



淡江外語論叢

淡江大學外國語文學院 印行 Published by College of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tamkang University

December
2024

言語、文学、文化 言語、文学、文化
 Language, Literature, Culture
 Langue, Littérature, Cultures
 Lengua, Literatura, Cultura
 Sprache, Literatur, Kultur
 Язык, Литература и Культура
 言語、文学、文化 言語、文学、文化
 Language, Literature, Culture
 Langue, Littérature, Cultures
 Lengua, Literatura, Cultura
 Sprache, Literatur, Kultur
 Язык, Литература и Культура
 言語、文学、文化 言語、文学、文化
 Language, Literature, Culture
 Langue, Littérature, Cultures
 Lengua, Literatura, Cultura
 Sprache, Literatur, Kultur
 Язык, Литература и Культура
 言語、文学、文化 言語、文学、文化
 Language, Literature, Culture
 Langue, Littérature, Cultures
 Lengua, Literatura, Cultura
 Sprache, Literatur, Kultur
 Язык, Литература и Культура
 言語、文学、文化 言語、文学、文化
 Language, Literature, Culture
 Langue, Littérature, Cultures
 Lengua, Literatura, Cultura
 Sprache, Literatur, Kultur

No. 42

42 淡江外語論叢

Tamkang Studies of Foreign Languages and Literatures

December 2024

淡江大學外國語文學院 印行



淡江外語論叢 December 2024 No.42

目 錄 **Table of Contents**

Exploring Ecogothic Paradoxes: The Southern Swamp in Anne Rice's <i>Interview with the Vampire</i>	林嘉鴻/Chia-Hung Lin 呂虹瑾/Hong-Jin Lu 1
「文殊問疾」の物語を構築す る要素について—表現技巧や 人物描写の手法に着目して—	吉田文子/Yoshida Fumiko 22
Ambivalence and Ambiguity: Truths Veiled and Truths Revealed in Euripides' <i>Hippolytus</i>	吳瑜雲/Yu-Yun Wu 43

〈本期收論文 9 篇，獲推薦 3 篇。〉

主編的話

本人自 2024 年 8 月 1 日，正式接下《淡江外語論叢》的主編一職。首先感謝前任主編吳萬寶教授，及歷任主編多年來對期刊的堅持與貢獻，讓《淡江外語論叢》自 1998 年底第一期出刊起，穩定發展 27 年。也感謝所有的賜稿者，無論文章是否刊登，您們的支持和參與，使《淡江外語論叢》內容更加豐富和專業。

《淡江外語論叢》第 42 期共收錄三篇文章，探討不同領域的議題，展示外語研究在文學與文化分析中的豐富面向。第一篇文章以《夜訪吸血鬼》為例，剖析南方沼澤在自然與人類關係中的象徵意義，展現生態哥德文學如何反映環境與人類互動的深層矛盾；第二篇文章深入解析講經文《文殊問疾》，不僅揭示其在表現技巧及人物描寫上的卓越創意，也彰顯了宗教文學在情感與藝術間的微妙平衡；第三篇文章聚焦於《希帕里特斯》，精細研究真話與隱藏真相之間的糾結，為理解古希臘文學的主題深度提供了新視角。這些研究不僅拓展了我們對文本的認知，也鼓舞我們在學術之路上持續探索。

本人暨全體編輯委員誠摯邀請各位學術先進及同儕繼續踴躍賜稿，為本刊注入更多元化與具啟發性的學術觀點，成為學術同仁展示作品的重要平台。展望未來，我們將繼續秉持嚴謹與多元的標準，確保期刊內容品質，並以開放的態度促進多語種間的學術交流，力求在每期刊物中提供創新的研究發表，推動外語研究的發展。

最後，再次感謝各位對《淡江外語論叢》的支持，祝願《淡江外語論叢》在大家的共同努力下，持續蓬勃發展。

敬祝

學術精進，成果豐碩

主編 林怡弟 謹啟

Exploring Ecoготhic Paradoxes: The Southern Swamp in Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*

林嘉鴻/Chia-Hung Lin¹

呂虹瑾/Hong-Jin Lu²

淡江大學英文學系助理教授¹；致理科技大學應用英語系助理教授²

Department of English, Tamkang University

Department of Applied English, Chihlee University of Technology

【摘要】

生態哥德文學 (Ecoготhic literature) 結合生態批評 (ecocriticism) 與哥德元素，透過探究人類對自然界的黑暗觀感，來審視並瓦解我們更為陰森的環境想像；生態哥德連結生態焦慮與哥德式恐怖。正如 Andrew Smith 與 William Hughes 在《Ecoготhic》(2013) 中所闡述，哥德文學能巧妙地描繪並表達這些生態焦慮 (5)。哥德恐怖與生態批判的結合，揭示潛藏於環境惡化以及人類與自然之間不穩定關係的恐懼。這種文學手法不但暴露環境破壞所引發的焦慮，也批判人類對自然時常抱持的對立態度；同時凸顯出生態系統的脆弱性，以及其被動搖後可能帶來的嚴重後果。人類與自然間的互動與衝突，也揭示我們在生態互動中所面臨的矛盾。本論文運用生態哥德的視角，探討安·萊絲 (Anne Rice) 的《夜訪吸血鬼》(Interview with the Vampire) 中的沼澤，並剖析其作為自然與人類之間緊張關係的象徵意義。本研究強調，沼澤的陰鬱存在如何在文本中反映生態焦慮，對應人類對未被馴服且難以掌控的自然力量之恐懼。故事中人類與自然元素的交織關係進一步放大兩者共存的衝突，也展現出人類試圖掌控自然、而自然則抗拒被支配的持續角力。沼澤作為一個門檻空間，與棲身其中的過渡性生物——吸血鬼——相互映照，不僅反映他們的內在衝突，也暗示在控制與自然原始力量之間存在的模糊界線，象徵著創造與毀滅的矛盾。

【關鍵字】

生態哥德文學、《夜訪吸血鬼》、生態焦慮、哥德恐怖、人類與自然衝突

【Abstract】

Ecogothic literature, a fusion of ecocriticism and Gothic elements, interrogates humanity's darker perceptions of the natural world, to scrutinize and dismantle our more sinister environmental visions; ecogothic bridges ecological anxieties with Gothic horror. As Andrew Smith and William Hughes explicate in *Ecogothic* (2013), the Gothic genre adeptly portrays and articulates these eco-anxieties (5). The confluence of Gothic horror and ecological critique expounds latent fears regarding environmental degradation and humanity's precarious relationship with nature. This literary approach exposes underlying anxieties tied to environmental disruption while critiquing humanity's often adversarial stance towards nature. It highlights the fragility of our ecological systems and the grave consequences of their destabilization. The interrelation and conflict between humanity and nature implicate the paradox in our ecological interactions. Employing ecogothic perspectives, this paper examines the swamp in Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*, divulging the symbolic representation of the contentious relationship between nature and humanity. This analysis emphasizes how the swamp's menacing presence reflects the ecological anxieties to the narrative, mirroring humanity's fear of the untamed and uncontrollable aspects of nature. The entwined relationship between human and natural elements in the narrative magnifies the conflicts in their coexistence, illustrating the ongoing struggle between human attempts to dominate nature and nature's resistance to such control. The swamp, as a threshold space, mirrors the transitional beings—vampires—who inhabit it, reflecting their internal conflicts and implying the blurred boundaries involving control and the untamed forces of nature, a paradox of creation and destruction.

【Keywords】

Ecogothic literature, *Interview with the Vampire*, ecological anxieties, Gothic horror, human-nature conflict

1. Introduction

Ecogothic literature, an amalgamation of ecocriticism and Gothic elements, probes into humanity's more sinister perceptions of the natural world. Responding to the entreaties of theorists such as Estok and Morton to examine and dismantle our darker environmental

visions, the ecogothic bridges ecological anxieties with Gothic horror. As Andrew Smith and William Hughes illuminate in *Ecogothic* (2013), the Gothic genre is equipped to portray and articulate these eco-anxieties (5). The synthesis of Gothic horror and ecological critique specifies the latent anxieties about environmental degradation and humanity's precarious relationship with the natural world. This literary approach discloses the underlying fears tied to environmental degradation, while simultaneously critiquing humanity's often antagonistic relationship with nature. It exposes the fragility of our ecological systems and the dire consequences of their disruption. The interconnection and conflict between humanity and nature highlight the duality essential in our ecological interactions (Sulaiman 267). Utilizing ecogothic perspectives, this paper scrutinizes the swamp in Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*, revealing the symbolic representation of the contentious relationship between nature and humanity. This examination emphasizes how the swamp's ominous presence reflects the larger ecological anxieties fundamental in the narrative, mirroring humanity's fear of the untamed and uncontrollable aspects of nature. The connection of human and natural elements in the narrative serves to magnify the conflicts in their coexistence. This intertwined relationship illustrates the ongoing struggle between civilization and wilderness, highlighting the clash between human attempts to dominate nature and nature's resistance to such control. This dichotomy signals the perilous outcomes of disregarding ecological balance.

