation behind hospitality and inhospitality in *Beowulf* from the perspectives of theology, Derrida’s metaphysics of *différance* and Marcel Mauss’s theory of gift giving. First, the findings denote that hospitality is more complex than

inhospitality because of the necessity of exchanging hospitable arrangements for what the host intends to obtain. Second, tribal interests are the sole and main reason for showing either hospitality or inhospitality. Tribal or national interests are always superior to all considerations because they naturally stem from sovereignty. The current article argues at the beginning that without sovereignty, neither hospitality nor inhospitality exists. As hoard keepers of their tribes, the lords calculate their tribal interests. Friendship, kinship, holding banquets, giving gifts, marginalization are strategies for protecting or increasing tribal interests. If no monsters attacked the Danes, Hrothgar would not entertain Beowulf on a distinguished guest scale. Rather, he would treat Beowulf as a normal guest who is a neighboring-country visitor crossing the Kattegat. The degree of hospitality is based on the degree of mutual interests. The Danes need Beowulf to risk his life to lead them to fight Grendel. On Beowulf's side, he wins glory and treasures after victory. On the side of the Danes, they win long-awaited peace. Hospitality is derived from mutual interests for both sides.

In contrast to locals in Denmark, Beowulf, his warriors, Grendel, and Grendel's mother are foreigners. Like Beowulf, Grendel and his mother are foreign creatures in the eyes of the Danes. Whether they receive hospitality or inhospitality depends on differences between them. Unlike Beowulf, who is human, Grendel and his mother are monsters. Unlike Beowulf, who is given kinship by Hrothgar, Grendel and his mother are marginalized because they are the descendants of the Biblical Cain, who are condemned by the God. Unlike Beowulf, who is the savior of the Danes, Grendel and his mother are attackers. Unlike Beowulf, who is a prince of the Geats, Grendel and his mother are the descendants of the punished and exiled Cain. Unlike Beowulf, who can homogenize himself to the Danish society by accepting to be adopted by King Hrothgar, Grendel chooses to use violence to attack the Danes. Unlike Beowulf, who can use the same or similar language to communicate with the Danes, Grendel's language is neither translated nor understood by the Geats and the Danes. With all these differences, Grendel is doomed to be incompatible with the Danes. In terms of female's role as peace makers, providing hospitality at banquets or sacrificing in political marriages, respectively represented by Freawaru, Wealhtheow, and Hygd, by contrast, Grendel's mother is never a peace maker; instead, she is a warrior. In contrast to locals who live on land in Geatland, the dragon is a foreign non-human creature that dwells near the sea. Unlike Beowulf, who keeps hoards for his tribe and his glory, the dragon finds happiness in hoarding. Hospitality is more complicated than inhospitality. The outsiders who are incompatible with the societies of the Geats and the Danes tend to show inhospitality in an immediate and straightforward way while human societies may use a variety of hospitable strategies or tactics to camouflage their real intention—tribal interests—in *Beowulf*. When incompatibility occurs, inhospitality ensues, whereas hospitality is likely to exist in homogenous societies.

Works Cited

- Anonymous. "Beowulf." *The Norton Anthology of English Literature*. Translated by Seamus Heaney, edited by Greenblatt and Abrams, Norton, 2006, pp. 34-100.
- Baker, Peter S. *Honour, Exchange, and Violence in Beowulf*. Boydell & Brewer, 2013.
- Bazelmans, Jos. "Beyond Power. Ceremonial Exchanges in *Beowulf*." *Rituals of Power: From Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages*, edited by Frans Theuws and Janet L. Nelson, Brill, 2000, pp. 311-76.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Logics of Practice*. Translated by Richard Nice. Stanford UP, 1990.
- Clarke, Catherine A. M. *Writing Power in Anglo-Saxon England: Texts, Hierarchies, Economies*. D. S. Brewer, 2012.
- Classen, Albrecht. *Handbook of Medieval Culture: Volume 3*. Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome, editor. *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. U of Minnesota P, 1996.
- Derrida, Jacques. "La Différance." *Conférence Prononcée à la Société Française de Philosophie*, January 27, 1968. *Théorie d'ensemble*, Collectif, Seuil, 1968. 41-54.
- Derrida, Jacques, and Anne Dufourmantelle. *Of Hospitality*. Translated by Rachel Bowlby, Stanford UP, 2000.
- Fell, Christine E. *Women in Anglo-Saxon England: And the Impact of 1066*. Indiana UP, 1984.
- First Cause*. *Britannica*, www.britannica.com/topic/first-cause. Accessed 20 Aug. 2022.
- Ghani, Hana. "The Feminine Other: Monsters and Magic in *Beowulf* and *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*." *Journal of English Studies*, vol. 2, no.1, 2021, pp. 55-63.
- Goldsmith, Margaret E. *The Mode and Meaning of 'Beowulf'*. Bloomsbury, 2014.
- Grumett, David. "Andrew Shepherd, The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality." *Reviews in Religion and Theology*, vol. 24, 2017, pp. 367-9.
- Heffernan, James A. W. *Hospitality and Treachery in Western Literature*. Yale UP, 2014.
- Hospitality*. *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hospitable. Accessed 22 Aug. 2022.
- Hospitality*. *Cambridge Dictionary*, <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/zht/hospitality>. Accessed 22 Aug. 2022.
- Inhospitality*. *Merriam-Webster*, www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/inhospitable. Accessed 22 Aug. 2022.
- Kahral, Stanley J. "Feuds in "Beowulf": A Tragic Necessity?" *Modern Philology*, vol. 69, no. 3, 1972, pp. 189-98.
- Mauss, Marcel, Jane I Guyer, and Bill Maurer. *The Gift*. Macmillan, 2007.
- Meaney, Audrey L. "Scyld Scefing and the Dating of *Beowulf* - Again." *Textual and Material Culture in Anglo-Saxon England: Thomas Northcote Toller Memorial Lectures*, edited by Donald Scragg, D. S. Brewer, 2003, pp. 23-74.

- Melrose, Robin. *Warriors and Wilderness in Medieval Britain: From Arthur and Beowulf to Sir Gawain and Robin Hood*. McFarland & Company, 2017.
- Nelson, Nancy Susan. *Heroism and Failure in Anglo-Saxon Poetry: The Ideal and the Real within the Comitatus*. 1989. U of North Texas, PHD dissertation. *UNT Digital Library*, digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc332044/#description-content-main. Accessed 27 Aug. 2022.
- New International Version. *Biblica*, www.biblica.com/bible/niv/genesis/4/. Accessed 19 Aug. 2022.
- New International Version. *Biblegateway*, www.biblegateway.com/passage/ezekiel49-50&version=NIV. Accessed 7 Sept. 2022.
- Peterson, Brian Neil. *What was the Sin of Sodom: Homosexuality, Inhospitality, or Something Else*. Eugene, 2016.
- Shepherd, Andrew. *The Gift of the Other: Levinas, Derrida, and a Theology of Hospitality*. James Clarke & Co., 2014.
- Staver, Ruth Johnston. *A Companion to Beowulf*. Greenwood P, 2005.
- Waterhouse, Ruth. "Beowulf as Palimpsest." *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*, edited by Jeffrey Jerome Cohen, U of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 26-39. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5749/j.ctttsq4d.5>. Accessed 18 Mar. 2023.
- Weinstock, Jeffrey Andrew. *The Monster Theory Reader*. U of Minnesota P, 2020.
- Woolf, Henry Bosley. "A Note on the Hoard in *Beowulf*." *Modern Language Notes*, vol. 58, no. 2, 1943, pp. 113-15.

「我看見黑暗中的苦難」：《凱爾斯的秘密》中的怪物之眼

鄭暉凡^{*}

摘要

由湯姆·摩爾及諾拉·托梅執導、並於 2009 年問世的奇幻動畫長片《凱爾斯的秘密》，以現代數位藝術重構愛爾蘭國寶《凱爾斯之書》的繪製過程，並勾勒出極富島嶼特色的愛爾蘭歷史和視覺文化，因而被評論家喻為愛爾蘭國族電影。然而，本文認為電影中所呈現的愛爾蘭異教神克魯姆·庫魯克一角，已然讓國族與基督教主體的可能性有別於傳統定義，而其與《凱爾斯之書》之間糾結難分的關係，挑戰了純粹性的想像，彰顯身分的流動及多重意義的跨界。在故事中，克魯姆·庫魯克之眼，既是一個為了完成基督教抄本而必需取得的物件，亦是揮之不去、與眾多視覺意象相互呼應的凝視。它猶如拉岡理論中的詭異凝視，讓主體感到焦慮不安，引領主角跨越疆界，為愛爾蘭的過往提供一個更全球化的詮釋。本文透過分析動畫片中描繪的疆界建構與解構、基督教文化與異教的關係，以及克魯姆·庫魯克及其眼睛／凝視揭露的苦難與重生，指出《凱爾斯的秘密》藉由再創《凱爾斯之書》所傳達的，並非一個單純融合基督與異教的愛爾蘭國族，而是呈現出身份內含的衝突、不穩定性，及其可能向更多元複雜的世界開放的特質。

