

我的名字是紅：

跨文化的伊斯蘭文化主體

楊采樺/ Tsai-hua Yang
陸軍專科學校 講師
The Army Academy

【摘要】

在全球化的風潮下，文學作品已跨出了國家文學或比較文學的範疇，其挾帶的文化力量更跨越並模糊了原本的自身的文化疆界。本文以世界文學的角度分析帕慕克的作品“我的名字是紅”，探討藝術作品作為文化主體(the cultural subject)在面對他國文化主體(the cultural other)所產生的衝突，其來源看似是來自於兩個不同文化主體的差異，其實是根源自文化主體內在之矛盾，且藉由和他國文化的碰撞演譯出如拉岡所言之鏡像時期之自我建構；換言之，在全球化之下和他國文化交流的經驗實為文化主體凝望鏡中自我之過程。

【關鍵詞】

全球化、世界文學、文化主體、文化客體、伊斯蘭、基督教、文藝復興、互為主體、鏡像時期、人本主義

【Abstract】

This paper will examine Orhan Pamuk's novel, *My Name is Red*, from the perspective of “world literature.” With the rise of globalization, world literature takes the place of national literature and comparative literature, becoming a new trend in the literary field. What world literature deals with is culture problems in the face of other cultures. The problems come from the conflict of difference between different cultures. Most importantly, the problems also mirror the ironies inside the cultural subject itself. When it gazes a cultural other, what it sees is indeed the reflection of itself. The ambiguous self-other relationship can be examined by Lacan's theory of the Mirror Stage. The novel describes the cultural conflict between two groups of Turkish miniaturists. One group insists on following their traditional painting skill but the other one demands to transform it to the Western perspective style. Their strife is caused by the cultural difference between Turkey, or the Islam, and Europe, or the Christianity. However, I argue that their conflict also reflects the irony within the Islamic culture itself. The individualism legitimated by Christianity is prohibited in the Islamic country. However, Renaissance humanism still seduces and sways the Islamic community. Therefore, world literature indeed opens up a new literary field more “inter-culturally” and, at the same time, “inner-culturally.” It helps the cultural subject redefine and reexamine itself by collision with other cultures.

【Keywords】

globalization, world literature, cultural subject, cultural object, Islam, Christianity, renaissance, inter-subjectivity, mirror stage, humanism

Franco Moretti announces that “national literature doesn’t mean much: the age of world literature is beginning” (54). Furthermore, he points out that unlike comparative literature whose center lies in hegemonic Western Europe, world literature has a “cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country. (54)” In dealing with the new literary field, we have to grasp an important idea. The thing that changes is not the objects within the field only but the *borders* that confine it. Therefore, he states that the *categories* have to be changed in reading world literature. He agrees with Max Weber’s¹ point of view: ‘it is not the “actual” interconnection of “things”’, or the fast and frequent exchange of books only; it is “the conceptual interconnection of problems which define the scope of the various sciences’ (55).

Weber’s statement also helps me to define world literature as a reservoir which collects not only concepts from different countries and cultures but, as a result, *problems* of the culture in collision with the other one. In confrontation between the cultures come the problems. Should people give up their tradition catching up with the new trend? Or should they stick to their original custom and belief regardless of the cultural stranger? Obviously, these two questions are not the proper ways in thinking about the problems which are far more complicated. For every single culture, whether it is western or not, can be seen as “a cultural *subject*” along with a unique organic system that has interactive relationships with each small part as a whole. When Raymond Williams analyzed “culture” as a key concept in the development of human society, he mentioned Herder’s interpretation of “culture” in *Ideas on the Philosophy of the History of Mankind* (1784-91). Instead of reducing the development of humanity to a single principle, such as “reason” or “European civilization”, Herder argued, “to speak of ‘cultures’ rather than ‘culture’, so as to acknowledge variability, and within any culture to recognize the complexity and variability of its shaping forces. (17)” Due to the multiple and complex shaping forces of every culture guarantees every culture’s subjectivity and individuality, so we can assume every culture as “a cultural subject”.