2. Ecogothic Framework and Theoretical Context

The narrative's exploration of these themes indicates the pervasive unease that accompanies humanity's encroachment on natural landscapes. Furthermore, it expounds the dynamics between ecological integrity and human intervention. Through ecogothic approaches, Rice's work illuminates the anxieties surrounding ecological destruction and the interchange between the natural world and human existence. This analysis foregrounds the symbiotic relationship between human actions and environmental consequences, emphasizing the mutual dependency inherent in this dynamic.

Ecogothic literature merges Gothic horror with ecological themes to explore humanity's darker interactions with the natural world. The ecogothic genre, which deliberately integrates ecological criticism with unsettling views of nature, to analyze and dismantle humanity's more ominous environmental perspectives. This hybrid scrutinizes the anthropocentric exploitation of natural landscapes, divulging the sinister consequences of environmental degradation. The anxious "concerns" can be conveyed through Gothic motifs, offering storytellers and scholars a medium to express their unease with astute

societal insights, as Gothic Studies deciphers contemporary and historical complexities, illuminating the layers of human nature (Lundberg et al. 10). Ecoготhic narratives thus reveal the convoluted and often malevolent interchange between humanity and the environment, stressing the repercussions of ignoring ecological balance. The literary approach explicates the fears associated with environmental deterioration, offering perceptions into the anthropocentric impact on natural ecosystems. By amalgamating elements of horror and ecological critique, ecoготhic literature provides an agonizing “critique” of the interdependence between humans and the environment (Hudson and Going 7). This genre, therefore, provides a framework for examining the psychological and environmental implications of humanity’s exploitation of nature.

3. The Southern Swamp: Cultural and Historical Significance

The ecoготhic framework reveals the multifaceted anxieties embedded within natural landscapes. This perspective highlights the significant impact of ecological transformations on human consciousness. Wilson’s research on the swamp explicates it as a locus of ambiguity and liminality, capturing the conflation of boundaries between terra firma and aqueous expanses, civilization and wilderness, as well as life and death (IX). Such transformations emphasize the tensions and contradictions within the human-nature relationship. The endeavor to convert the swamp from its “natural state” into a “pastoral garden” nevertheless renders it an obstinate, lethal, and irreducible entity (Wilson XIX). This resistance to human control further complicates the ecological and cultural significance of such landscapes. The conceptualization of the swamp as an interstitial space where conventional demarcations dissolve is pivotal in understanding its symbolic resonance.

The ecoготhic vision provides a critical framework for understanding the symbolic role of natural landscapes in Southern literature. Given that *Interview with the Vampire* is set in the American South, particularly in the swamp regions, it is crucial to address the Southern natural ideology pertinent to this setting. The juxtaposition of the swamp with the cultivated plantation signals the tension between untamed nature and human attempts at subjugation:

The swamp and the myth of the plantation South have always been at odds. For the Cavalier-era Southern mind, ideas of control, purity, and dominion over nature (both within and without) were essential; in both literature and in the real world, the swamp always defied those ideas (Wilson 3).

This segment illustrates the opposition between the swamp and the mythos of the plantation South. The Southern psyche, shaped by Cavalier ideals, esteemed control, purity, and dominion over nature. However, the swamp, both in literature and in reality, subverted these ideals, embodying a realm that resisted taming and control. This defiance elicited both fear and reverence, as it contrasted with the cultivated, orderly vision of the Southern landscape. The swamp's untamed nature implicates a potent symbol of the limits of human dominion and the enduring power of the natural world.

The ecogothic paradigm illuminates the dynamics between nature and societal constructs. The swamp's indeterminacy and fluidity, according to Wilson, present an austere antithesis to the inflexible societal norms and compulsive obsession with order that defined the antebellum South. The swamp's very physical ambiguity, as exemplifying with treacle, which is "anomalous in the classification of liquids and solids, being in neither one nor the other set," fundamentally undermines a system as meticulously devoted to order and categorization. An adversary to any Victorian, European, or Southern notion of "purity," the essence of the swamp's menace lies in its liminality, its perilous confluence of land and water that can suddenly yield beneath the unsuspecting foot (Wilson 9). He expounds the swamp's physical ambiguity, demonstrating how it posed a substantial threat to the Southern preoccupation with order and classification. The swamp's treacherous amalgamation of land and water engendered an unpredictable and hazardous milieu, thus amplifying its feared status. Furthermore, its equivocal nature symbolized a direct affront to the rigid societal norms of the antebellum South, embodying a space that subverted the purity and control esteemed by Southern society. This analysis indicates the tension between natural chaos and human attempts at imposing order, highlighting the swamp as a symbol of resistance against anthropocentric dominance.

4. The Swamp in *Interview with the Vampire*: Symbolism and Liminality

The symbolic role of the swamp in Southern culture provides a framework for understanding its depiction in Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*. In the novel, the swamp functions as a symbol of the South's untamed, mysterious, and often malevolent nature, contrasting sharply with the controlled, cultivated landscapes of the plantations (Rice 6, 162). According to Wilson, the dichotomy in perception between the North and South regarding the swamp reflects larger cultural and ideological conflicts prevalent during the antebellum period. He provides a broader cultural perspective, explaining how the swamp was viewed differently. While Northern abolitionists used the swamp metaphorically to criticize Southern morality, Southerners saw it as a tangible barrier to

their agrarian ideals. The swamp's physical presence served as a reminder of the gap between the South's idealized vision and its reality, highlighting both fear and reverence for its stubborn existence (7). In the North, the swamp became a convenient symbol to critique the perceived moral failings of the South, while in the South, it was an unavoidable reality that indicated the limitations and challenges of creating a controlled, agrarian paradise. These divergent perceptions indicate the entrenched cultural and regional disparities of the period.

Historically, swamps have posed a significant obstacle to the imposition of order long before European settlement in North America. From the outset, European settlers perceived Southern swamps and the marshlands of New England distinctively, with their responses being imbued with value judgments (Wilson 14). The swamp's multifaceted symbolism thus reflects a complex interaction of ecological, cultural, and ideological dimensions. The swamp, with its resistance to cultivation and its association with disease and danger, stood as a contrast to the romanticized image of Southern plantations, revealing the underlying tensions between idealism and practicality in Southern culture.

The swamp's very existence challenges the anthropocentric notion of nature as a suppressed and disciplined entity, instead presenting it as an autonomous and formidable force. In Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp exemplifies this unrestrained and powerful aspect of nature, functioning as an environment that juxtaposes the vampires' battle with their predatory nature and existential challenges (Rice 16). Wilson points out the swamp's role as the antithesis to the meticulously constructed image of the Southern pastoral garden. The "Cavalier myth," a fabricated narrative, aspired to impose control and order upon the Southern landscape, depicting it as a cultivated and tranquil environment. This mythos reflects an anthropocentric and dominion-oriented view of nature, wherein the natural world is subjugated and tamed. However, the swamp, with its ambiguity and ungovernable nature, defied these hegemonic aspirations. It epitomized untamed wilderness and chaos, resisting the imposition of artificial order and structure.

This resistance implicates the swamp's formidable and feared nature, derived from its essentially uncontrollable and unpredictable elements. It provides a potent symbol of the South's underlying wildness and complexity, contrasting the sanitized and idealized vision of the Southern landscape promulgated by the Cavalier myth. Consequently, the swamp remains an enduring and obstinate expanse within the Southern "self-narrative," embodying the perpetual tension between cultivated order and natural wildness (7). This dialectical relationship signifies the swamp's role as a significant counterpoint to the

controlled and orderly pastoral garden, symbolizing the inexorable presence of natural chaos and unpredictability within the Southern cultural and environmental ethos.

In the Southern setting of *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp functions as an interstitial space where the demarcations between human and vampire, life and death, are indistinct. This “liminal” zone implicates the ambiguity and fluidity of identity, compelling characters to navigate a realm where traditional binaries are continually blurred (Bloom 266). The swamp’s enigmatic nature exemplifies the complexity of the characters’ identities, involving the tension within the narrative. This setting acts as a metaphorical landscape that challenges and destabilizes the characters’ sense of self and perception of existence. The swamp’s duality as both a site of refuge and danger mirrors the characters’ internal struggles, reinforcing the thematic exploration of identity and transformation. Thus, the swamp’s role in the narrative is vital for understanding the wider ecogothic implications within the text.