關鍵詞：《凱爾斯之書》、怪物、克魯姆·庫魯克、凝視、疆界

^{*} 國立台灣大學外國語文學系兼任助理教授
(投稿日期：2022 年 11 月 13 日；通過刊登日期：2023 年 2 月 15 日)

“I’ve Seen Suffering in the Darkness”: The Monster’s

Eye in *The Secret of Kells*

CHENG, WEI-FAN **

Abstract

Released in 2009, *The Secret of Kells* is an animated film directed by Tomm Moore and co-directed by Nora Twomey. Its vivid reconstruction of the origin of the Book of Kells and artful combination of Irish history, Celtic insular art, and modern digital techniques make it an Irish national cinema. However, the role of Crom Cruach, an intriguing pagan god/monster, contests traditional conceptions of nationality and Christian selfhood. His entangled relationship with the Book of Kells highlights the fluidity of identity and the multiple possibilities of border-crossing. The “Eye of Crom” is both an indispensable object in completing the Christian manuscript and a haunting gaze overlapping with various images in the film. Recalling the anxiety-triggering gaze in Jacques Lacan’s theoretical framework, the eye image propels the protagonist to step beyond the border and consequently hints at a more cosmopolitan interpretation of the Irish past. By scrutinizing the (de-)construction of borders, the intertwined relationship between Christianity and paganism, and the notions of suffering and rebirth underlying Crom Cruach’s eye and the recurring gaze, this article aims to argue that the animated reproduction of the Book of Kells suggests a hybrid identity that is unsettling, conflicting, and therefore more connectible to the world of infinite complexity.

Keywords: Book of Kells, monster, Crom Cruach, gaze, border

** Adjunct Assistant Professor, Department of Foreign Languages and Literatures, National Taiwan University

I. Introduction¹

Tomm Moore and Nora Twomey’s award-winning animated film, *The Secret of Kells* (2009), is a sparkling star in the filmdom.² By adopting a 2-dimensional artistic style, the film leads the audience back to both the delicate world of the Book of Kells and “the era of animation before computer-generated imagery” (Ryzik). *The Secret of Kells* reimagines the origin of the Book of Kells, a highly artistic and ornamented manuscript believed to be illuminated around 800 AD or earlier, a time when the invading Viking force threatened Scotland and Ireland.³ Written in Latin and composed of four gospels of the New Testament,⁴ the Book of Kells is well-known for its resplendent style, lavish decorations, colorful images of plants and native animals, abstract Celtic spirals, and interlaced patterns.⁵ It was written three centuries after St. Patrick brought Christianity to Ireland and about two centuries after monasticism flourished.⁶ Despite the expansion of Christianity in the seventh and eighth centuries, secular arts, stories, and vernacular literature in Ireland still co-existed with the Irish church, and many pre-Christian histories, tales, genealogies, and traditions survived in the records and teaching of ecclesiastical schools (State 31). The flowering details of the Book of Kells, wherein Celtic, Germanic, and Mediterranean

¹ This article is a substantially revised and extended version of a manuscript presented at “Literature, Culture, and History: An International Conference in Literary and Cultural Studies,” co-organized by National Taiwan University and Yonsei University in 2019. I want to thank the anonymous reviewers for offering insightful comments and constructive suggestions that helped me polish the work.

² *The Secret of Kells* won Audience Award at the Annecy International Animated Film Festival (2009), Best Irish Film at the Dublin International Film Festival (2009), Audience Award at the Edinburgh International Film Festival (2009), Best Animated Film at the Boulder International Film Festival (2010), Best Animation at the Irish Film and Television Awards (2010), etc. It was also nominated for Best Film at the Annecy International Animated Film Festival (2009), Best Animated Film at the European Film Awards (2009), Best Animated Feature at the Annie Awards (2010), Best Film at the Irish Film and Television Awards (2010), and Best Animated Feature at the Academy Awards (2010). For more information, see “*The Secret of Kells*: Awards,” *IMDb*.

³ The origin of the Book of Kells, including its date, place, and illuminators, has been debated and remains inconclusive. It is generally believed that the book must have been completed after the monks of Iona took refuge in Kells due to a series of devastating Viking raids in AD 806 and 807. But it could be dated earlier according to some scholars, who think the book may have been written in Iona (Simms 13). For further studies on the historical background of the Book of Kells, see George Otto Simms’s *Exploring the Book of Kells* (1988), Bernard Meehan’s *The Book of Kells: An Illustrated Introduction to the Manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin* (1994), pp. 9-16, and Carol Farr’s *The Book of Kells: Its Function and Audience* (1997), pp. 15-28.

⁴ The four gospels in the Book of Kells are Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

⁵ For the discussions on the artistic style of the manuscript, see Blanche Cirker’s “Foreword” in *The Book of Kells: Selected Plates in Full Color* (1982), Meehan’s *The Book of Kells: An Illustrated Introduction to the Manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin* (1994), pp. 17-77, Ruth Megaw and Vincent Megaw’s *Celtic Art from Its Beginnings to the Book of Kells* (2001), pp. 254 and 276, Dennis W. Harding’s *The Archaeology of Celtic Art* (2007), pp. 252-58, and Fintan O’Toole’s *A History of Ireland in 100 Objects* (2013), p. 56.

⁶ One of the most influential and worth-mentioning figures is St. Columba, also known as Colmcille or Colm Cille, the founder of the monastery of Iona. He founded many monasteries and Christian societies in Ireland and Scotland and sailed from Ireland to Iona in AD 563 (State 29-30; Simms 13-16). Two hundred years after his death in 597, the “Columban” school of writing could still be seen in the works of later monks, including the Book of Kells (Simms 15). The name of Colmcille is mentioned in the film when Brother Aidan introduces Brendan, the young protagonist, to the crystal lens used in the production of images in the manuscript. Brother Aidan calls the lens the “Eye of Colmcille” (*The Secret* 40:35-40:43).

elements coincide (Megaw 254), attest to the juxtaposition of Christian faith and secular culture. A beautiful compound of evangelistic tidings and insular, pagan arts, the Book of Kells is considered one of the chief treasures of Ireland and a symbol of “Irish nationality” (Meehan 17).

Using modern digital techniques to reproduce the visual beauty of the Book of Kells, the film undoubtedly reveals “a national interest” (Burke). In an interview, Moore expresses his fascination with Gaelic tradition, Celtic designs, and the beauty and history of the book, and he hopes the film’s international visibility may encourage more people to make Irish indie animation (qtd. in Ryzik). In effect, the animated film differentiates itself from “what may be regarded as a diluted form of American artistic and cultural imperialism” (Wells 2) and “makes one nostalgic for the more ornate designs of pre-Euro Irish currency” (Burke).

Regardless of the national and religious connotations it contains, *The Secret of Kells* does not solely target a homogeneous audience. Maria O’Brien argues that while the film shows interest in the narration of Irish nationality, its display of the protagonist’s reliance on nature, rather than on his religion, for inspiration “undermines the purity of the origins of the nation of Ireland” (36) and generates “a space for those that do not fit, to claim it as theirs through allegiance with its inspiration” (37). This space for those outside the particular interest group consequently ensures the film’s universal popularity.

The film draws public and academic interest through its richness in visual display and its differences from the original work. Lynn Ramey comments that the Book of Kells in the animated film is not a faithful representation of the medieval text, but “a simulacrum, a distorted version of the original” (114).⁷ This echoes A. O. Scott’s claim that “a gentle spirit of syncretism” suffuses the film, and “the exact nature of the manuscript . . . is left vague.” *The Secret of Kells* focuses not on the content of the manuscript but on the life of Brendan, the young protagonist who will later become the master illuminator of the Book of Kells.⁸ The film’s display of images is intriguing, especially regarding the recurring “Eye of Crom.” Ruth Megaw and Vincent Megaw mention that the intricate design of the Book of Kells is “barely fully discernible without a magnifying glass—an aid perhaps provided in the scriptoria by a natural crystal” (255). Interestingly, in the film, the “natural crystal” is not taken from the forest, which would have been a reasonable choice if the film simply aims at presenting a marriage between pagan elements and Catholic themes (O’Brien 34), but from the den of Crom Cruach, a Celtic pagan god portrayed as a monster of darkness. Moreover,

⁷ For further discussion of the relationship between cinema, media, image, and book in *The Secret of Kells*, also see Richard Burt’s “Writing the Endings of Cinema: Saving Film Authorship in the Cinematic Paratexts of *Prospero’s Books*, Taymor’s *The Tempest* and *The Secret of Kells*” in *The Writer on Film: Screening Literary Authorship* (2013), pp. 178-92.

⁸ Scholars, however, argue that the Book of Kells must have been a collective work completed by more than one author (Simms 7; Megaw 255; Harding 254-58). As Harding puts it, “numerous different hands were involved as artists and scribes, especially if the work was disrupted by Viking raids and a retreat from Iona for completion in the comparative refuge of Kells” (258). The film simplifies the issue of authorship probably to present a more consistent and explicit story.

the monster’s eye appears as an encircled sun, which echoes many other eye-like images in *The Secret of Kells*.