The encounter of the cultural subject with another one must cause problems which not only affect one single part of its organic system but change the total relationships among its every inner part. Their borders contact and, at the same time, conflict; what changes are not their small parts that touch, but the whole shape of their territories. That is, in the context of world literature,

¹ Max Weber, “Objectivity in Social Science and Social Policy, 1904, in *The Methodology of the Social Sciences*, New York 1949, p. 68.

the encounter of the other culture causes cultural conflicts with the invaded culture power and, most importantly, the transformation of the cultural subject itself. Many theories tend to observe the phenomenon as a competition between two cultures. As two cultures contact with the rise of the world literary market, the exotic culture causes culture shocks and even may challenge the local cultural subject. However, I doubt if the power to shape the cultural subject simply comes from the other culture. My question can be asked in another way. When the cultural subject meets with the cultural other, can its gaze on the other be a parallel of the gaze in the Lacan's mirror stage? I do believe these conflicts bring the cultural subject a chance to mirror the problems from within because the other culture can reflect the image of the cultural subject that sometimes rmisecognizes the other to be itself. In the age of World Literature, global circulation of literary works offers lots of chances to help the cultural subject look closely at itself and make it set a new borderline and reshape itself through the copies from the other countries.

Orhan Pamuk speaks with authority about the tension and turbulence between the Islam and Western in his novel, *My Name is Red*. This novel has been translated into twenty-four languages and won the IMPAC Dublin Award in 2003. Nevertheless, it seems that not much academic interest is paid to the book so far and only few scholars research this novel in terms of aesthetics. For example, the Turkish scholar, Feride Cicekoglu, focuses on the different aesthetic qualities between theses two cultures in her article: A Pedagogy of Two ways of Seeing: A Confrontation of "Word and Image" in *My Name is Red*.² I do agree that the confrontation between the East and West is the important theme of the novel. Nevertheless, the relation between the cultural subject and other is far more complex. The aim of this paper is not only to analyze the problems of Turkish cultural subject in the face of the Western culture in Pamuk's novel, *My Name is Red*. At the same time, through the encounter of the other culture, the cultural subject can see its own image reflected on the other culture. When the foreign culture invades, the conflicts will expose the paradox existing in the cultural subject itself. In other words, the other culture's role is quite ambiguous in their confrontation. It is like an enemy to invade the territory of the cultural subject; but on the other hand, it lets the cultural subject have a close gaze of itself and functions like a mirror image of the cultural subject.

1. The Conflicts between Two Modes of Knowledge

2 Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol.37, No.3, Fall 2003.

According to Michel Foucault's theory of "archaeology of knowledge," history develops in circular forms instead of in linear chronological process. In fact, these circular forms can be explained as modes of knowledge whose enclosed systems were ruptured and then opened; but now, they are about to be destroyed when "knowledge takes up residence in a new space" (217). Therefore, Foucault orders history in a brand-new way. For him, history is not conditioned by continuity of time sequence but by various modes of knowledge or different kinds of space where knowledge resides. History is regarded as a kind of spatial concept because knowledge of form or boundary differs and history changes from one age to another. In *My Name is Red*, Pamuk records Turkish history in the sixteenth century. In reading the novel, Foucault's theory offers an appropriate approach to analyze the two different modes of knowledge from Turkey and the Western World and the conflicts between them.

The Ottoman sultan, Mehmet II, defeated the Byzantine Empire and occupied Istanbul in 1453. Gradually the Ottoman Turks established a vast Turkish sultanate in southwest Asia, northeast Africa, and southeast Europe. Istanbul can be called a global and international city because of its geographical position as a bridge between the Black Sea and the Mediterranean Sea. On the other hand, it is also a connection among three continents of Europe, Asia, and Middle East. In such a global city, we can clearly find the encounter of different modes of knowledge and the conflict between them. Hence, it is meaningful that Pamuk sets the scene of *My Name is Red* in Istanbul and describes the conflict between two groups of Turkish miniaturists. Besides, the historical background also implies the cause of the conflict between them. With the rise of Renaissance, the Western painters from France, Venice, and Persia started to paint the world in a new style— combining new subject matters with the perspective technique. Some Turkish miniaturists want to follow those Western painters. However, the traditional ones insist that they should reserve the painting skills inheriting from their masters.