5. Ecogothic Atmosphere: Danger, Decay, and Beauty

In Anne Rice’s *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp is a multi-layered setting that enhances the novel’s gothic atmosphere. Its depiction combines elements of natural beauty and seclusion with aspects of danger, death, and decay, creating a stratified context for the characters’ experiences. This bifurcation in the swamp’s portrayal not only mirrors the internal disquiet of the characters, particularly the vampires, but also heightens the thematic tension between life and death, nature and civilization.

On the one hand, the swamp is described with an enchanting allure. The moss-hung cypresses and the chorus of creatures add to the mystical charm of the narrative. This natural beauty contrasts with the refined life of the plantations, making the latter appear even more precious and desirable. Louis recalls the vision of the swamp rising beyond the plantation, stating, “I can still remember that thin, rapid music and the vision of the swamp rising beyond her, the moss-hung cypresses floating against the sky. And there were the sounds of the swamp, a chorus of creatures, the cry of the birds. I think we loved it” (Rice 6). The swamp’s sounds, such as the cries of birds, create a sense of connection with nature and contribute to the overall gothic ambiance. The dance of light and shadow within the swamp further magnifies its eerie beauty, casting an almost surreal glow that heightens the sense of otherworldliness. This ethereal quality of the swamp signals the theme of ambivalence, presenting it as both a sanctuary and a place of lurking danger, thus enhancing the novel’s atmospheric complexity.

Moreover, the swamp offers seclusion and privacy, away from the prying eyes of society. This isolation is beneficial for characters seeking to conduct secretive activities or simply to escape the scrutiny of the civilized world. The swamp provides a secluded, private area where characters can retreat, adding a layer of mystery and enchantment to their lives. This seclusion is exemplified when Louis and Claudia use the swamp to dispose of Lestat's body, taking advantage of its remote and hidden nature to keep their dark deeds concealed: "I hitched the horse myself, shushing the groggy coachman, and drove the hearse out of the city, fast in the direction of the Bayou St. Jean, towards the dark swamp that stretched to Lake Pontchartrain" (Rice 136). This use of the swamp highlights its role as a facilitator of secrecy and concealment, crucial for the characters' dark machinations.

Conversely, the swamp also embodies significant aspects of decay and danger. It is a place frequently serving as a burial ground for bodies, emphasizing its ominous reputation. The swamp is depicted as dangerous, filled with muck and rustling animals, evoking fear and unease. The stench and the presence of creatures contribute to the sense of peril that the swamp represents. This danger is palpable when Louis and Claudia drive towards the dark swamp, "I could smell the stench of the muck, hear the rustling of the animals" (Rice 136), signaling the swamp's hostile and foreboding nature. The swamp's hazardous environment features its role as a symbol of trepidation and malevolence.

Furthermore, the swamp symbolizes isolation and desperation, providing a setting for hidden duels and confrontations, where societal norms are abandoned, and characters engage in acts of violence away from the public eye. This role implicates the swamp's association with chaos and the breakdown of social order. The scheduled duel on the edge of the swamp illustrates this point: "Well, the duel, as I told you, was scheduled for four a.m. On the edge of the swamp just beyond the city's northern gate" (Rice 43), showing how the swamp becomes a place where characters can engage in actions they prefer to keep hidden from society. The swamp's capacity to harbor clandestine activities illustrates its function as a symbol of subversion and ambiguity.

From the preceding observations, the swamp in *Interview with the Vampire* represents a significant natural element that enhances the novel's gothic tone. Its dual nature, combining beauty and seclusion with danger and decay, parallels the characters' own struggles and transformations, making it an integral part of the story's dark and mesmerizing world. This multidimensional depiction of the swamp signifies its pivotal role in the narrative, explicating the interconnections between the environment and the characters' states.

6. The Vampiric Condition and Ecological Anxiety

The swamp's manifold nature serves to amplify the characters' internal conflicts, symbolizing the entangled dynamics between humanity and monstrosity. This natural environment becomes a stage where the characters confront their "dual identities" and the characteristic contradictions within their existence (Craven and Sandars, 2024). In the narrative landscape, the swamp's duality denotes the tension and fear experienced by the characters: "There were creatures all around him in the dark [swamp]. ... the tenacity of the will to live" (Rice 162). This portrayal augments the narrative's examination of survival and primal instincts, illustrating how the ostensibly destructive swamp paradoxically embodies a source of vitality and life force. By situating the narrative within this ambiguous landscape, Rice denotes the tension between the characters' humanistic qualities and their monstrous impulses, thus enhancing the psychological depth of the narrative.

The awakening of Louis to his vampiric nature illuminates the duality of enlightenment and agony. Louis' transformation into a vampire suggests both a revelatory and tormenting experience, saturating him with an acute awareness of the preciousness of life while simultaneously binding him to the perpetual act of taking it: "My vampire nature has been for me the greatest adventure of my life; all that went before it was confused, clouded; I went through mortal life like a blind man groping from solid object to solid object" (Rice 81). Louis begins by describing his vampiric nature as the greatest adventure of his life, indicating that it has brought him experiences and visions far beyond those of his mortal existence. He reflects on his mortal life as being "confused" and "clouded," suggesting a lack of clarity and purpose. The simile of living "like a blind man groping from solid object to solid object" conveys a sense of aimlessness and lack of direction during his human life.

Next, "[i]t was only when I became a vampire that I respected for the first time all of life" (Rice 81). Louis reveals that his transformation into a vampire, paradoxically, instilled in him a newfound respect for life. This line indicates a significant shift in his perception, where the act of becoming a vampire opened his eyes to the value and convolution of living beings, something he had not truly appreciated before.

Lastly, "I never saw a living, pulsing human being until I was a vampire; I never knew what life was until it ran out in a red gush over my lips, my hands" (Rice 81). Here, Louis conveys the paradox of his existence. He admits that he never truly "saw" or understood the essence of a living human being until he became a vampire. The vivid imagery of life "running out in a red gush" over his lips and hands symbolizes the act of feeding on humans,

which paradoxically grants him a deeper understanding and respect for life even as he ends it. This line illustrates the duality of his enlightenment—he gains profound insights into life through the very act of taking it.

In sum, Louis articulates the paradox of his existence: his metamorphosis into a vampire has endowed him with a heightened appreciation for life, even as he must extinguish it to sustain himself. This ambivalence of humanity and monstrosity is central to his character, as he struggles with reconciling his newfound perceptions with his predatory instincts. The association of his enhanced reverence for life against the grim necessity of taking it denotes the underlying conflict that defines his vampiric existence.

The duality of Louis's existence is marked by an ongoing struggle between his innate human empathy and his predatory vampiric instincts.

I knew peace only when I killed, only for that minute; and there was no question in my mind that the killing of anything less than a human being brought nothing but a vague longing, the discontent which had brought me close to humans, to watch their lives through glass. I was no vampire. And in my pain, I asked irrationally, like a child, Could I not return? Could I not be human again? (Rice 86)

This internal conflict delineates the constant dichotomy between Louis's human and vampiric natures, manifesting in his simultaneous abhorrence of and compulsion toward killing. The subsequent passages offer more thorough interpretations.

“I knew peace only when I killed, only for that minute” (Rice 86). Louis finds a fleeting sense of tranquility in the act of killing, suggesting that his predatory nature temporarily quells his inner turmoil. However, this peace is ephemeral, lasting only for the brief moment of the kill, highlighting the transient relief that violence brings him.

“[A]nd there was no question in my mind that the killing of anything less than a human being brought nothing but a vague longing” (Rice 86). Killing non-human creatures fails to satisfy Louis's deeper urges, leaving him with an indistinct sense of yearning. This statement signifies the gravity of his condition, where only human victims can temporarily satiate his vampiric hunger and bring him a semblance of peace.

“[T]he discontent which had brought me close to humans, to watch their lives through glass” (Rice 86). Louis's dissatisfaction drives him to observe human lives from a distance, symbolizing his alienation. This metaphor of watching through glass suggests his separation from the human experience, evoking a sense of isolation and longing for a connection he can no longer fully participate in. Louis's intense conflict is manifest as he contends with his need to kill to attain a momentary semblance of peace. The ephemeral

consolation he derives from killing humans designates his basic connection to humanity, whereas his dissatisfaction with killing lesser beings implicates his monstrous nature. His fervent yearning to revert to his human form, despite its impossibility, exposes the incessant internal struggle between his human values and vampiric instincts. This association between his humanity and the monstrous compulsion imposed by his vampirism indicates the pervasive discord that underpins his essence.

The continuous clash between Louis's human empathy and his vampiric nature is captured through his reflections on his predatory actions, emphasizing the core conflict that delineates his being. This tension between his human and monstrous sides is symbolized in the novel's depiction of the swamp.