Several questions arise from the film’s intriguing display of these images: What does the recurring eye-like image mean throughout the story? What message does the pagan monster’s participation in making the Book of Kells, the sacred gospel book of Christianity, convey? And what kind of Christian-pagan relationship does the film depict? While critics like O’Brien highlight the film’s departure from Irish-centeredness and its revelation of hybridity, the critical role of Crom Cruach is so far underemphasized, if not untouched.

This paper explores the role and function of the recurring eye-like image and argues that the film’s display of the uncanny eye corresponds to its contemporary concerns: the fluidity of identity and the multiple layers of border-crossing. At the superficial level, the film seems to present Crom Cruach as both a source material for the book’s production and a marginal existence to be defeated and excluded from Christian civilization. Yet, the integral role of the monster’s crystal eye in completing the Book of Kells marks the confusing entanglement between Christianity and paganism. Looking into the eye of the monster enables us to decipher the film’s choice of visual display and sense its restless inquiries into how one negotiates with the turbulent environment in a world of increasing complexity. By delving into the role of Crom Cruach and the uncanny eye-like image, this paper argues that while the film “interrogate[s] ideas of the nation as fluid and hybrid” (O’Brien 38), the hybridity is neither a harmonious mixture of pagan belief and Christian tradition nor a simple return to the world of nature. Instead, the monster as a liminal being keeps the audience aware of the conflicts and entangled histories underlying the process through which different cultural, religious, or ethnic groups were integrated—either willingly or reluctantly—into a single nation. In effect, *The Secret of Kells* suggests a more cosmopolitan Irishness that can appeal to a multicultural world.

II. The Monster at the Borderline

The Secret of Kells invites the audience to see how the Book of Kells is made following the journey of the Christian protagonist Brendan. Although Brendan is the prime mover of the plot, his movement and action are propelled by characters within or beyond Christendom. The story is set in the city of Kells during Viking invasions. Brendan’s uncle Cellach, the abbot of Kells, is fascinated by the idea of building a wall to protect citizens, save civilization, and prove the power of Christianity over paganism. One day, Brother Aidan, a monk and a manuscript illuminator entrusted by his brothers to protect the uncompleted Book of Iona, comes to Kells to take refuge after the destruction of the monastery of Iona. To learn the skills of painting, Brendan, for the first time, disobeys Cellach’s command, steps beyond the wall of Kells, and enters the forest. With the help of

Aisling, a fairy capable of transforming herself into a wolf, Brendan successfully obtains the ingredient to make ink for the manuscript. Yet, Brother Aidan tells Brendan that the painting cannot be completed without a crystal lens, the “Eye of Colmcille,” which was trampled by the Vikings when he escaped from Iona. Upon knowing that the “Eye of Colmcille” was originally made from the eye of Crom Cruach, a pagan monster in the forest, Brendan again enters the forest, defeats Crom Cruach, and takes his eye. The manuscript illumination thus begins, but before its completion comes the Viking raid, during which Cellach is terribly injured. Unable to help his uncle, Brendan escapes with Brother Aidan and becomes a preacher years later, sending hope to Irish inhabitants by showing them the completed Book of Kells, a symbol of light and hope.⁹ In the end, Brendan returns to Kells and reunites with his uncle, who, dwelling in despair for years due to his belief that Brendan was killed in the Viking invasion, can finally step out of the sphere of darkness upon seeing his nephew and the splendid work.

Border-crossing is a crucial motif that takes the audience through the film’s storyline. Brendan’s physical movement from the city to the forest signifies the first layer. It hints at the possibility of bridging the gap between citizens within the wall of Kells and the external space representing “freedom, the full spectrum of nature, and connection to an otherness beyond” (Spartz 185). The film itself points to a broader sense of border-crossing by drawing together the collective memory of Ireland and a universal feeling of suffering and salvation. As O’Brien’s post-colonial reading suggests, Ireland and animation “come together in *The Secret of Kells* to interrogate ideas of the nation and Irishness within a world context” (34). The film’s portrayal of nation and identity corresponds to Homi K. Bhabha’s explanation of ambivalence, which “emerges from a growing awareness that . . . the cultural temporality of the nation inscribes a much more transitional social reality” (1). This “transitional social reality” enables us to see beyond the tradition of a specific group of people, acknowledge the shared values of humanities, and detect the underlying complexities of a cultural product.

Crom Cruach and the “Eye of Crom” answer to the idea of border-crossing in different stages of the story. Equating the “Eye of Colmcille” with the “Eye of Crom” is an eccentric choice, which makes Crom Cruach’s role intriguing even before he first appears in the film. This choice suggests a subtler border-crossing because it associates the origin of the Christian work with pre-Christian paganism and therefore makes the Irish past and the Irish treasure ambiguous—a concept corresponding to Bhabha’s discussion. Given that Aisling represents the friendly ally from the world of nature and the fearsome Vikings the main antagonists, the function of Crom Cruach is elusive at first glance.

⁹ However, scholars have pointed out that the manuscript of the Book of Kells is actually unfinished (Meehan 24; McCaffrey and Eaton 195).

To explore how the pagan monster’s presence and participation in the making of the manuscript reshape the understanding of Christianity, Christian subjects, and subsequently the national identity of Ireland, this paper reads the intriguing role of Crom Cruach in the light of Jeffrey Jerome Cohen’s monster study. Cohen refers to monsters as “disturbing hybrids” that resist categorization (“Monster Culture” 6) and “police the borders of the possible” (“Monster Culture” 12). Monsters destabilize borders. The word “border” carries various meanings. It may refer to a demarcation line that divides two categories, groups, or parties; it can also mean a borderland or a frontier where “negotiations take place, identities are reshaped and personhoods invented” (Naum 107).¹⁰ Crom Cruach’s ambiguous presence answers to the latter definition. Not only a symbol of pre-Christian nature but also a monster whose very existence is “a rebuke to boundary and enclosure” (Cohen, “Monster Culture” 7), Crom Cruach complicates the Book of Kells and opens up new interpretive possibilities by participating in the process of illuminating the manuscript.

An unsettling border existence, Crom Cruach occupies the position of exteriority, a term Walter D. Mignolo uses to shed light on “the outside that is needed by the inside” (“The Many Faces” 724).¹¹ Although the term seemingly bears the meaning of the “external,” it is, in fact, “the borderland seen from the perspective of those ‘to be included’” (Mignolo, “The Many Faces” 724).¹² In the film, Crom Cruach, a pagan god marginalized during the process of Irish Christianization, hybridizes the nature of the Book of Kells by occupying a central position in the book’s illumination. A hybrid creature lingering at the established border, Crom Cruach is thus an icon crucial to the renegotiation of identity and the re-formation of subjectivity. The potentiality of the monster lies in its ability to “ask us how we perceive the world, and how we have misrepresented what we have attempted to place” (Cohen, “Monster Culture” 20).

Interestingly, Crom Cruach interferes in the manuscript illumination and makes Brendan anxious not through his existence per se but through his intriguing eye, which echoes many other eye-like images to the extent that it becomes an almost omnipresent gaze. Jacques Lacan’s theory of the gaze as *objet petit a*, though in a very different context, offers important insight into deciphering the film’s representation of the gaze, which is related to

¹⁰ See Magdalena Naum’s discussion on the concepts of “borderland” and “frontier,” which are understood as synonymous terms in her paper, “Re-emerging Frontiers: Postcolonial Theory and Historical Archaeology of the Borderlands.” For the elaboration of the frontier and its significance in medieval studies, see also Nora Berend’s “Medievalists and the Notion of the Frontier,” in which the frontier is considered “a contact zone, where an interchange of cultures was constantly taking place” (57).

¹¹ Mignolo reiterates the same concept in his later works, including his monograph, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (2011), and his journal article, “Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (De)coloniality, Border Thinking and Epistemic Disobedience” (2011).

¹² Mignolo’s idea echoes “extimité,” a Lacanian concept meaning “external intimacy” or “intimate alterity,” which is appropriated by Cohen in his discussion of monsters (*Of Giants* xii). Although these two terms are formulated under different theoretical frameworks, they both speak to the border existence functioning as the limit of the inside and capable of dissolving the stability of identity. For the discussion on how monsters expose the extimité, see Cohen’s *Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages* (1999), pp. xii-xiii; 4-5.

but cannot be simply equated with Crom Cruach's eye. In his discussion of the gaze, Lacan distinguishes "the function of the eye and that of the gaze" (*The Seminar* 74).¹³ He writes,

In our relation to things, in so far as this relation is constituted by the way of vision, and ordered in the figures of representation, something slips, passes, is transmitted, from stage to stage, and is always to some degree eluded in it—that is what we call the gaze. (*The Seminar* 73)

Unlike an identifiable eye, the gaze is always elusive, marking the subject's unsettling position in relation to and in the field of the Other (*The Seminar* 84).¹⁴ It is the cause of desire, the given-to-be-seen, and the recall of the lack (Quinet 139-40). On the one hand, it appears as what "the subject tries to adapt himself to"; on the other hand, it is "specified as unapprehensible" (Lacan, *The Seminar* 83). Its presence arouses the subject's anxiety about being gazed at. It generates a feeling of lack and, in effect, cancels the subject's subjectivity.