Enishte Effendi, a Turkish master, leads the miniaturists to work for a controversial project, which is a portrait of their Sultan in the Frankish style. This project causes a serious problem. The Sultan desires his illumination to be drawn but he hesitates to do so at the same time. In Turkey, a portrait cannot exist individually. Allah should be put in the center of the page, and thereby the world; and at the same time, He also cannot be depicted in the human form. According to the Islam doctrines, visual images or portraits of Allah are not allowed to exist because such artistic portraits will lead to idolatry and are disdained. Allah is, in fact, incorporeal, so it is impossible to make a two- or three- dimensional portrait of Him. Thus, it is not legitimate

to hang and worship His portrait on the wall. As a result, in the Sultan's point of view, making a portrait of him without a story is to violate such aniconism; but putting his portrait in a book is not so blasphemous. Finally he patrons the master Enishte to make a book with his portrait in the Frankish style for him.

Olive is one of the miniatures who take part in the Sultan's book. For the reason of his pride, in stead of putting the Sultan in the center of the picture/world, he situates his own portrait there in the Frankish style. He feels extremely excited because this lets him be "in the center of everything, like a sultan or a king, and at the same time, *myself*" (398). The ecstasy of being a distinctive man is delivered through a portrait of his own image. Yet, his profane behavior to desire to be as important as Allah is not forgiven in the Muslim country. Only in the Western countries, the uniqueness and distinctiveness of the man is promoted by the European humanists in the Renaissance. The Italian philosopher, Giovanni Pico Della Mirandola writes an article called "The Dignity of Man"³ to glorify the man's individuality which is permitted by Christian God:

He (God) received man, therefore, as a creature of undetermined nature, and placing him in the middle of the universe, said this to him: "Neither an established place, nor a form belonging to you alone, nor any special function have We given to you, O Adam, and for this reason, that you may have and possess, according to your desire and judgment, whatever place, whatever form, and whatever functions you shall desire (476).

Therefore, it is God that places man in the center of the world according this Christian philosopher's statements. It is also God that leaves the man "undetermined," releasing the freedom to create himself. What is illegitimate for a Muslim is, on the contrary, legitimate for a Christian.

It is the ambitious master who persuades the Sultan to be portrayed in the Frankish style. The artist who uses the Frankish style tends to depict "novel" subject matters that have never

³ *The Portable Renaissance Reader*. Ed. By James and Bruce and Mary Martin McLaughlin. New York: Penguin Books, 1977.

been seen in the traditional masters' works. The ability to create new things never belongs to human beings. Only, Allah, the Creator of the world, possesses this unique power. If a human wants to innovate, he actually commits a religious sin. That is why Enishte is murdered violently by one of his miniaturist, Olive. He hates Enishte, who involves him in such a sinful scheme. After making such sinful illustrations that rebel against his faith, he talked to Enishte:

On judgment Day, the idol maker will be asked to bring the images they've created to life, since...in the Glorious Koran, "creator" is one of the attributes of Allah. It is Allah who is creative, who brings that which is not into existence, who gives life to the lifeless. No one ought to compete with him. The greatest of sins is committed by painters who presume to do what He does, who claim to be as creative as He (160)

For a Muslim, Allah is the only one creator of everything in the world. Therefore, to paint the new subject matters in the perspective skill is blasphemy. However, for a Christian like Leonardo Da Vinci, to depict the natural world with the perspective skill is totally legitimate. When a painter makes a subtle invention of the nature of all forms, seas, plants, animals, and flowers which are surrounded by "shade and light;" this is "true knowledge and legitimate issue of nature" (532). According to a Christian painter's viewpoint, painting is born of nature and to speak it correctly, it is the grandchild of nature. All visible things are generated by nature, and all these children give birth to painting. Thus, he jumps into a conclusion that we may justly call painting the grandchild of nature and related to God. What is the art of painting? I think Da Vinci believes that to depict vividly the visible world created by God is like making a copy of God's creation. What the Western painter does is "imitate" the world instead of "creating" the world as Olive regards. Hence, what is thought to be blasphemous in Islam is "legitimate" in Christianity.