The swamp's equivocal nature reflects the vampires' own existential limbo, ensnared between vitality and mortality, humanity and monstrosity. This portrayal aligns with Wilson's depiction of the swamp, emphasizing its role as a mirror to the characters' ambiguous existence. The swamp's ambiguity underlines the thematic exploration of identity and the duality within the novel, illustrating how the natural environment can embody and amplify the internal conflicts of the characters. The thematic resonance of the swamp within the narrative not only highlights the internal struggles of the characters but also extends to wider ecological and cultural anxieties.

The swamp acts to embody a compelling metaphor for the crossing of ecological and cultural anxieties in literature. Through Parker's methodology, the swamp is analyzed from a perspective that scrutinizes the complex relationship between humans and the nonhuman environment (214). This approach interprets how the swamp embodies broader ecological anxieties and cultural trepidations, revealing the symbiosis between nature and human perception. The swamp functions as a potent symbol for various ecological concerns such as environmental degradation, biodiversity loss, and the ramifications of climate change. Its volatile and inscrutable nature implicates the precariousness and "ambiguity" natural in ecological systems, indicating an ingrained instability and mysteriousness in the natural world (Parks 5). Culturally, it reflects fears of the unknown, the uncontrollable facets of nature, and the perceived threat to anthropocentric dominance over the natural world. This complex symbolism bridges the environmental and psychological dimensions of the narrative, reinforcing the characters' internal and external conflicts. In alignment with this perspective, the vampires in this novel, with their static existence and resistance to change, further embody the anxiety surrounding ecological and cultural transformations. Their inability to adapt and evolve is ironically accentuated by the swamp's characteristic dynamism, reinforcing themes of inertia and the perils of resisting natural cycles.

7. Human–Nature Tensions: Symbolism of Decay and Renewal

The swamp, as an ecological system, relies on the equilibrium and diversity of nature for its existence and maintenance (Deb et al., 2016). However, anthropogenic activities such as drainage, pollution, and development disrupt this balance, leading to ecological degradation and species extinction. In the novel, the perilous and volatile nature of the swamp not only symbolizes the threats inherent in the natural world but also reflects the repercussions of human activities that degrade the environment (Van Assche et al., 2012). These consequences include ecological disequilibrium, environmental degradation, and the existential crises faced by humanity itself.

The swamp’s ominous presence, in *Interview with the Vampire*, with its miasmatic waters and tangled vegetation, reflects a space of both destruction and rebirth, signifying the paradoxical nature of existence.

I went deeper and deeper in with Lestat’s remains, though why, I did not know. And finally, when I could barely see the pale space of the road and the sky which was coming dangerously close to dawn, I let his body slip down out of my arms into the water. (Rice 136)

The subsequent analysis provides further detail:

“I went deeper and deeper in with Lestat’s remains” (Rice 136). The narrator’s gradual immersion into the swamp with Lestat’s remains illustrates a reflective and symbolic descent into a liminal space, where the boundaries between life and death, order and chaos, are indistinct. This act implicates the narrator’s confrontation with the abysmal depths of both the environment and his own psyche.

“[T]hough why, I did not know” (Rice 136). This phrase indicates the narrator’s existential bewilderment and lack of conscious volition, suggesting that his actions are propelled by an inscrutable compulsion, resonating with the swamp’s enigmatic and inscrutable nature.

“And finally, when I could barely see the pale space of the road and the sky” (Rice 136). The diminishing visibility signifies the narrator’s increasing alienation and detachment from the known world, as he penetrates deeper into the swamp’s arcane and disorienting environment. The “pale space” epitomizes the thin and precarious boundary separating civilization from untamed nature.

“[W]hich was coming dangerously close to dawn” (Rice 136). The imminent arrival of dawn represents a critical and lethal juncture for vampires, as exposure to sunlight is

fatal. This temporal marker suggests the peril and urgency of the narrator's endeavor, heightening the narrative tension.

"I let his body slip down out of my arms into the water" (Rice 136). The relinquishment of Lestat's body into the swamp's murky waters symbolizes a capitulation to the primordial forces of decay and regeneration. This act denotes a relinquishment of dominion and an acknowledgment of the swamp's transformative and purgative power.

This descent signifies a symbolic surrender to the primeval forces that govern life and death within the swamp's depths, underlining the interaction between destruction and renewal in the natural world. The swamp's foreboding atmosphere, teeming with decay and enigmatic vitality, mirrors the psychological labyrinth Louis navigates. His penetration into the swamp signifies a descent into an environment that epitomizes desolation and primeval decay. The swamp, with its fetid waters and ubiquitous vegetation, is a liminal space that exists on the threshold of life and death. Louis's journey deeper into this morass reflects his own plunge into moral and existential ambiguity. The swamp, with its miasma and murk, provides an apt metaphor for the convoluted and often mysterious path Louis treads as a vampire.

The inexorable approach of dawn implicates the inescapable passage of time and the impending threat it poses to the vampire's nocturnal existence: "And finally, when I could barely see the pale space of the road and the sky which was coming dangerously close to dawn" (Rice 136). The encroachment of dawn introduces an element of imminent peril, as the first light of daybreak heralds potential destruction for vampires. The "pale space" denotes the nebulous line separating night from day, symbolizing the precarious balance between safety and annihilation. This impending dawn not only heightens the tension but also underscores the urgency of Louis's actions. The swamp, ensconced in darkness, becomes a sanctuary that must be abandoned with the coming of light.

The act of surrendering Lestat's remains to the swamp's depths represents a symbolic gesture of relinquishment and finality: "I let his body slip down out of my arms into the water" (Rice 136). The act of consigning Lestat's remains to the swamp's aqueous embrace is imbued with both literal and symbolic significance. The water, inactive and somber, embodies a natural repository for decay and regeneration. By relinquishing Lestat's body to this mire, Louis is enacting a form of purgation, attempting to expunge the vestiges of his tormentor. The swamp's capacity to obscure and absorb provides an agonizing reminder of the cyclical nature of life and death, albeit in a grotesque and perverted form for the undead.

8. Ecogothic Warnings and Moral Implications

In this milieu, the symbolic weight of the swamp becomes more apparent. The swamp, akin to the forest in Parker's analysis, functions as an active agent in the narrative rather than a mere passive background. The act of consigning Lestat's body to the swamp can be interpreted as an engagement with what Parker describes as the "living forest," where nature is not simply a setting but an entity endowed with agency and the capacity to evoke fear and introspection (Parker 69). This dynamic interaction between the characters and their environment is emblematic of the ecogothic tradition, highlighting the interrelation between humanity and nature.

Wilson's analysis further supplements this interpretation by contextualizing the swamp within the broader cultural and historical milieu of the Southern United States. The swamp in Southern culture, as Wilson explains, is a liminal space that embodies both refuge and menace. It is a realm of enigma and alterity, frequently associated with the uncanny and the supernatural (XV). In this light, Louis's act of consigning Lestat's remains to the swamp transcends personal purgation, navigating these broader cultural associations. The swamp emerges as a repository of both physical remains and cultural anxieties, a liminal zone where the boundaries between the human and the nonhuman, the living and the dead, are overwhelmingly blurred.

This exploration of the swamp's symbolic significance leads into an examination of the expansive themes of ecological disruption and suffering in the narrative. The dynamics between the swamp and the vampires reflects the overarching themes of environmental destruction and torment. In Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp symbolizes the vampires' existential plight, illustrating the effects of disregarding the natural cycle. The existence of vampires characterizes a disruption of natural order/chaos. Their immortality and escape from the natural cycle of life and death result in perpetual suffering and isolation (Hurtado, 2023). This "unnatural" state symbolizes the consequences of humanity's attempts to control and alter nature, leading not to liberation but to intensified agony (Rice 64). The vampires' torment can be viewed as an allegory for the backlash of nature against the violence inflicted upon it by humans, implicating the inseparable bond and mutual dependency between nature and humanity.

This observation reveals the significant psychological and ecological consequences inherent in the disruption of natural cycles. The vampires' existence exemplifies a powerful metaphor for the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. Such symbolic representations signals the critical need for a harmonious relationship with the environment. In the novel, the swamp and the vampires collectively symbolize various facets of

ecological destruction. The perilous and unpredictable nature of the swamp intimates that the natural world becomes increasingly perilous and unmanageable when it is disrupted (Vickers, 2022). The vampires, conversely, symbolize the enduring agony and intrinsic corruption engendered by such destructive actions. Their undead state contrasts with nature's perpetual regeneration, signifying the irrevocable impact of anthropogenic activities on the natural world.