Crom Cruach's eye does appear as a real, physical eye in *The Secret of Kells*, but in the meanwhile, the film presents a haunting gaze which, though mimicking the sun-like figure of the "Eye of Crom," calls upon myriad spirits of the pre-Christian nature. The recurring image becomes an uncanny gaze that triggers the Christian subject's desire to know and arouses his anxiety in the field of the Other. Consequently, it propels the reinterpretation of the Book of Kells and reshapes the Christian subject's relationship with the world. Seeing through the literal border, that is, the wall of Kells, and re-viewing the world through the eye of the border existence, namely the pagan monster Crom Cruach, Brendan eventually obtains a more comprehensive insight into the difficult relationship between his own culture and that of others. The subject negotiated through the elusive eye/gaze can never acquire a stable identity in traditional thinking of the nation-state.

The analysis in the following is divided into two parts. The first part examines the image of walls, the intriguing overlap of various "eyes," and the entangled relationship between pagan nature and Christianity to scrutinize how the concept of border is gradually shattered. The second part then investigates the unyielding force of paganism within the discursive authority of Christianity to explain how the (re-)viewing of the pagan monster leads to the reconsideration of Christian and Irish identity. By deciphering Crom Cruach's conspicuous existence and the voiceless but recurring eye/gaze, this paper offers its interpretation of the idea of suffering and suggests the pagan monster's potential rebirth in and via the Christian work.

¹³ Lacan's discussion about the gaze is elaborated comprehensively in *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis* (1978), chapters 6 to 9, which are organized into a section entitled "Of the Gaze as *Objet Petit a*."

¹⁴ In this article, the capitalized big Other refers to the absolute otherness in the context of psychoanalysis: the subject learns to articulate his/her desire, feels the lack, and is driven by *objet petit a*, which may appear as the gaze, in the field of the Other. By contrast, the lowercase other or others articulate the cultural or religious others in the discussion of the relationship between the (Christian) self and the (pagan) other.

III. The Deconstruction of Borders

Wall and border images are prominent in *The Secret of Kells*. Soon after Aisling’s monologue in the first few seconds of the film come the monks and people living within the wall of Kells. The interpretation of the wall can be multifaceted. It first points to a material wall separating the people of Kells from external threats, particularly the power of paganism associated with the mysterious forest surrounding the city of Kells and the savage, ferocious Viking pirates constantly invading and destroying Christian monasteries. In addition, the wall image also implies an ideological border that fortifies the self-other boundary and separates Christian civilization from the outside world.

Suggesting both a physical boundary and an ideological distinction, the wall echoes the characterization of Cellach, a tall and rigid abbot who shadows the young protagonist and his companions and hinders them from seeing further whenever he appears. Cellach firmly believes that constructing the fortress-like wall can help Christian people withstand external dangers, preserve their culture, and prove the power of their faith. In response to Brendan’s reserved attitude toward the construction of the wall, Cellach asserts that “Pagans, Crom worshipers . . . It is with the strength of our walls that they will come to trust the strength of our faith” (*The Secret* 14:10-14:21). With his own room being a space of artificiality, calculation, and administration, the abbot signifies the consolidation of borders. James T. Spartz observes that he is “steadfast in the center of his own creation—the monastic fortress of Kells—seeking command and control of the external world rather than growing and changing with it” (186). Characterized as the “watchful eye” of authority (Ramey 114), Cellach restlessly supervises the construction of the wall and reminds citizens of their responsibilities.

While Cellach highlights the ability of border to “divide, delineate and control” (Naum 102), Brendan transforms the meaning of border from a line of distinction to a zone of contact and collision. This transformation is manifested not only through Brendan’s action of border-crossing but through the overlap of different eyes, including Aisling’s and Brendan’s eyes and the intriguing eye of Crom Cruach in later scenes. The film begins with a scene of the cosmos, with a sun-like figure in the foreground. When the image zooms out, the micro-universe is coupled with the eyes of Aisling, whose words constitute the first sentence in the film: “I have lived through many ages, through the eyes of salmon, deer, and wolf” (*The Secret* 01:09-01:23). This sentence reminds the audience of the flow of time, the creations on earth, and the constant transformation and becoming. The voice is Aisling’s, but the speaker can be identified both as the fairy girl Brendan encounters and as nature itself, which existed before Christianity. The sun figure in the eyes of Aisling corresponds to the literal sun in the film, thereby revealing the bond between Aisling and pre-Christian nature. The bright world Aisling sees differs significantly from Cellach’s dark sphere, and

Brendan, who yearningly marvels at the fantastic forest where Aisling dwells, is hence “distinct from his controlling uncle, striving to exist in touch with the wider world, led by the call of spirit and open to change yet willing to do battle in exploration of the unknown” (Spartz 186-87). After an accidental fall and the discovery of a cleft under the wall, Brendan sees through the border and enters the world of nature.

Brendan’s attempt to touch the Book of Iona placed on Brother Aidan’s desk marks the critical moment when Brendan’s eyes overlap with the recurring eyes of pagan nature, of Aisling, and subsequently of Crom Cruach. When he touches the book, an eye-like halo emerges and startles him. This eye-like image indicates two things. First, it associates the Book of Kells with pagan inspirations, showing Christianity’s intimacy with and its roots in the natural world. In this sense, the eye emerging from the manuscript may point to the eyes of Aisling and the spirit of nature, as the need for the ingredients of colorful inks would lead Brendan to the forest and give him a chance to see the world Aisling perceives. Insular elements are transformed into Brendan’s paintings, appearing in the manuscript of the Book of Kells as circular images of trees, leaves, flowers, native animals, and insects.

Apart from this, the eye Brendan perceives intriguingly overlaps with Crom Cruach’s eye. Although the lens, an object needed to complete the Christian work, is named the “Eye of Colmcille” after the Christian saint, the film discloses that it is actually the eye of “Crom,” a pagan monster in the depth of the forest (*The Secret* 41:55-42:26). The sun image on the lens mirrors the image carved on the pillars in front of Crom Cruach’s cave and the eye image that startles Brendan and makes him feel like he is being gazed at. The recurrence of the eye image makes the eye an uncanny Lacanian gaze which is “always present in manifestations of anxiety” (Quinet 144). It triggers confusion and forces the viewer to wonder why the Christian gospel would be associated with the pagan monster and how the Book of Kells should be comprehended if its completion is facilitated by the lens made of the pagan monster’s eye.

With various eye-like images echoing its existence, the “Eye of Crom” ceases to be an eye and becomes a gaze because the viewing subject is unidentifiable; it is not that Crom Cruach keeps gazing at Brendan, but that Brendan constantly feels being gazed at. Lacan explains that the gaze “surprises him [the subject] in the function of voyeur, disturbs him, overwhelms him,” but it also sustains him “in a function of desire” (*The Seminar* 84-85). The gaze Brendan feels is powerful and, to some extent, monstrous and terrifying, but this is not because it belongs to Crom Cruach the pagan monster. Lacan’s concept implies that the gaze belongs to no one, not any subject per se. In *The Secret of Kells*, the eye-like image functions as a pre-existing gaze because it surprises and disturbs Brendan the Christian subject and locates him in the field of the Other, which alludes to the inassimilable non-Christian world in the film’s narrative context. Constantly feeling the gaze’s presence, Brendan is driven to respond to the very existence whose true identity he does not know. He

is, therefore, a subject of lack, a subject whose subjectivity depends on the command of the Other.

The overlap of various eye images, a collection including the monster’s eye, implies that the film does not merely spotlight the connection between Christianity and the bright, lively nature—otherwise Aisling’s eyes would be sufficient enough to convey the message. By drawing together Brendan’s eyes, Crom Cruach’s eyes, and the eyes associated with pagan nature yet unidentifiable in effect, the film proposes reconsidering Irish national identity and incorporating what is previously regarded as unfavorable.

The idea of nature is neutral, but that of paganism is not. The film’s portrayal of Aisling, the innocent and kindhearted fairy of the forest, may bespeak the harmonious assimilation of pagan nature into Christianity—pagan nature here being a neutral phrase referring to the non-Christian domain that, although separated by the wall of Kells, could be readily accepted, embraced, and included by Christian civilization without apparent resistance. Yet, Aisling’s interaction with Brendan presents a Christian-pagan relationship so harmonious that it risks undermining the suffering of pagan culture and sacrificing pagan tradition for the advocacy of Christian values. In the film’s prologue, Aisling says, “I’ve seen suffering in the darkness. Yet I have seen beauty thrive in the most fragile of places. I have seen the book, the book that turned darkness into light” (*The Secret* 01:40-02:09). When Brendan starts practicing drawing, she also looks curiously at Brendan’s work. Her amicability to, and even alliance with, the Christian world makes the nature she represents a place waiting to be assimilated and bridged. Hence, even though the contact with Aisling and her forest marks a crucial moment of Brendan’s border-crossing, the readiness of the pagan nature represented by Aisling simultaneously undermines the impact of Brendan’s movement.