This confrontation between two modes of religious systems is represented repeatedly by Pamuk. Before Olive kills Enishte, they have a conversation about their "blasphemous" painting in which the perspective technique is applied to depict a new subject matter, a dog. He mentions people's gossip on their painting as open defiance of their religion to use the perspective technique to draw a mangy street dog. When a painter draws a dog very "vividly" with the perspective technique, he brings life to the lifeless. In other words, he "creates" a dog. On the other hand, he draws it in the size of the mosque which is in the background. For a Muslim, he is difficult to imagine how a dog can be a theme of the picture and as big as the holy mosque? For a

religious prayer of Allah, it is disrespect and blasphemy toward their religion even though the perspective technique can depict the real scene that is seen by our eyes. The actual size of the dog indeed is supposed to be as big as the mosque because it is farther away from the observer. Therefore, the different skills of painting are not the core of the conflicting artists. The core of their conflict between the miniaturists is actually caused by two different modes of knowledge. One is from Islam and the other is from Christianity.

The portrait painted in the Frankish style or with the perspective technique, is so real as to be adorned by the Christians but now causes the turmoil among the Turkish artists. Olive tells Enishte his anxiety after joining the sinful project to make illuminations in the Frankish style:

You've supposedly rendered the face of a mortal using the Frankish techniques, so the observer has the impression not of a painting but of reality; to such a degree that this image has the power to entice men to bow down before it, as with icons in churches. According to him, this is the Devil's work, not only because the art of perspective removes the painting from God's perspective and lowers it to the level of a street dog, but because your reliance on the methods of the Venetians as well as your mingling of our own established traditions with that infidels will strip us of our purity and reduce us to being their slaves (160).

His anxiety comes from the fact that the virtual reality made with the perspective technique challenges the ideal World of Allah's vision. Allah is the only reality and truth in the world. How can His omniscient perspective view be replaced by a human painter's trivial work? Besides, the mimic of a human's face is so close to the real one that it would easily lead to idolism. At the same time, what Olive worries about is the disappearance of the "pure" tradition.

What does Olive mean by saying "our established tradition" and "our purity?" What is the Turkish established tradition for a miniaturist, like Olive? Every miniaturist is rigidly trained for tens of years by an ornery master who leads a workshop. When the miniaturist master teaches his apprentices, he inherits the painting skills from his master. One master after another, the miniaturists of the workshop establish their own tradition. According to Islam, life or work closely relates to the religion. The workshop plays an important role in conserving the Islamic tradition and value. Thus, the apprentice inherits from his masters not only painting skills but the religious belief. If the established tradition of the painting skills the miniaturists have followed

for hundreds even thousands of years is destroyed by the perspective technique, the Islamic law and value cannot spread through the workshop and the religion starts to separate from people's work and life. As a result, Islam cannot be kept intact and "pure."

In such a religious country, aesthetic and artistic values cannot split with the Islam doctrines. As an artist, the murderer expresses his panic and confusion in the very beginning of the novel. "Does a miniaturist, ought a miniaturist, have his own personal style? A use of color, a voice all his own" (17)? For Islamic miniaturists, the answer is negative for sure. If a Turkish miniaturist makes his artistic work, he still has to follow the established tradition of his master and his religion, what he draws will be a heritage of the tradition. Under this condition, what he depicts is not his personal creation and thereby he does not have his own personal style. If one miniaturist signs his painting, he will be a liar and a pirate for the techniques and styles of the old masters and the values of Islamic culture. Moreover, if he draws a picture in a personal style without corresponding to the established tradition, his work will be criticized to be imperfect in the Islamic community.