Vampires in Rice's novel exhibit augmented physical attributes, including formidable strength, celerity, and heightened sensory acuity. These enhancements are evident when Louis delineates his metamorphosis and the newfound capabilities he acquires:

I saw as a vampire...He had seemed white to me before, starkly white, so that in the night he was almost luminous; and now I saw him filled with his own life and own blood: he was radiant, not luminous. And then I saw that not only Lestat had changed, but all things had changed" (Rice 21).

The transformation not only bestows preternatural abilities but also alters the perception of reality, implying the disjunction between mortal existence and the vampiric state. Immortality is a core aspect of their undead state, which comes with a significant psychological burden. Louis reflects on the endless passage of time and the existential ennui that accompanies it.

Moreover, the conflict between vampires' enhanced existence and perpetual suffering implicates the essential contradictions of their condition. Their need for blood is not merely for sustenance but is intrinsically linked to their predatory nature and the existential dread of their condition: "Killing is no ordinary act... It is the experience of another's life for certain, and often the experience of the loss of that life through the blood, slowly" (Rice 29). This dependency engenders a convoluted moral landscape where vampires must reconcile their predatory instincts with the vestiges of their humanity. The act of feeding, suffused with both vitality and death, signals an incessant reminder of their deviation from human norms and their immersion in an existential paradox (Kosloff & Solomon, 2020). The predatory necessity entwined with their survival denotes the wider themes of principled ambiguity and the struggle between their vampiric nature and residual human empathy. This duality exacerbates their ontological conflict, perpetuating an endless tension between their primal urges and the remnants of their conscience consciousness.

The ubiquitousness of sunlight as a lethal element indicates the peril that the natural world poses to the vampiric condition, rendering their immortality fraught with hazards: "You will die, you know. The sun will destroy the blood I've given you, in every tissue, every vein" (Rice 25). This illustrates how sunlight, or the exposure to the outside during

the day, is fatal for vampires. The dire consequences of such exposure highlight the fragility and vulnerability that accompany their otherwise potent existence. Furthermore, the omnipresent threat of sunlight serves as a persistent reminder of their perpetual estrangement from the natural order, demonstrating the existential dichotomy between their immortality and the mortal world. This unyielding menace not only intensifies their isolation but also magnifies the incoherence between their eternal life and the transient nature of the environment around them.

The constant threat of sunlight exemplifies the ecological implications of vampiric existence. As the vampires navigate their precarious reality, they embody the environmental narrative of unsustainable practices and their inevitable consequences. This thematic continuity shows the inseparable link between ecological equilibrium and the ontological dilemmas faced by the undead.

This interconnectedness between the vampires' vulnerabilities and their ecological consequences denotes the issues of environmental imbalance and existential suffering. In this context, ecogothic literature features the long-term repercussions of human-inflicted environmental degradation and the ensuing reflection (Sekhar, 2016). This genre reveals the interchange between ecological devastation and the psychological ramifications experienced by humanity. In *Interview with the Vampire*, the vampires' immortality represents both a defiance of natural laws and a symbol of the price paid for disrupting nature: "My agony was unbearable. Never since I was a human being had I felt such mental pain" (Rice 86). Louis articulates intense emotional and psychological torment. The term "agony" signifies an extreme level of suffering, while "unbearable" connotes a pain that surpasses his capacity for endurance. He emphasizes that this intensity of mental anguish is unparalleled since his metamorphosis from human to vampire, thereby emphasizing the considerable depths of his current despair. This depiction illustrates the substantial cost of transcending natural boundaries and the psychological toll exacted by such transgressions. It becomes clear that the quest for immortality is innately linked to a forfeiture of psychological equilibrium and harmony with nature. The existence of the swamp symbolizes a reminder of nature's self-regenerative capacity and resilience, while simultaneously warning that continued destruction will precipitate greater ecological disasters and human suffering.

From an ecogothic perspective, the swamp and vampires in *Interview with the Vampire* characterize not only the precarious relationship between nature and humanity but also the intense anguish engendered by environmental degradation. The menace of the swamp and the affliction of the vampires together constitute a cautionary tableau,

admonishing us that acts of ecological desecration will inevitably recoil upon us, implicating the imperative of symbiotic coexistence with the natural world.

The putrescent decay within the swamp mirrors the principled and mystical corruption of the vampires, engendering a sense of pervasive dread. The esoteric quality of Potter's discourse reveals a panoply of perceptions into the enigmatic landscapes within literature. By deploying an expansive lexicon, Potter's discussion of Le Fanu's landscapes can be applied to understand the swamp in *Interview with the Vampire* as a site of ecological and metaphysical significance. The swamp, much like Le Fanu's landscapes, can be seen as possessing a theological autonomy that resists human domination and interpretation. This aligns with Potter's argument that Le Fanu's landscapes "subvert the Adamic primacy of humanity over the environment" by positioning nature as an independent entity within the hierarchy of creation (Potter 111). The swamp in Rice's novel exemplifies a liminal space where anthropocentric perspectives are rendered obsolete, thereby symbolizing the power and mystery of the natural world.

In *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp embodies this autonomy through its dense, impenetrable vegetation and the pervasive sense of decay and rebirth. The swamp's very nature challenges the characters' attempts to control or fully understand it, thereby highlighting humanity's vulnerability and limited perception. This reflects Potter's assertion that such landscapes reveal "humanity's vulnerability while resisting the attribution of meaning" (Potter 113). The swamp emerges as a potent symbol of the inscrutable forces of nature that transcend human comprehension and demonstrate the existential limits of human agency.

In shedding light on the dance between humanity and nature, the ecogothic elements of the swamp embody a crucible for existential anxiety and metaphysical reflection. Indeed, the swamp's malevolent characteristics manifest the theme of nature's supremacy, thereby reinforcing the narrative's overarching exploration of ecological imbalance and human frailty. Also, this thematic resonance extends to the relationship between terror and the environment, a cornerstone of the ecogothic narrative. Parker points out the significance of "eco-phobia"—an irrational dread of nature—in Gothic literature (6). In *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp characterizes eco-phobic elements, signifying a locus where human dominion is subverted, and the monstrous facets of nature emerge with unsettling prominence. The swamp's sinister and unfathomable aspects amplify the theme of nature as an uncontrollable force, exacerbating the characters' existential dread.

Anthropomorphic attributes suffuse the environment with a palpable, almost human-like consciousness. Drawing upon Parker's discourse on animate forests, the swamp in

Rice's narrative is portrayed as a sentient, dynamic entity. Its perpetually shifting, perilous terrain and the eerie, almost cognizant presence that seems to scrutinize intruders underscore its vitality. This portrayal aligns with the Gothic tradition of depicting nature as an active agent within the narrative, rather than a mere passive environment, reinforcing the thematic depth and atmospheric intensity of the novel.

Concurrently, the swamp's animated essence conveys the fundamental tension between vitality and decay, illustrating its multifaceted role within the story. This complication segues seamlessly into the exploration of the swamp as a liminal space, blurring the lines between creation and destruction, a paradoxical interchange providing a region where boundaries obscure and oppositions converge. The concept of duality, central to Potter's analysis of Le Fanu's landscapes, is also pertinent to Rice's depiction of the swamp (115). In *Interview with the Vampire*, the swamp is a place where life and death coexist, mirroring the vampire's own liminal state between the living and the dead. This duality is essential to the Ecogothic, as it underlines the "struggle" between the natural and the supernatural (Keetley and Sivils 129). This thematic duality not only enhances the atmospheric complexity of the narrative but also signifies a commentary on the interconnectedness and cyclical nature of existence. The apposition of vitality and decay within the swamp implicates the essence of ecogothic literature, revealing the nexus crossing ecological realities and metaphysical anxieties.

9. Conclusion

In summation, the ecogothic paradigm within Anne Rice's *Interview with the Vampire* illustrates the dynamics involving humanity and nature through the symbolic representation of the swamp. This natural setting, with its enigmatic and multifaceted nature, is considered a potent metaphor for the knotty relationship crossing ecological systems and human existence. The swamp's duality, embodying both life and death, beauty and decay, mirrors the internal conflicts of the characters, particularly the vampires, who navigate their existence oscillating, straddling humanity and monstrosity. The novel's depiction of the swamp reinforces the themes of ecological disruption and the inherent consequences of humanity's attempts to dominate and exploit the natural world. The vampires' eternal struggle with their predatory nature and existential torment parallels the broader ecological anxieties concerning environmental degradation and the unsustainable exploitation of natural resources. This narrative framework amplifies the ecogothic critique of anthropocentric perspectives, denoting the need for a more harmonious and symbiotic relationship with the environment.

Furthermore, the swamp's portrayal as a liminal space where boundaries dissolve and oppositions converge magnifies the layered theme of the novel. It embodies the paradoxical synergy of creation and destruction, symbolizing the underlying instability and mystery of ecological systems. This dynamic interaction between the characters and their environment reveals the psychological and environmental ramifications of disrupting natural cycles, offering a commentary on the impacts of ecological imbalances.