Crom Cruach, by contrast, stands for the part of pagan tradition more unacceptable from the Christian perspective. Crom Cruach, also known as *Crom*, *Cromm Cruaich*, *Cenn Crúach*, or *Crom Dubh* in old Irish, was a pre-Christian Irish god often associated with growth and fertility (Bonwick 121; MacCulloch 79; Smyth 40) and was even referred to as “the head of all gods” (Bonwick 121).¹⁵ James Bonwick considers Crom Cruach the sun god because “his image was surrounded by the fixed representations of twelve lesser divinities” and that “the one surrounded with the twelve would readily suggest the Sun and the twelve Signs of the Zodiac” (121).¹⁶ Yet, this pagan god ceased to help men after St. Patrick ended his worship and his worshipers deserted him for the Christian faith (MacCulloch 80). The film’s portrayal of the “Eye of Crom,” which is depicted as a sun

¹⁵ For further information about Crom Cruach, see also Daragh Smyth’s *A Guide to Irish Mythology* (1996), Seamus MacGabhann’s “Landmarks of the People: Meath and Cavan Places Prominent in Lughnasa Mythology and Folklore” (2000), and Carmel McCaffrey and Leo Eaton’s *In Search of Ancient Ireland: The Origins of the Irish from Neolithic Times to the Coming of the English* (2002).

¹⁶ See also Smyth, p. 40.

enclosed within two circles, reiterates Crom Cruach's association with the sun. Crom Cruach's being the symbol of fertility and brightness in old Irish folklore explains why Aisling's eyes, the sun figure, and the forest's central space all resemble the "Eye of Crom." A deity symbolizing goodness and brightness in ancient times, Crom Cruach, however, appears as a serpentine monster in the forest that even Aisling, a fairy of the pagan world, is afraid of. While Aisling belongs to the part of the pagan culture that might be assimilated, Crom Cruach is characterized as a figure too threatening to be involved.

Despite his horrifying appearance and his noticeable differences from Aisling, a friendly fairy standing by the side of the Christian protagonist, Crom Cruach is in fact an ambiguous existence rather than an absolute enemy of Christianity, and his unsettling role is further accentuated by the film's portrayal of the Viking raiders. Compared to Crom Cruach, the Vikings are bloodthirsty antagonists, physically menacing and spiritually unresponsive. The film depicts them as gigantic killing machines. They always appear as black figures against red backgrounds, signifying warfare, destruction, devastation, and death. Crom Cruach, on the other hand, does not match the simple classification of anti-Christian others. This results from his entangled relationship with the Book of Kells and how he is portrayed and described. Aisling calls Crom Cruach's cave "a place of suffering" instead of a place of death or destruction (*The Secret* 30:23-30:26), thereby rendering the pagan deity an ambiguous threshold being refusing categorization.

The film does not specify whose and what kind of suffering that would be, but O. Davies and D. Lowry-Corry's discussion on the Killinagh Church, a place believed to be the original location of Crom Cruach, offers some clues. Davies and Lowry-Corry explain,

In all parts of Europe survivals of paganism are found in Christian worship, temples converted into churches, pagan statues into statues of saints, pagan festivals inserted into the Christian calendar. Nowhere is this process more obvious than in Ireland. . . . The early Christian did not believe in the non-existence of pagan divinities or demons; on the contrary, these were often powerful, and had either to be exorcised or constrained to Christian service. In the case of the Killinagh stones it seems that the magic power of a pagan deity had been tamed and christianised to prevent it being lost or misused. (101)¹⁷

Their explanation suggests an interpretation of the term "suffering" as the suffering of Crom Cruach, rather than of Aisling, Christian believers, or any other subjects in the story; more specifically, it indicates the suffering of the pagan tradition "exorcised or constrained to Christian service." Pagan religion and culture were not completely wiped out during the process of Christianization, but they were preserved in ways that distorted them from their

¹⁷ Smyth, on the other hand, associates the stone idol of Crom with the Killycluggin Stone and mentions that it was once surrounded by twelve silver stone idols (40).

original forms and meanings. Pagan deities underwent the process of domestication, during which conflicts, struggles, and subsequent “sufferings” might be involved.

Crom Cruach’s suffering makes interpreting the Book of Kells as a mixture of paganism and Christianity a naïve reading, for the word “mixture” downplays the unwillingness during the process. While partly agreeing with O’Brien’s statement that “the film subverts its [the Book of Kells’s] religious origins by marrying pagan elements with more expected Catholic themes” (34), this paper contends that the film complicates the issue by forcing its viewers to reconsider Crom Cruach’s role in the making of the manuscript. An outside created during the formation of the inside, or an “exteriority” in Mignolo’s phrasing, Crom Cruach visualizes the frontier where the histories, cultures, and traditions of Christianity and paganism collide and intertwine.

The role played by the “Eye of Crom” in Brendan’s painting is thought-provoking by virtue of its ability to mirror the pagan god’s multifaceted relationship with the Christian world. The eye image emerges when Brendan first touches the book; after Brendan begins his practice of painting, he sees the eye again in his dream and upon his awakening. In his dream, the eye is displayed as both a swirling vortex threatening to swallow him and a radiating star overhanging his head; it represents the source of anxiety and the inspiration for art. These various encounters with the uncanny image all happen before Brother Aidan informs Brendan that Crom Cruach’s eye is the crystal lens necessary for producing the manuscript. The order of the plot implies Crom Cruach’s association with Christianity and the Christian work even before his function is specified. The pagan god/monster is, therefore, capable of generating the “anxious possibility” termed by Cohen (“The Promise” 449), who states that “[t]he effects of the monster are undeniable: a spur to self-protection; an insistent impulsion to narrative; a catalyst to fear, to desire, and to art” (“The Promise” 454).

IV. Paganism within the Framework of Christianity

Crom Cruach’s role in illuminating the Book of Kells paradoxically marks the pagan participation in the production of a Christian framework within which the repressed pagan voice can only surface in the discourse of Christianity. If leaving the city of Kells and entering the forest where Aisling dwells signifies the first layer of Brendan’s border-crossing, then defeating Crom Cruach and acquiring his eye represents the second layer, subtler but more radical in its alternation of the significance of the Christian manuscript.

The concept of border-crossing is clearly shown in the scene in which Brendan escapes from his room and steps into Crom Cruach’s den to win his eye. Upon realizing that Brendan keeps concentrating on the book’s production and fails to fulfill his duty, namely building the wall, Cellach separates him from Brother Aidan and imprisons him. At night,

Aisling sets Brendan free by transforming Brother Aidan's cat Pangur Ban into a spirit capable of sliding into Cellach's bedroom and stealing the key. In the meanwhile, Aisling sings to Pangur Ban in a combination of English and Irish: "You must go where I cannot, / Pangur Ban Pangur Ban / There is nothing in this life but mist, / And we will only be alive, / for a short while" (*The Secret* 46:35-48:00).¹⁸ Representing the naïve nature, Aisling bespeaks her inability to go beyond; nonetheless, her song indicates others' potential for reaching "where she cannot."

On the one hand, Aisling's song foretells the movement of Brendan, who steps beyond the wall of Kells, enters the place of the unknown, and brings back the monster's crystal eye, which enables him and, subsequently, the Christian people, to perceive the world from the perspective of the pagan other. On the other hand, the song points to the potential of Crom Cruach, who, even though defeated by Christianity, enables the Irish pagan culture to surface and revive by functioning as a lens in the process of artistic creation.

Crom Cruach's potential to preserve the trace of the Irish pagan tradition subtly echoes the motif of "revival" in Aisling's song. Moore addresses this theme by referring to "the Celtic revival poems," which, he explains, "are called aisling poems—because 'aisling' means dream or vision in Gaelic" (qtd. in Puchko). In fact, Aisling, who has sacrificed herself for Brendan when they try to enter Crom Cruach's den, does reappear in later scenes. Her return reflects the message of revival in the aisling poems and invites the audience to think twice over Crom Cruach's "death."

The connotation of revival in Aisling's song is more clearly illustrated in the battle scene. With Aisling's help and sacrifice, Brendan finally enters Crom Cruach's cave, where he perceives Crom Cruach's transparent and gigantic serpentine body flowing in darkness. Reminiscent of the typical incarnation of evil in the Christian tradition, namely the serpent who tempts Eve into eating the fruit of knowledge and results in the fall of humankind, the portrayal of Crom Cruach can easily incur a negative feeling in the audience's mind. Bravely confronting the monster, whom Moore refers to as the symbol of "Brendan's fears" (qtd. in Solomon), Brendan traps Crom Cruach within a painted boundary with his pen and pulls out his eye. The monster, blinded and unable to locate his enemy, therefore accidentally devours his own tail, resulting in self-destruction. At the superficial level, this episode envisions the scene of Christian victory over paganism. As a monk and a scribe of the valuable Christian gospel, Brendan outwits Crom Cruach, encloses him within Christian power, and eventually puts him (his eye) into Christian service. Brendan's victory parallels that of St. Patrick, who defeated Crom Cruach and ended his worship more than three centuries before Brendan's time.¹⁹ Moore admits that he takes inspiration from the story

¹⁸ The translation is taken from "Aisling Song," *The Secret of Kells Wiki*.