In order to draw perfectly, practice and experience are needed for a Turkish miniaturist. Take drawing a horse for example. If they want to draw a "perfect" horse that Allah envisioned and desired, they would have to sketch it for thousands of times for tens of years. They claimed the best portrait of a horse is supposed to be drawn in the dark, because a true miniaturist would become blind working unceasingly for years. Blind masters guided their brushes from memories acquired after years of thought, contemplation and reflection. "Having seen plenty of horses, illustrated and actual, their lifetimes, they know that the last flesh-and-blood horse they see before them will only mar the perfect horse they hold in their thought. The horse that a master miniaturist has drawn tens of thousands of times eventually comes close to God's vision of a horse. (256)"

Compared with the real horse in front of him, the Turkish would prefer to imitate the horse drawn by other master miniaturists. In these masterpieces, the beauty has been exalted and each horse rendered out of his imagination has become a "model of form." This "model of form" resides in miniaturists' common memories. Hence, the art of painting becomes cumulative common memories and a tradition that is a force to keep the rules and laws of the Islamic community. In such a community, what they really concern is the collective memories and the established tradition that make them identified and distinctive from the cultural other. When it comes to the style, it is the "imperfection" of the mother...That "signature" and "style" are but

the means of being brazenly and stupidly self-congratulatory about flawed work' (65).

According to Kant, "if the universal (the rule, principle, or law) is given, then the judgment which subsumes the particular under it is determinant. ...If, however, only the particular is given and the universal has to be found for it, then the judgment is simply reflective. (19)" He explains that the determinant judgment determines under universal transcendental laws, or *a priori*. The reflective judgment cannot borrow from experience and it can only give as a law from and to itself. Based on these two kinds of judgment, we can say that the Islamic aesthetic tradition is close to the *determinant* judgment because of *a priori*, the universal laws to determine which painting is perfect or not. Before a Turkish miniaturist draws a horse, a "perfect" one, he has to know the universal laws that determine the "perfection" of the horse. Then he has to follow the laws and cumulate his experiences from his master and he himself and he can draw a perfect horse. The Western (Frankish) aesthetic style is similar to the *reflective* judgment. When an artist paints a horse, he just has to observe the horse carefully in front of him. From the horse itself the painter finds out the way how he draws.

Therefore, after we read the novel, it seems that we can jump into a conclusion here. The problem that the two different groups of Turkish miniaturists encounter is caused by the two modes of knowledge from Islam and Christianity. They are from two different ends of the binary opposition in terms of their religions that leads to their opposing aesthetics. It may be the cultural other from Europe that gets Turkey into a state of intense agitation. However, I think it is partly true to say so. The confrontation between the two groups of Turkish artists is, at the same time, caused by the problem within their own culture. In other words, as a cultural subject, the Islamic tradition is somehow shaken by the Christian civilization. Yet, the cultural subject's relationship with the cultural other is more problematic than the simple binary opposition. World literature is characterized by the fast circulation of the literary works and the regular confrontation of different cultures. The cultural subject is inevitably disturbed on and on so it is always in the process of "becoming" and hence on the way of self-identification. Therefore, I think the culture subject under the context of world literature can be examined as the self in the mirror stage. As long as the cultural subject never stops changing itself through the encounter of the other culture, it can never stop establishing its subjectivity and self-identity.

2. The Cultural Subject and the Cultural Other

Pamuk's novel elaborates on Weber's definition of world literature—"the conceptual

interconnection of problems which define the scope of the various sciences.” In my opinion, the world literature also offers “interconnection of problems” which defines a cultural subject. World literature not only means the confrontations of different sets of criteria for epistemology, or in Foucault’s words, modes of knowledge, it also helps one culture discover *its own* problems because of the confrontation with the cultural other. Although in a sense the cultural subject’s problem comes from the cultural other; to speak of it more correctly, I think that the cultural subject’s own problem is just reflected by the other. When one culture encounters the cultural other face to face, their ambiguous relationship can be described as the self-other relation in the mirror stage. On the one hand, the cultural subject identifies the *imago* as himself and he can establish his subjectivity. On the other hand, the cultural subject also has to separate and deny the other in the mirror; he is able to complete his identification. The cultural subject’s attitude toward the cultural other is obscure— both to identify and to deny because what he sees in the mirror is he himself and at the same time not at all.