By integrating elements of Gothic horror and ecological critique, *Interview with the Vampire* embarks on an exploration of the interconnectedness between human/vampire actions and environmental consequences. The novel's ecogothic perspective not only enhances the atmospheric and thematic depth of the narrative but also provides a critical framework for examining the cultural and ideological conflicts surrounding humanity's relationship with nature.

Ultimately, this analysis foregrounds the swamp as a symbol within the ecogothic tradition, reflecting the multifarious and often antagonistic interrelations between humanity and the natural world. The narrative's examination of these themes implicates the exigency to confront ecological anxieties and cultivate an awareness of our environmental entanglements. Through its evocative and multilayered depiction of the swamp, *Interview with the Vampire* articulates an agonizing critique of the fragile equilibrium between civilization and wilderness, pointing out the indomitable force and persistence of nature amidst human incursion. The paradoxical conjunction of beauty and decay in the swamp in *Interview with the Vampire* parallels the characters' internal struggles, augmenting the novel's gothic ambiance. Symbolizing isolation and chaos, the swamp supplies a clandestine arena for duels and violent confrontations that subvert societal norms. Furthermore, the swamp intensifies the tension involving humanity and monstrosity, imbuing the narrative with psychological depth and probing the primal instincts of survival. In short, the swamp's depiction reveals the complex and often disquieting relationship spanning nature and human ambition, illuminating the impact of ecological themes on the liminal existence of both human and nonhuman entities. The swamp, as a threshold space, mirrors the transitional beings—vampires—who inhabit it, reflecting their internal conflicts and implying the blurred boundaries involving control and the untamed forces of nature, a paradox of creation and destruction.

Works Cited

Bloom, Clive. *Gothic Horror a Guide for Students and Readers*. 2nd ed ed. London:

- Macmillan, 2007.
- Craven, Allison, and Diana Sandars. *Gothic in the Oceanic South : Maritime, Marine and Aquatic Uncanny in Southern Waters*. Abingdon: Routledge, 2024.
- Dang, Trang, Elizabeth Parker, and Michelle Poland. “The Ecogothic: An Interview with Elizabeth Parker and Michelle Poland.” *REDEN. Revista Española de Estudios Norteamericanos* 3.2 (2022): 113-28.
- Deb, Jiban Chandra, HM Tuihedur Rahman, and Anindita Roy. “Freshwater Swamp Forest Trees of Bangladesh Face Extinction Risk from Climate Change.” *Wetlands* 36 (2016): 323-34.
- Hudson, Kathleen, and Mary Going. *Religious Horror and the Ecogothic*. Ecocritical Theory and Practice. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2024.
- Hurtado, Victoria. “The Vampire, a Mythical Monster for Eternity.” *Corpus Mundi* 4.1 (2023): 75-88.
- Keetley, Dawn, and Matthew Wynn Sivils. *Ecogothic in Nineteenth-Century American Literature*. New York: Routledge, 2018.
- Kosloff, Spee, and Sheldon Solomon. “The Paradox of Faith: How Existential Concerns Motivate Both Prosocial and Antisocial Religious Behaviors.” *The Science of Religion, Spirituality, and Existentialism*. Elsevier, 2020. 435-54.
- Lundberg, Anita, Katarzyna Ancuta, and Agnieszka Stasiewicz-Bieńkowska. “Tropical Gothic: Arts, Humanities and Social Sciences.” *eTropic* 18.1 (2019): 1-11.
- Parker, Elizabeth. *The Forest and the Ecogothic: The Deep Dark Woods in the Popular Imagination*. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2020.
- Parks, Cecily. “The Swamps of Emily Dickinson.” *The Emily Dickinson Journal* 22.1 (2013): 1-29.
- Potter, Madeline. “Vampires and Theology.” *The Palgrave Handbook of the Vampire*. Springer, 2024. 91-107.
- Rice, Anne. *Interview with the Vampire*. New York: Ballantine Books, 2010.
- Sekhar, G Raja. “A Study of Eco-Criticism in English Literature.” *ACADEMICIA: An International Multidisciplinary Research Journal* 6.7 (2016): 12-23.
- Sulaiman, Nahidh Falih. “Environmental Elements and Their Symbolic Meanings in Selected Dramatic and Fictional Works.” *International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences* 5.13 (2019): 266-74.
- Van Assche, Kristof, Sandra Bell, and Petruta Teampau. “Traumatic Natures of the Swamp: Concepts of Nature in the Romanian Danube Delta.” *Environmental Values* 21.2 (2012): 163-83.

Vickers, Morgan P. “On Swampification: Black Ecologies, Moral Geographies, and Racialized Swampland Destruction.” *Annals of the American Association of Geographers* 113.7 (2023): 1674-81.

Wilson, Anthony. *Shadow and Shelter: The Swamp in Southern Culture*. Jackson: University Press of Mississippi, 2006.

本論文於 2024 年 7 月 1 日到稿，2024 年 9 月 4 日通過審查。

「文殊問疾」の物語を構築する要素について —表現技巧や人物描写の手法に着目して—

吉田文子/ Yoshida Fumiko

實踐大學高雄校區應用日文學系助理教授

Department of Applied Japanese, Shih Chien University, Kaohsiung Campus

【摘要】

講經文〈文殊問疾〉將《維摩詰所說經》〈文殊師利問疾品〉開頭一部分轉化成吸引聽眾的娛樂性故事，描述佛陀命令文殊菩薩去向維摩詰探病，文殊受命率領隨行者前往維摩詰居處之過程。與講經文相同，變文也是以佛經中的故事為題材而創作的。然而，變文是不受原經文情節的限制，可以自由展開故事內容，講經文則引用經文，依照經文內容展開故事情節，因此大致上不會偏離經文內容。雖然如此，〈文殊問疾〉使用經文、經疏中絕對看不到的通俗措辭，將佛陀、文殊、其他佛弟子等天界人物描繪成情感豐富、充滿人情味的存在，擁有不亞於變文的豐富故事性。本文著眼於講經文〈文殊問疾〉具有而變文沒有的限制—引用經文，很難偏離佛經大綱這一點，探討在此限制下所創造出來之豐富故事性。第二章進行講經文與經文、經疏之比較，探討兩者之間的根本差異。第三章聚焦於〈文殊問疾〉的表達技巧與人物描繪手法，探討構成其故事趣味性的要素。

【關鍵字】

文殊問疾、講經文、故事性、表達技巧、人物描繪

【Abstract】

"Manju visit a sick" is a narrative that has made a part of "Manjusri visit a sick" in "Vimalakirti Sutra" into a story that attracts the interest of the audience, and it depicts the process of how the Buddha ordered Manjusri to visit the sick Vimalakirti, and Manjusri received the order and led the attendants to the place of Vimalakirti. Bianwen, a narrative created based on historical events seen in Buddhist scriptures, just like Jiangjingwen(narratives of Buddhist scriptures), can freely develop stories without being restricted by the plot of the original Buddhist scriptures. On the other hand, Jiangjingwen quotes the sentences of Buddhist scriptures and proceeds the story

according to it, so in the main plot, it does not deviate greatly from the contents of Buddhist scriptures. However, "Manju visit a sick" uses popular phrases that can never be seen in Buddhist scriptures and Jingshu(explanation of Buddhist scriptures), and people in the heavenly world such as Buddha, Manju, and other Buddhist disciples are depicted as emotional and humane beings, and develops an interesting story that is no less interesting than Bianwen. This paper focus on the restrictions that are not in Bianwen in Jiangjingwen, that is, it is difficult to get out of the main plot because it quotes the sentence of the Buddhist scriptures, and study the interest of the story of "Manju visit a sick" created under such restrictions.