¹⁹ McCaffrey and Eaton note that "in 432 Patrick arrived back in Ireland to convert the people to Christianity" (102). While their comments on the tolerant attitude of St. Patrick, who "did not try to stamp out the earlier rituals but rather cleverly blended them with Christian theology" (102), seemingly contradict Davies and

about “St. Patrick defeating Crom” (qtd. in Solomon). Yet, his following words make the meaning of the battle scene ambiguous. Moore adds, “Prior to St. Patrick, Crom was defeated by the sun god, Lugh. So, in the pagan myth and the Christian parallel, we had the theme of turning darkness into light, as in the line from the poem” (qtd. in Solomon). Seemingly leading to a binary opposition between good and evil, light and darkness, the relationship between Crom and Lugh in Irish folklore is, in fact, intricate, and this intricacy sheds a different light on Crom’s supposed death and gives the battle scene a second level of meaning.

The tale about Crom Cruach has multiple versions. Bonwick identifies him as the sun god in pre-Christian Irish mythology. Daragh Smyth, on the other hand, explains that Crom Cruach was a corn god whose festival, known as Domhnach Chroim Duibh, “is held in many places throughout Ireland on the last Sunday in July or the first Sunday in August” to celebrate his overthrow by St. Patrick (40). In a later section of his book, Smyth mentions another pre-Christian Irish god called Lug, a harvest god whose festival, known as Lughnasa, is held within the same period as that of Crom Cruach (104). Lug was also related to the image of the sun, and his festival was regarded as “the sun god’s day” (Smyth 105). Carmel McCaffrey and Leo Eaton refer to the same god as Lugh and his festival Lúnasa, noting that he is “both the protector of the harvest and the provider of a good time” (84). While Smyth, McCaffrey, and Eaton do not associate Crom Cruach with Lug/Lugh despite their many similarities, Seamus MacGabhann draws the connection by explaining that “Domhnach Chrom Dubh” or “Crom Dubh Sunday” is just one of the dozens of names of the festival of Lughnasa in Irish-speaking areas (220). He further illustrates how Irish folklore changes with the process of Ireland’s Christianization: “the role of Lugh . . . is given to St. Patrick, and Balor [the older sun god and fertility god slain by Lugh] . . . is domesticated in the folklore as Crom Dubh, the pagan whose power in the land is overthrown by the saint” (221). These studies reveal that Crom Cruach not only functions as a hallmark of Christian victory over paganism but is a complicated figure whose existence is closely intertwined with other pagan gods in Irish tradition. His name sometimes replaces the name of Lugh, even if Lugh defeats him in some versions of the Irish folklore. Rather than fixing Crom Cruach on the position of evil, darkness, failure, or death, the changing folklore testifies to the capacity of the pagan sun god to survive and thrive, in the name of Crom Cruach or other names. *The Secret of Kells* also reflects the intricate relationship between the darkness Crom Cruach seemingly represents and the notion of light. While exiled and living in a deserted, dark space on the margin of civilization, Crom Cruach has crystal eyes that mirror

Lowry-Corry’s account that many pagan divinities were “exorcised or constrained to Christian service” during Irish Christianization (101), these descriptions are not contradictory. Even if St. Patrick himself was willing to bring together pagan tradition and Christianity and only artfully guided the pagan Irish to his religion, it would be unlikely that Christianity at large was tolerant of paganism or that paganism did not suffer during the process of Christianization.

the sun's image, and the pillars in front of his den are also carved with sun totems. Both of these depictions point to the entanglement of light and darkness, which continuously counteracts and generates each other.

Foregrounding Brendan's victory, the film indeed subtly reveals Crom Cruach's struggle against Christian control and his subsequent rebirth in arts. Although Crom Cruach's look implies his subjection to the Christian discourse, his serpentine appearance also resembles the ribbon patterns, interlaces, and snake ornaments in the Book of Kells, the decorations of which strikingly parallel the jewelry and metalwork of pagan traditions (Meehan 17-20). Moreover, the image of a serpent eating its own tail recalls the icon of Ouroboros, a pagan symbol of life, infinity, and eternity. Deriving from the Greek word *οὐροβόρος*, meaning "tail-devourer" or "tail-eater," the Ouroboros has been found in many ancient cultures. According to Carlos Eire, the Ouroboros is typically delineated as "a serpent or dragon devouring its own tail and forming a circle," and it is often interpreted as "a symbol of eternity and infinity, especially of a cyclical nature: creation out of destruction, life out of death, eternal renewal and destruction" (29). Associated with the sun, agriculture, and fertility in the Celtic folklore but used as a symbol of darkness in the film, Crom Cruach manifests the entanglement of life and death, creation and destruction, and is, therefore, an intricate icon pointing to the "infinity" and "cyclical nature" of the Ouroboros.

The double role of Crom Cruach as an incarnation of evil and darkness in the Christian discourse and a symbol of the sun in the pagan tradition manifests the struggle of paganism against Christian codification, showing that although traditional pagan belief is domesticated and converted into Christian uses, it still strives for the assertion of its voice. While symbolically confined to the Christian world and physically entrapped within the boundary drawn by Brendan, Crom Cruach manages to undermine the imposed limitation and unsettle it from within.

The film's appropriation of the image of Ouroboros in depicting Crom Cruach suggests a new possibility of interpreting the pagan god/monster, his influence on the Book of Kells, and his relationship to the survival of Christian civilization under the threat of the imminent Viking forces. Apart from enabling a more optimistic reading of Crom Cruach, the motifs of infinity, revival, and creation also shed a different light on Brendan's painting. The creative renewal is manifested firstly in Crom Cruach's rebirth in the Christian work and secondly in the creative process of Brendan's painting. Resembling Crom Cruach's serpent-like shape and the sun figure he represents, the spirals and cyclic patterns on the parchment demonstrate the return of the pagan deity. Moreover, the depiction of many of the film's background scenes, which look similar to the parchment, also transforms the world into a manuscript, and Crom Cruach, transferring from one manuscript to another, thus keeps reappearing in various texts that survive through the ages. The creative force of the pagan

deity influences and inspires Brendan’s work, for Crom Cruach’s eye becomes a magnifying glass through which Brendan looks into his work and the world in greater detail.

The eye as a lens enables Brendan to see through the constituted boundary—either the physical wall or the rigid, inflexible mentality—and perceive the world from a different perspective. This experience of “seeing through the established border” is facilitated by the literal act of seeing through the eye of the marginalized and silenced pagan deity. While the wall established by Cellach represents the will to distinguish Christians from pagans and to consolidate a field of security wherein stable civilization and identity could be maintained, the complicated role played by the “Eye of Crom” declares the impossibility of this attempt. The crystal lens makes the Book of Kells both a witness to Crom Cruach’s suffering and a gift of hope that can only be achieved via the pagan deity’s eye.

The process of illuminating the book thus becomes a manifesto of the Christian subject’s lack in its encounter with the other/Other. The term “lack” does not imply that Brendan is a subject lacking a specific ability or agency. Instead, it conforms to Lacan’s explanation of the subject’s lack in the field of the Other and in the language itself. Lacan uses the pronoun “I,” a signifier of the subject, to explain the idea: “it designates the enunciating subject, but does not signify him” (*Écrits* 677). The split between the uttered “I,” namely the subject appearing in language, and the enunciating subject who speaks the word suggests that signifiers can never completely encompass the subject they signify. Constituting himself using the pre-existing language of the Other, the subject thus “function[s] only as a lack” (*Écrits* 683). Lacan writes, “one cannot even speak of a code without it already being the Other’s code” (*Écrits* 683). In *The Secret of Kells*, the book’s completion propels the formation of a collective Christian identity, but the Christian subject is constantly driven by lack and anxiety because its constitution is, and can only be, enunciated using the other’s code, namely the lens made of Crom Cruach’s eye. Brendan feels the lack when under the gaze of the Other, and his perspective, mentally and physically modified by the pagan other, testifies to the intimate and entangled relationship between Christianity and its others.