If we take Turkey, Islam, as a cultural subject, Europe, or Christianity, can be regarded as the cultural other. It is not wrong that the problem that occurs among the Turkish miniaturists is somehow ascribed to the invasion of the perspective painting technique from the Europe. Or it is also quite reasonable that Pamuk’s story reveals the crisis of the Islamic community is caused by the Christian civilization. However, it is a more suitable remark that through the new perspective method, the Islamic community discovers its own cultural ironies which are implied in the novel. I think the cultural paradox of the Islamic community lies in their religious belief strips them of the possibility to be a individual human being out of the collective civil society. How can an individual be individual in a traditional community? How can a man experience his particular existence and importance under the Allah’s glory? Humanism in the Renaissance starts to proclaim the dignity of a man in every aspect included in painting. This kind of cultural trend makes the Turkish expose themselves under the paradox of their culture.

The cultural paradox is hidden almost everywhere in the novel. Black, the nephew of the master miniaturist Enishte, falls in love with the master’s daughter, Shekure. When he tries to express his adoration to his cousin, he turns to his culture. In the legend of Husrev and Shirin, on seeing a handsome picture of Husrev’s hanging on the branch of the tree in a beautiful garden, Shirin is love-stricken. Many paintings depict the scene where Shirin gazes upon Husrev’s image with passionate adoration. After Black sees the picture many times, he made exact copies by imitating the original. In order to show his love to Shekure, he makes a copy “for himself.” In his

“copy”, he replaces Husrev and Shirin with himself and Shekure and writes their own names under the figures. In the Islamic, man lives on the collective experiences and tradition and making a copy of a legendary illustration is allowed by the culture. Yet, by making a copy, the particular affection of his own cannot be shown. He pirates the original picture by renewing the faces and putting on his signatures. He becomes a thief of the culture; his signature becomes the thief’s footprints. Under the universal laws of a community, the particular affection cannot be represented through paintings unless the tradition is adapted or even destroyed.

The cultural paradox tortures the members in the community, especially the artist like Olive. He is a talented miniaturist, clinging to old forms. He can complete any subject matter with recourse to the old models he learns from the old master. Why does such an artist work for a blasphemous book and betray his tradition to paint in the Frankish style? It is because the deep strong desire hidden in every man’s heart cannot be satisfied by the Islamic culture. No matter whether he is a Muslim or not, every *man* desires to “attain the importance in this world.” The miniaturist master knows it very well after he sees the infidels’ portraits:

These supposedly important infidels... had attained the importance in this world solely on account of having their portraits made...for a moment among the paintings I felt flawed and important...it seemed, I’d better understand why I existed in this world...It’s a sin of desire, like growing arrogant before God, like considering oneself of utmost importance, like situating oneself at the center of the world (108).

For a faithful Muslim conforming to the old universal tradition carefully for his life, his eyesight used to fall backward to the past and ancestors. Particularity is covered and erased by universality. The infidels’ picture turns his eyesight to the present and himself, to the “now and I”. “I” begin to feel “flawed and important” in this world because of the arrogance of competing with God.

As an agency of the cultural subject, Olive, on the one hand, identifies with the cultural other so he paints in the Frankish style. At this moment, he thinks that he is imitating an other culture through seeing it. In fact, what he really sees and copies is the dark shadow of himself. When Olive is fascinated with the Western culture, what really attracts him is from within himself--the deep desire and lack in his own culture. When he starts to identify the cultural other, the boundary between the cultural subject and the cultural other blurs. He has an ambiguous

attitude toward his mimicry of the other culture. On the one hand, he feels like he could become the Other. On the other hand, he also denies the cultural other so he criticizes the Turkish artist like himself who reverse the old tradition to the Frankish style. “We paint the way we feel like painting, embracing our faults and individuality under the influence of the Franks so we might possess a style, we might resemble ourselves, but we won’t be ourselves (389).” In order to *be* the self, the separation between them has to be made. Hence, when one culture encounters the other one, in a sense, it can be an encounter with the self and a process to rebuild its subjectivity. All in all, world literature offers every cultural subject opportunities to encounter the cultural other and at the same time, to oppose itself to its own image masked as a cultural other in the mirror.