【Keywords】

Manju visit a sick, Jiangjingwen, interest of the story, expression techniques, character depiction

1. はじめに

講経文「文殊問疾」は『維摩詰所説經』「文殊師利問疾品」の冒頭の一部分を聴衆の興味を引くような物語に仕立て上げたものであり¹、仏が文殊菩薩に維摩詰の病気見舞いを命じ、文殊が命を受け供を率いて維摩詰のいる毘耶^{びや}へ向かうまでの過程が描かれている²。講経文と同様に仏典に見られる故事を元に作られた語り物としては「降魔変文」「破魔変文」といった変文が挙げられ、これらの講経文、変文のいずれも語りと唱とが交互に出現する表現形式を特徴としているが³、変文が元となる経文の筋書の制限を受けることなく自由に物語を展開し得るのに対し⁴、講経文は経文を引用しそれに沿って物語を進める

¹ 鳩摩羅什漢訳『維摩詰所説經』は『大藏經』第14冊(大正一切經刊行會編[1924-1934年]、台北・新文豐發行、1983年)に見られる。講経文「文殊問疾」に関しては、本稿では主なテキストとして項楚選注『敦煌變文選注』(成都・巴蜀書社出版、1988年初版・2002年増訂本出版)に収録のものを用いた。

² 維摩詰の住むヴァイシャリーの漢訳には「毗耶」「毘耶」「吠舍離」「吠舍離」などがあるが、本稿では講経文中に頻出する「毗耶」の異体字(毗)を正字(毘)にした「毘耶」を使用する。

³ 通常講経文や変文の形式的特徴を語る際には「『散文と韻文』が交互に出現する」、という言葉が用いられるが、この際の「散文」は七言句から成る韻文の部分に対して比較的散文的である、という意味で使われており、実際には字句構成が整った部分や対句の連続、押韻といった韻文的要素が含まれ、純然な散文とは言い難い。本稿では実質上の散文との混同を避けるため、「講唱文学」の「講唱」にヒントを得た私訳の「語りと唱」を使用する。

⁴ 変文の筋書展開や表現技巧に凝らされた創作上の工夫については以下の拙著を参照されたい。「『降魔変文』の物語としての面白さを構築する要素について—語りに見られる修辞技巧を中心に—」(『語文與國際研究』第22期、文藻外語大學、2019年12月)、「『破魔変文』の物語を構築する要素について—語りと唱に見られる表現技巧を中心に—」(『淡江外語論叢』第37期、淡江大學、2022年6月)。

形式を取る為、大筋においては經文の内容から大きく外れることがない。しかしながら「文殊問疾」にはその經文や經疏には決して見られない通俗的な言い回しが使われ、仏や文殊、その他の仏弟子といった天界の人物が感情豊かで人間味溢れる存在として描かれており、変文に勝るとも劣らぬ豊かな物語性を有している。本稿では講經文「文殊問疾」が經文を引用しその大筋から外れ難いという変文にはない制限を有する点に着目し、このような制限の下に生み出された豊かな物語性について考察する。第一段階として、まずは講經文と經文・經疏との比較を行うことにより、両者の根本的な相違点を明らかにする。次に「文殊問疾」の表現技巧や人物描写の手法に焦点を当て、その物語としての面白さを構築する要素について考察する。尚、本稿では「文殊問疾」の主なテキストとして、数多くの校勘意見を取り入れ仏教用語には仏典の用例を引くなど丁寧な語釈が付けられている『敦煌變文選注』を使用し⁵、校勘部分は『敦煌變文講經文因緣輯校』も参考とした⁶。

2. 講經文と仏典の根本的な相違点について

本章では講經文「文殊問疾」（以下講經文と略称する）とその經文・經疏との比較を行い、両者の根本的な相違点を明らかにする。比較の際のテキストとして、經文は『變文選注』の講經文中や項氏注に引用のものその他、鳩摩羅什漢訳『維摩詰所説經』を参照した。經疏は現存のもので講經文が作成された時代に最も近いとされている隋・吉藏撰『維摩經義疏』『維摩經略疏』を使用する⁷。『維摩經義疏』は經文の語句を随文解釈したもの、『維摩經略疏』は經文の大意を解釈したものであり、以下本稿ではそれぞれ義疏、略疏と略称する。『變文選注』では語りと唱との纏まりごとに校註がつけられており、その区切りに従うと「(1)仏の下命」「(2)文殊の受命」「(3)隨行を求める仏弟子達」「(4)維摩詰

⁵ 『敦煌變文選注』（以下本稿では『變文選注』と略称する）に収録の「文殊問疾」は『敦煌變文集』（王重民他編、北京・人民文學出版、1957年）の「維摩詰講經文」を原文としてそれに校註を付けており、『變文集』では羅振玉著『貞松堂藏西陲秘籍叢殘』（『羅雪堂先生全集』三編冊九、台灣・文華出版公司、1970年）に「文殊問疾佛曲」として収録されている文献の画像を元に校勘を行なっている。別に羅氏の『敦煌零拾』（『羅雪堂先生全集』三編冊七）には「佛曲三種」の「文殊問疾第一卷」として活字に起こしたものが見られる。

⁶ 周紹良・張湧泉・黃征輯校『敦煌變文講經文因緣輯校』（南京・江蘇古籍出版、1998年。以下本稿では『變文輯校』と略称する）。前書きによると、校勘に際しては先ず張・黃両氏が底本となる原本を『敦煌寶藏』などに収録の画像から書き写し、それに同文献の異本を見て校註を付けた後、周氏がそれらを纏めると共に過去の閲読の際の校訂意見を盛り込んで校録を施す、という方法が取られている。「文殊問疾」の校勘には『變文集』と同様に『貞松堂藏西陲秘籍叢殘』に収録の文献の画像を底本としている。

⁷ 經疏の選出においては平野顛照氏の以下の論文を参照した。「敦煌本講經文と仏教經疏との關係」（『大谷学報』第40号、大谷学会、1960年9月）、「敦煌本講經文と仏教經疏との關係-続(完)-」（『大谷学報』第41号、大谷学会、1961年10月）。『維摩經義疏』は前掲『大藏經』第38冊、『維摩經略疏』は『大藏新纂卍續藏經』第19冊（台北・白馬精舍印經會出版、2000年）に収録のものを使用した。

の下へ赴く文殊と随行者達」の四つの場面に分けられる。本章ではこの場面ごとに内容の比較を行い、また(1)から(4)の番号を場面番号として本章や次章の考察で該当場面を示す際に用いることとする。

2.1 仏の下命

講經文の場面(1)には大勢の菩薩や仏弟子達が見舞いを辞退する様が描かれているが、『維摩詰所説經』「文殊師利問疾品」は仏が文殊に見舞いを命じるところから始まっており⁸、他の者達が見舞いを辞退する様は「文殊品」ではなくその前の章の「弟子品」と「菩薩品」に見られる⁹。弟子品では十大弟子が、菩薩品では弥勒菩薩、光嚴菩薩、持世菩薩、善徳菩薩が見舞いを命じられるが、それぞれ過去に維摩詰に出会った際の状況を語り、その叡智に満ちた言説を引き合いにして「私にはこのようなお方の見舞いは務まりません」と断る、といった内容が繰り返される¹⁰。文殊品の義疏は「先に命に堪えぬは、他によって維摩詰の徳を顕す。今命に堪えるにより、維摩詰は自らその徳を顕す」「先に命に堪えぬは、維摩詰の智慧を明らかにする。今命に堪えるにより、その通慧を明らかにする」¹¹。弟子品や菩薩品での大勢の者達の見舞いの辞退に言及し、他の菩薩や仏弟子達の辞退は維摩詰の高徳や神通、叡智を顕すためであるという解釈である。

このように經文の思想的解釈に徹している經疏に対して、講經文では仏が見舞いに行く勇気のない仏弟子達の不甲斐無さを言い連ね、文殊の高徳や見目の良さを過剰なまでに褒めちぎるなど、經文や經疏には見られない表現がふんだんに盛り込まれている。維摩詰が如何に偉大な存在であるかを顕示するために描かれた見舞いの辞退が、講經文では「維摩詰に恐れをなし、あれこれ理由をつけて見舞いを断る不甲斐ない弟子達」という誠に人間味を帯びた物語に変化し、弟子達の辞退の模様を言い連ねつつ文殊を褒めちぎることにより、仏が他の弟子達の不甲斐なさをくどくどと嘆き最後の頼みの綱である文殊を懸命に説得する感情豊かな有様を描き出している。講經文は仏典の叙述に物語的解釈

⁸ 「仏告文殊師利、汝行詣維摩詰問疾」。

⁹ 『維摩詰所説經』の「文殊品」までの章立ては「佛國品第一、方便品第二、弟子品第三、菩薩品第四、文殊師利問疾品第五」となっており、維摩詰の発病は「方便品」に描かれている。

¹⁰ 十大弟子も菩薩も各々維摩詰の言説を引いて状況を説明したのち、皆一様に「故我不任詣彼問疾」という一言で見舞いを辞退する。弟子品の結尾には「如是五百大弟子各各向佛説其本縁、稱述維摩詰所言、皆曰不任詣彼問疾」、この部分の義疏に「弟子品二章、初命十人已訖。此下總明五百不堪。五百者、八千羅漢内、有五百高德名聞者也」とあり、十大弟子の他、その下位の五百の弟子も皆辞退したとする。また、菩薩品の結尾には「如是諸菩薩各各向佛説其本縁、稱述維摩詰言、皆曰不任詣彼問疾」、義疏に「此第二、三萬二千菩薩、各辭不堪、但文不備載耳」とあり、經文に詳述の四者を初めとする三万二千の菩薩が辞退したとしている。