The concept of perceiving the world by way of the Other, or the other’s eye, echoes Mignolo’s account of the exteriority, which indicates “the outside invented in the process of creating the identity of the inside, that is Christian Europe” (*The Darker Side* 20). The border epistemology challenges the dominant ideological framework and suggests a route of escape from the hegemonic perspective. A threshold being embodying “the languages and categories of thought negated by and expelled from the house of imperial knowledge” (Mignolo, *The Darker Side* 20)—the term “imperial knowledge” in the context of the film may parallel Christianity—Crom Cruach offers Brendan a new way of perceiving the broader cosmos.²⁰

²⁰ The appropriation of Mignolo’s idea set in the modern, colonial context is not to equate Christianization

The film reveals the correlation between Christianity and paganism after Brendan takes Crom Cruach's eye. The turbulence experienced by Christian people during the Viking raids concurs with the experience Irish pagans underwent in an earlier period, and this parallel makes the word "suffering," a term used by Aisling to describe the place of Crom Cruach, intriguing. It may hint at the suffering of the Celtic pagan culture, which was marginalized, negated, or expelled by the expanding Christian force, but it simultaneously refers to that of Christian civilization shattered and diminished by the Vikings. Brendan's acquisition of the "Eye of Crom" indicates his inheritance from Crom Cruach, or from the Irish pagan tradition, the power of revival and the creative force surviving destruction. Crom Cruach's rebirth in the Christian manuscript suggests an artful adaptation into the world of others and a challenge to the purity of Christianity. Brendan's painting demonstrates a similar manner of survival. As Brother Aidan suggests, Christianity survives not by means of the construction of the wall but by means of the completion of the Book of Kells, which represents the hope of Christianity in the age of darkness. Yet, with the participation of the pagan nature during its production and completion, the Book of Kells turns out neither a work of pure Christianity nor a work by which people, borrowing Cellach's words, "will come to trust the strength of the Christian faith" (*The Secret* 14:18-14:21). Instead, the book demonstrates the Christian subject's border-crossing and is thus a testament to the surviving power of Irish pagan tradition.

The redefinition of the Book of Kells correlates to a broader sense of border-crossing at the end of the film, which reveals an open attitude to a future consonant with Aisling's song, "You must go where I cannot." The idea of stepping beyond the established boundary is visually presented through Brendan's physical movement in the triptych after he leaves the city of Kells. The triptych has been a popular form of panel painting since the medieval period, and it was commonly used to create altars in churches. It refers either to a single picture divided into three parts or three continuous images integrated into one unit, usually with the one in the middle being the largest and showing the central theme. *The Secret of Kells* adapts this form of art in several scenarios to show the movement of characters. For instance, the technique is used near the film's beginning to present Brendan's movement from the scriptorium to the central region of Kells and finally to Cellach's tower. In the scene of the Viking raid, the film uses a similar mode of expression to delineate the continuous images of the warrior's actions and the misery caused by their atrocities. Rather than conveying moral lessons, the film appropriates the art of triptychs to foster a medieval atmosphere, emphasize the shift of action and time, and create a boundary in order to break it. The visible frame of the triptych reminisces the border image but transforms its meaning

with colonization or to conclude that Christianity colonized pagan Celtic religion; instead, my article argues that the pagan monster's role in illuminating the Book of Kells, an Irish national treasure and a significant masterpiece of early Christian art, offers a perspective different from the Christian point of view and helps renegotiate Irish national and religious identity in a modern cosmopolitan world.

from a line of separation or differentiation to a zone of contact. The portrayal of Brendan’s journey after he leaves the city of Kells vividly manifests this idea. His travel is depicted as three juxtaposed natural landscapes framed by an arch-like border decorated with spiral patterns that resemble the leaves and trees in the forest. Brendan and Brother Aidan literally move from one picture to another in the triptych to illustrate geographical and temporal shifts. The film does not present three static paintings and asks the audience to “imagine” their connection; instead, it has the protagonist walk from one picture to another to show the motion. By doing so, it visualizes the very idea of border-crossing. As Brendan gradually completes the Book of Kells during his journey, his physical movement coincides with the metaphor of stepping beyond, which the “Eye of Crom” facilitates.

V. Conclusion

Beginning with the construction of the city wall and ending with the concept of stepping beyond, *The Secret of Kells* directs its audience to a heterogeneous and cosmopolitan world by retelling an ancient story of the Book of Kells. The film’s portrayal of the partly-imagined history of pre-modern Ireland sheds light on the post-colonial Irish society. Spartz suggests that the film shows a “form of resilience,” namely “a mode of moving through change, not wholly affected yet not entirely immune, and coming through it as wiser, stronger, and more aware” (186). Crom Cruach’s participation in the production of the Book of Kells challenges the work’s purity, and his eye, functioning both as a desired object and as a gaze haunting the sacred work and its illuminator, constantly forces viewers to reconsider the relation between Christianity and pagan beliefs. Extending from O’Brien’s interpretation of *The Secret of Kells* as “a hybrid space that borrows elements from myriad sources” (38), my study emphasizes the role of Crom Cruach in (re-)shaping the Christian identity. The monster’s den as a site of exteriority not only enables viewers to read the pagan images as the “myriad sources” or the artistic decorations that enrich the Christian manuscript but, more importantly, forces them to perceive and recognize the suffering of pagan tradition during the expansion of Christianity. Border-crossing is made possible precisely through the act of seeing from the eye of the pagan god/monster, an existence at the threshold.

Despite the film’s cliché ending and its designation of the gospel book as people’s hope, which seemingly weakens the impacts of the pagan elements presented earlier, *The Secret of Kells* does not associate the work only with Christians. In the final reunion scene, Cellach confesses that the piece of painting he once wrested from Brendan is his only comfort over the years. While his words emphasize the consoling power of the gospel, the eye-like image on the parchment simultaneously reminds the audience of the eye’s original owner. In addition, the word “darkness” in the wish to “turn darkness into light” recalls the darkness

of Crom Cruach's den, of Cellach's dark room, and subsequently of the dark ages of Christianity. This connection suggests a feeling of suffering shared by the people living in the same land and an intertwining relationship between Christians and pagans. Hence, the hopeful message in the film's ending addresses not only a specific cultural, religious, or ethnic group but a diverse audience in a cosmopolitan world.

In the film, the eye of Crom Cruach is like a gaze, which functions as an *objet petit a* that causes doubts and confusion and reveals the want and lack of the Christian subject. The narrative of *The Secret of Kells* reveals neither the formation of Christian Irishness nor a new subjectivity generated through a harmonious mixture of Christianity and paganism. Instead, the work complicates the core value of identity by reimagining the Irish national treasure as a hybrid text. This hybridity addresses an intriguing possibility of understanding one's position in relation to the Other and in a broader world of multiplicity.

Works Cited

- “Aisling Song.” *The Secret of Kells Wiki*, thesecretokells.fandom.com/wiki/Aisling_Song. Accessed 15 May 2017.
- Berend, Nora. “Medievalists and the Notion of the Frontier.” *The Medieval History Journal*, vol. 2, no. 1, 1999, pp. 55-72.
- Bhabha, Homi K. “Introduction: Narrating the Nation.” *Nation and Narration*, edited by Homi K. Bhabha, Routledge, 1990, pp. 1-7.
- Bonwick, James. *Irish Druids and Old Irish Religions*. S. Low, Marston, 1894.
- Burke, Liam. “Drawing Conclusions: Irish Animation and National Cinema.” *Estudios Irlandeses*, no. 4, 2009, www.estudiosirlandeses.org/reviews/drawing-conclusions-irish-animation-and-national-cinema/. Accessed 15 May 2017.
- Burt, Richard. “Writing the Endings of Cinema: Saving Film Authorship in the Cinematic Paratexts of *Prospero’s Books*, Taymor’s *The Tempest* and *The Secret of Kells*.” *The Writer on Film: Screening Literary Authorship*, edited by Judith Buchanan, Palgrave Macmillan, 2013, pp. 178-92.
- Cirker, Blanche, editor. *The Book of Kells: Selected Plates in Full Color*, Dover Publications, 1982.
- Cohen, Jeffrey Jerome. “Monster Culture (Seven Theses).” *Monster Theory: Reading Culture*. U of Minnesota P, 1996, pp. 3-25.
- . *Of Giants: Sex, Monsters, and the Middle Ages*. U of Minnesota P, 1999.
- . “The Promise of Monsters.” *The Ashgate Research Companion to Monsters and the Monstrous*, edited by Asa Simon Mittman and Peter J. Dendle, Ashgate, 2012, pp. 449-64.
- Davies, O., and D. Lowry-Corry. “Killinagh Church and Crom Cruaich.” *Ulster Journal of Archaeology*, vol. 2, 1939, pp. 98-104.
- Eire, Carlos. *A Very Brief History of Eternity*. Princeton UP, 2011.
- Farr, Carol. *The Book of Kells: Its Function and Audience*. British Library, 1997.
- Harding, Dennis W. *The Archaeology of Celtic Art*. Routledge, 2007.
- Lacan, Jacques. *Écrits: The First Complete Edition in English*. WW Norton & Company, 2006.
- . *The Seminar of Jacques Lacan: The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, edited by Jacques-Alain Miller, translated by Alan Sheridan, Norton, 1978.
- MacCulloch, J. A. *The Religion of the Ancient Celts*, Project Gutenberg, 2005.
- MacGabhann, Seamus. “Landmarks of the People: Meath and Cavan Places Prominent in Lughnasa Mythology and Folklore.” *Ríocht Na Midhe*, vol. 11, 2000, pp. 219-39.
- McCaffrey, Carmel, and Leo Eaton. *In Search of Ancient Ireland: The Origins of the Irish from Neolithic Times to the Coming of the English*. New Amsterdam Books, 2002.