3. Uncovering the Cultural Subject: Islam

Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak declares the declination of the Eurocentric Comparative Literature and America-centered Area Studies. Instead, she proclaims “a new Comparative Literature,” and advocates that we have to learn “the protocol of those disciplines, turning them around, laboriously” (11). She also points out the fact that the difficulty of crossing disciplines or borders is to refuse appropriation and control from the dominant. From a Muslim community, Edward Said as well attacks the formidable structure of the cultural domination. In “*Orientalism*”, he criticizes the relation between the East and West which is fixed in a set of binary opposition. The Oriental is constructed as being irrational and different while the Western is, on the contrary, rational and normal. Based on the power structure, the Islamic culture has been being interpreted in a masked and distorted way by the strong Christian culture. In his book, *Covering Islam*, he writes that “For most of the Middle Ages and during the early part of the Renaissance in Europe, Islam was believed to be a demonic religion of apostasy, blasphemy, and obscurity” (5). He sees clearly the conflicts between the two cultures and understands that the Islam has been being constructed as a cultural other by the Christian since the Renaissance. Now, he looks forward to “an alternative: if “Islam” tells us far less than it ought to, if it covers up more than it covers, where—or rather, how—are we to look for information that encourages neither new dreams of power nor old fears and prejudices” (172)?

With the rise of world literature, perhaps there is a possibility to ease off Spivak’s and Said’s concern in a sense. World literature traverses the boundary of national literature and provides a platform without a hegemonic Euro-center but with numerous centers of cultural

subjects. Different cultures travel via the global circulation of books all over the world so fast that the frequency and intensity of the culture shocks between the cultural subject and others increase. However, in the face of the cultural other, it is not just the encounter with the other, but also the encounter with the mirror image of the cultural subject. Hence, within the context of the world literature, their relationship can be seen as the self-other relationship in the mirror stage not as a fixed power relation attacked by Said. In fact, the self-other relation between different cultures will tend to become an inner power to both examine and even change the cultural subject itself not to manipulate the other. In conclusion, one contribution of the world literature is not only to let the cultural other in the past can voice for itself and turn into a cultural subject but to gaze the *imago* and to reshape a becoming cultural subject after the encounter of cultural others.

As a sharp critic, Said successfully indicates how the Western media models the image of Islam, how the Western expert interprets Islam, and how the West “covers” Islam. As an Islamic novelist, Pamuk, instead, helps us uncover Islam by putting *My Name is Red* within the context of world literature. On the one hand, he speaks out Islamic tradition and history with the global circulation of his book. Owing to his book, Islam becomes a cultural subject being able to voice to the rest of the world. On the other hand, the text helps readers uncover Islam within the context of world literature. The encounter of different cultures causes problems which offer the opportunities to reflect the problems existing within the cultural subject. The conflict between the Western painting style and the traditional Turkish painting skill not only displays the culture difference, it also reflects the culture paradox within the Islam. As a matter of fact, the encounter with humanism of the Western Renaissance exposes the Muslim’s irony: how to be individualized in a collective community, or how to have humane dignity under the harsh control of Allah? It is this discovery of the culture paradox implied in *My Name is Red* that contributes to uncovering the Islam.

引用書目

Da Vinci, Leonardo. “Nature, Ari, and Science.” *The Portable Renaissance Reader*. Ed. By James and Bruce and Mary Martin McLaughlin. New York: Penguin Books, 1977.

Foucault, Michel. *The Order of Things*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994.

Harbermas, Jurgen. “The Critique of Reason as an Unmasking of the Human Sciences: Michel Foucault.” *The Philosophical Discourse of Modernity*. Trans by Lawernce, Ferderick. Germany: Suhrkamp Verlag, 1985.

Moretti, Franco. “Conjectures on World Literature”. *New Left Review1: Jan Feb 2000*.

Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Our Religions: Islam*. Taiwan: Rye Field Publications, 2002.

Pamuk, Orhan. *My Name is Red*. Trans. by Erdag M. Goknar. New York: Vintage Books, 2001.

Williams, Raymond. *Marxism and Literature*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Said, Edward W.. *Covering Islam*. New York: Random House, 1997.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty. “Death of a Discipline.” New York: Columbia University Press, 2003.