- Meehan, Bernard. *The Book of Kells: An Illustrated Introduction to the Manuscript in Trinity College, Dublin*. Thames and Hudson, 1994.
- Megaw, Ruth, and Vincent Megaw. *Celtic Art from Its Beginnings to the Book of Kells*. Thames and Hudson, 2001.
- Mignolo, Walter D. "Geopolitics of Sensing and Knowing: On (De)coloniality, Border Thinking and Epistemic Disobedience." *Postcolonial Studies*, vol. 14, no. 3, 2011, pp. 273-83.
- . *The Darker Side of Western Modernity: Global Futures, Decolonial Options*. Duke UP, 2011.
- . "The Many Faces of Cosmo-polis: Border Thinking and Critical Cosmopolitanism." *Public Culture*, vol. 12, no. 3, 2000, pp. 721-48.
- Naum, Magdalena. "Re-emerging Frontiers: Postcolonial Theory and Historical Archaeology of the Borderlands." *Journal of Archaeological Method and Theory*, vol. 17, no. 2, 2010, pp. 101-31.
- O'Brien, Maria. "The Secret of Kells (2009), a Film for a Post Celtic Tiger Ireland?" *Animation Studies*, vol. 6, 2011, pp. 34-39.
- O'Toole, Fintan. *A History of Ireland in 100 Objects*. Royal Irish Academy, 2013.
- Puchko, Kristy. "[Interview] Tomm Moore Talks 'The Secret of Kells.'" *The Film Stage*, 5 Oct. 2010, thefilmstage.com/interview-tomm-moore-talks-the-secret-of-kells/. Accessed 10 May 2022.
- Quinet, Antonio. "The Gaze as an Object." *Reading Seminar XI: Lacan's Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, edited by Richard Feldstein, Bruce Fink, and Maire Jaanus. State U of New York P, 1995, pp. 139-47.
- Ramey, Lynn. "Immediacy, Hypermediacy, and New Media in *The Secret of Kells* (Moore 2009)." *Medieval Perspectives*, vol. 29, 2014, pp. 109-19.
- Ryzik, Melena. "An Indie Takes on Animation's Big Boys." *The New York Times*, 3 Mar. 2010, www.nytimes.com/2010/03/03/movies/awardsseason/03kells.html. Accessed 15 May 2017.
- Scott, A. O. "Outside the Abbey's Fortified Walls: A World of Fairy Girls and Beasts." *The New York Times*, 3 May 2010, www.nytimes.com/2010/03/05/movies/05secret.html. Accessed 2 June 2017.
- Simms, George Otto. *Exploring the Book of Kells*. O'Brien Press, 1988.
- Smyth, Daragh. *A Guide to Irish Mythology*. Irish Academic Press, 1996.
- Solomon, Charles. "Ancient Book Inspires Classic Animation of 'The Secret of Kells.'" *Los Angeles Times*, 31 Mar. 2010. www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2010-mar-31-la-et-kells31-2010mar31-story.html. Accessed 24 Feb. 2023.
- Spartz, James T. "The Secret of Kells: Through a Forest of Darkness and Light." *Resilience: A Journal of the Environmental Humanities*, vol. 2, no. 3, 2015, pp. 184-88.

State, Paul F. *A Brief History of Ireland*. Facts On File, 2009.

The Secret of Kells. Directed by Tomm Moore and co-directed by Nora Twomey, Cartoon Saloon, 2009.

“*The Secret of Kells*: Awards.” *IMDb*, www.imdb.com/title/tt0485601/awards/?ref_=tt_awd. Accessed 7 May 2023.

Wells, Paul. *Animation: Genre and Authorship*. Wallflower Press, 2002.

《國立彰化師範大學文學院學報》徵稿啟示

（全年徵稿，隨到隨審）

每年5月、11月出刊

- 一、《國立彰化師範大學文學院學報》（以下簡稱「本學報」）是由國立彰化師範大學文學院負責發行之學術期刊，本刊以英語、國文、地理（及休閒、觀光遊憩）、美術（暨藝術教育）、兒童英語、翻譯（口、筆譯）、台灣文學、歷史研究領域為主之學術專刊，每半年發行一次（預訂每年五、十一月出版），歡迎學術研究人員投稿。來稿刊出前，均經過正式之雙審查程序。
- 二、本學報除公開徵稿外，為拓展本刊視野，豐富其內容，增進其學術能量，得於不違背本學報宗旨之前提下，經總編輯（由文院長擔任）推薦，經編輯委員會審定後成為特邀稿。
- 三、稿件得以英文或中文撰寫，並遵循APA或MLA最新版格式，本學報內容可能用於非商業性之複製。
- 四、稿件字數中文以不超過25,000為原則，英文以不超過15,000為原則；中文摘要約600字，英文摘要約350字，均請由左至右橫排。
- 五、稿件版面以A4紙張，註明頁碼，一律採電腦打字，並請用Word軟體編輯（12號字，中文字體以新細明體，英文字體以Times New Roman，1倍行高，中文標點符號用全形，英文標點符號用半形，邊界採用Word預設格式）。
- 六、來稿一律請附：中英文篇名、摘要、關鍵詞及投稿者基本資料表。
- 七、本學報可採線上審查系統或紙本方式投稿，方法如下：
 - （一）**線上審查系統投稿**：請至本學報線上投稿系統
<http://www.journals.com.tw/ncuearts/contents/index.jsp>之「線上投稿」註冊個人帳號，並依系統指示進行投稿，無須另行繳交紙本稿件及電子郵件電子檔。
 - （二）**紙本投稿**：請將稿件電子檔以附件檔案形式電子郵件至
ncuecollegeofarts2023@gmail.com（收件人：張為舜先生），另將稿件影印三份，連同其他文件掛號交寄至「50007彰化市進德路1號 國立彰化師範大學文學院」。
- 八、本學報稿件審查採匿名雙審制，文稿中請避免出現作者相關資訊，編輯委員會斟酌審稿員意見及建議後做最後決議，未獲採用者則致函通知，恕不退稿。
- 九、投稿若經刊載，稿件著作權歸屬本學報，本學報亦有刪改權，投稿時需繳交「投稿授

權聲明書」。本學報不接受已刊登之文章，如發生抄襲、侵犯著作權而引起糾紛，一切法律問題由投稿者自行負責。

十、刊載方式：

1. 每期刊載數量依編輯委員會商議，投稿者稿件若當期未刊載，則依序近期刊載。
2. 來稿經審查通過後或再次審查中，作者不得要求撤稿，若撤銷，次兩期內不接受其投稿。

十一、來稿刊出後，將致贈投稿者五份抽印本及當期學報一本，並附上該論文PDF電子檔，不另支稿酬。簽署著作權授權書的稿件刊登者，其文章將收錄於國立彰化師範大學圖書館機構典藏系統、國家圖書館、南華大學彰雲嘉無盡藏學術期刊資料庫、文化部、華藝數位電子期刊資料庫、凌網科技數位出版品營運平台、遠流／智慧藏學習科技股份有限公司。

國立彰化師範大學 文學院

地址: 50007 彰化市進德路1號

電話: (04)723-2105 分機 2022 / 2023 傳真: (04)721-1221

電子郵件信箱: ncuecollegeofarts2023@gmail.com

《國立彰化師範大學文學院學報》第 28 期專題徵稿

徵稿主題：

圖像書寫與史觀敘事

從當代文化的角度來探討圖像書寫策略或帶有史觀視野的理論趨勢，透過圖像分析或史觀座標提供我們對於過去、現在、未來的新知識體系與想像架構。本專題徵稿方向，試圖關切今日全球化的跨文化與跨領域浪潮下，藝術史、文化研究、美學、文學、歷史學與地理學將如何展開新時代的圖像觀視與時空敘事？如何在多重學科相互交織的研究網絡中譜寫出關於我們時代的精神景觀？

徵稿對象：不限學門，開放各領域之專家學者。

本專題截稿時間：2023 年 6 月 30 日以前。

徵稿說明：

除本專題針對主題性論文徵稿之外，原全年開放性徵稿部分仍舊維持，稿件隨到隨審。歡迎各領域學者踴躍賜稿！

國立彰化師範大學文學院學報

第廿七期

發行人：陳明飛

總編輯：黃聖慧

主編：王曼萍

出版機關：國立彰化師範大學文學院

出版日期：2023 年五月初版一刷

創刊年月：2002 年 11 月

刊期頻率：半年刊

其他類型版本說明：本刊同時登載於國立彰化師範大學文學院
網站，網址為 <https://ncuearts.ncue.edu.tw/>

展售處：

五南文化廣場 (04) 2437-8010

臺中市北屯區軍福七路 600 號

國家書店 (02) 25180207-22

桃園縣中壢市合圳北路二段 95 巷 190 之 1 號(國家書店流中心)

印刷：--

地址：500 彰化縣彰化市進德路 1 號

定價：NT\$500

書號：0031352 ISSN：2305-9761 GPN：2009106008

版權所有 翻印必究

NCUE Journal of Humanities

Volume 27, May 2023

Issued by College of Arts, National Changhua University of Education Edited
by Hui-shuang Su

No.110, Zhuhe Rd., Changhua City, Changhua County 50075, Taiwan