台灣義務教育階段導入日語教育可行性 之初探

闕百華/ Pai-hua Chueh

淡江大學日文系 副教授

Department of Japanese Tamkang University

【摘要】

2006 年國際交流基金會調查顯示:世界上學習日語的總人數,排名第一是韓國,其次是中國,台灣則是排名第五。韓國與中國在義務教育階段,日語是正規課程之一,有課程標準和教科書。學習重點放在提升學生文化素養,拓展學生的國際視野。相對於此,台灣偏重英語教育和鄉土語言教育,義務教育要開設日語課程難度頗高。本文建議可用國際了解教育的一環實施跨領域學習,或於綜合活動課程當中,導入日語教學活動。

【Abstract】

In “Survey on Japanese-Language Education Abroad 2006” the country with the largest number of students of the Japanese language was Korea. China had the second-highest number of students. Taiwan is the fifth. At the compulsory education stage in Korea and China, Japanese is a regular curriculum. These two countries have Japanese course of studies, and Japanese textbooks. By the way, In Taiwan, because English and the dialects education are overemphasized, then, it is considerably difficult to establish Japanese as a subject in Taiwan today. Thus, I think that it is appropriate to introduce Japanese activity by integrated curriculum or Integrative Activities as part of international understanding.

【關鍵詞】

義務教育 日語教育 第二外語 國際了解 綜合活動課程

前言

長久以來，台灣與日本因為歷史以及地理等因素，兩國之間的經濟貿易關係非常密切。2004 年日本是臺灣的第一大貿易夥伴，2005-2006 年大陸超越日本，日本成為台灣之第二大貿易夥伴，但台灣仍舊維持日本第四大貿易夥伴的地位。由於台日貿易往來頻繁，加上政府、民間、教育界等各方面交流熱絡，日文已成為必備的國際語言之一。此外，由於日本是亞洲經濟強權，世界第二大經濟體，全球實施日語教育的機關以及學習日語的總人數，有日益增多之趨勢。

根據國際交流基金會 2006 年度所做的「海外日本語教育機關調查」結果顯示：世界上 133 個國家、地區中，共計有 298 萬人在教育機構學習日語。學習人口前五名，依序分別為韓國 91 萬人，佔全球學習人數 30.6%；中國大陸 68 萬人，佔全球學習人數 23.0%；澳洲 37 萬人，佔全球學習人數的 12.3%；印尼 27 萬人，佔全球學習人數 9.2%；台灣 19 萬人，佔全球學習人數 6.4%（國際交流基金 2007a）。單是位於東亞的韓國、中國、台灣，就佔世界上學習日語總人口的 6 成。本文首先以國際交流基金會的調查為主軸，說明中、韓國等東亞國家的義務教育階段，皆具備日語課程基準與教科書之現況。相對於此，台灣現行「九年一貫課程綱要」當中，雖然規定國中可以開設選修第二外語，卻沒有第二外語的綱要與教科書。因此，本文將分析近年交流協會日語中心所做的「台灣日語教育現況調查」與教育部規定的課程基準（「國民中學課程標準」、「國民中小學九年一貫課程綱要」），說明台灣國民中學第二外語日語教育的歷史與現狀。同時提議參照九年一貫課程創新教學的精神，實施跨領域學習或善用綜合活動課程，以國際理解教育的一環，導入日語教學活動。最後，就台灣現有少數實施日語活動的國中、小學案例做介紹，並對於改善的方向提出淺見。

1. 中、韓等國義務教育階段之日語教育

一 中國義務教育階段的日語教育

隨著 1972 年中、日兩國恢復邦交，1970 年代前期以東北地區為中心實施日語教育的學校增加，估計當時全中國學習日語的人口高達 30 萬人，此乃中國第一波學習日語的風潮。1979 年中日政府共同成立「北京日語研究中心」（通稱「太平學校」），日語教育事業的發展向前邁進一大步。進入 1980 年代初期，隨著中等教育階段的「日語教學綱要」公佈，以及人民教育出版社陸續出版初、高中日語教科書，再加上日本在 1983 年發表「招收留學生 10 萬人計畫」，中國政府於隔年開放私費留學等眾多因素影響，學習日語的人口大幅增加，造成第二次學習