¹¹ 「此品來意、有八因縁。一者、弟子品、是聲聞小道、菩薩品、為因位人、故並不堪問疾。文殊師利、為往古諸佛、故堪問疾也。(中略)四者、上命不堪、因他顯淨名徳、今因命堪、淨名自顯其徳。五者、上命不堪、多明淨名智慧、今因命堪、具顯其通慧」。

を思う存分施し、維摩詰の偉大さという教義伝達要素を物語を面白くするための要素として活用しているのである。また、文殊に対する過剰なまでの美辞麗句は、他の弟子達の不甲斐なさを際立たせる他、次段での文殊が仏命を断りたくても断れず思い悩み葛藤することへの伏線ともなっている。

2.2 文殊の受命

場面(2)の経文において、文殊は「維摩詰と渡り合うのは大層難しい(彼上人者難為訓對)」としてその叡智や高德を讃え、「それでも私は命を受けて見舞いに行く(雖然、當承佛聖旨、詣彼問疾)」と決意する¹²。義疏は「命を受けて行こうと思うも、先に維摩詰の徳を賞賛することにより、命を受け難き心が起こる」「維摩詰の徳はこのように高く、自分が対抗できるような相手ではないが、仏の意向を受けて行かねばならない」¹³、略疏は「文殊は仏の祖師であるにも関わらず、自力では任に堪えられないので仏の力に頼らなければならない。これによって維摩詰の奥深く不可思議な能力を知り、文殊が困難を感じながらも行く決意をするのは衆生のためであるということを知る」¹⁴。つまり経文の「彼上人者難為訓對」は、維摩詰は七仏の祖である文殊を持ってしても対抗し難い存在であるとする事により、維摩詰の人知を超えた能力を示しているという解釈である。

講経文はこれを物語的に膨らませ、「自分はまだまだ修行不足で弁舌が人より勝っている訳でもない」「今すぐ断りたいと思うけど、お釈迦様のお言葉に背くななんてとてもできない」「お言葉通りに見舞いに行きたいとも思うけど、他の自分より高德の人達を差し置いて行くななんて、きまりが悪くてしょうがない」「弁舌に長け仏法に通じた維摩詰の見舞い、自力ではとても務まらない。行くとしたら何が何でもお釈迦様の力に頼らなければならない」といったように、自分の能力に自信が持てず、仏直々の命令という重圧の下に思い悩む様子をこの場面の半分以上に渡って描いている。経文のたった四文字の「難為訓對」を何倍にも膨らませ、「遂行困難な任務を受けて苦悩する文殊」という物語に仕立て上げているのである。

2.3 随行を求める仏弟子達

場面(3)の経文において、他の菩薩・仏弟子・諸神達は「文殊と維摩詰が渡り

¹² 「文殊師利白佛言『世尊、彼上人者難為訓對。深達實相、善說法要、辯才無滯、智慧無闕、一切菩薩法式悉知、諸佛祕藏無不得入、降伏衆魔、遊戲神通、其慧方便、皆已得度。雖然、當承佛聖旨、詣彼問疾』」。

¹³ 「初章四者。一明欲受命而往、前嘆淨名之德、便往者起難遭之心。二正受命而往。三大衆隨從。四文殊與衆俱往。此初章也。」「『雖然、當承佛聖旨、詣彼問疾』、此第二受命而往。其德若此、非所堪對、當承聖旨、然後行耳」。

¹⁴ 「『雖然』下第三、受命。淨名雖德行難對、今當承佛力、詣彼問疾也。文殊是往古佛、尚稱不堪、當承佛力。故知淨名不思議、為衆生故爾耳」。

合うとなれば、きっと素晴らしい仏法談義が交わされるに違いない」と考え、妙法聞きたさに文殊の毘耶行きへの随行を望む¹⁵。義疏は「文殊と維摩詰という聖賢が揃ったからには今まで聞いたことのないような仏法を聞くことができるだろうと思い随行を望む」¹⁶。

講経文では文殊の見舞い行きを知った天界・人界の者達は我も我もと声を上げて随行を申し出る。大勢の者達が随行を求めて文殊を取り囲み、競い合うかのように宝物で飾り立て音楽奏で香を焚き、歓喜に沸く中で仏に別れを告げて毘耶へと向かう様子が描かれている。経文の要が「大勢の者達が二人の聖賢の交わす妙法を聞きたがる」ことであるのに対して、講経文では冒頭から中盤以降までその点には一言も触れず、随行を求めてにぎやかな隊列を成す様ばかりが描かれる。結果として、場面(1)での見舞いの辞退から一転、態度を急変させて我も我もと文殊に追隨する仏弟子達の日和見的な言動が際立ち、仏法談義の聴講はまるで後付けの理由であるかのような印象を与える。経文の要である仏法談義が講経文では副次的要素として描かれており、経文の思想的解釈に徹している経疏に比して、講経文は物語としての面白さを徹底的に追求したものであることが分かる。

2.4 維摩詰の下へ赴く文殊と随行者達

場面(4)の経文において、文殊は菩薩・仏弟子・天人達を従えて維摩詰のいる毘耶離城へと入りゆく¹⁷。義疏は「上には仏の意向に従うため、下には機縁(悟りを開ききっかけ)を益すために、大勢の者と共に行く」¹⁸。

講経文では文殊を先頭に毘耶へと向かう一行の華やかな隊列や瑞祥に満ち溢れた周囲の情景が全段に渡って描かれている。義疏が「大勢の者を引き連れて行くのは仏命に従い機縁を益すため」と思想的解釈をしているのに対し、講経文では大勢の随行者が成す隊列の見た目の華やかさをひたすら描き、この場面を物語の終幕としている。経文ではこの後に維摩詰と文殊の仏法談義の様子が描かれ、そこが正に「文殊品」の重要部分となっているのだが、講経文は経文の冒頭のほんの一部分しか引用しておらず、しかもそれは物語を導き出すための前置きのような存在となっているのである¹⁹。

¹⁵ 「於是衆中諸菩薩・大弟子・釋・梵・四天王等、咸作是念『今二大士文殊師利維摩詰共談、必說妙法』。即時八千菩薩、五百聲聞、百千天人皆欲隨從」。

¹⁶ 「此第三、大衆隨從。既有勝聖、必說妙法、故率欲聞所未聞」。

¹⁷ 「於是文殊師利與諸菩薩・大弟子衆及諸天人、恭敬圍繞、入毗耶離大城」。

¹⁸ 「此第四、文殊正往。上順佛旨、下益機縁、故與衆俱往」。

¹⁹ 講経文における経文の役割に言及したものとして、北村茂樹著「敦煌出土所謂『維摩詰經講経文』の二つの系統について」(『北陸史学』24号、金沢・北陸史学会、1975年11月)が挙げられる。この論文は『敦煌變文集』に収録された六種類の「維摩詰經講経文」について、第二種と第一・四・五・六種(第六種は羅振玉『敦煌零拾』所収の「文殊問疾第一卷」との系統が異なることを指摘したものであるが、その中で北村氏は第二種を「講経文A類」、第一・四・

3. 「文殊問疾」における表現技巧や人物描写の手法について

前章に見られるように、講経文は経文を引きつつもそこに物語的解釈を存分に施し、ほんの数文字の内容を何倍にも大きく膨らませ、経文の教義伝達要素を副次的要素として描いている。講経文各場面の冒頭に引用された経文は物語を導き出すための前置きのような存在となっており、講経文は物語としての面白さを徹底的に追求したものであることが分かる。仏典における仏や文殊が人知を超えた叡智を兼ね備え衆生を救う存在であるのに対し、講経文の仏や文殊は普通の人間と同様に嘆き焦り苦悩する存在として描かれており、このような仏典と講経文との人物像の落差がまた講経文の物語としての面白さを生んでいる。仏のアメとムチを用いた必死の説得、遂行困難な任務と仏の過剰な賛辞をプレッシャーに感じ思い悩む文殊、形勢の変化を見て取り態度を急変させ文殊に追従する仏弟子達、といったように、感情豊かな存在として描かれたそれぞれの登場人物は物語において相乗効果を生み出し、それが更なる面白さを作り出している。本章ではこれらの人間味溢れる人物描写が講経文の物語を構築する上での重要なポイントとなっていると捉え、「仏の説得」、「文殊の葛藤」、「仏弟子達の日和見的态度」に焦点を当て、そこに見られる表現技巧や人物描写の手法について考察する。

本章に引用の原文の下線は対句部分を表し、二句一対、四句一対など対句の一つの纏まりを一区切りの連続した下線で示す。文字の校勘は項氏のテキストに従い欠字の補足は〔 〕、誤字の修正は()で示す²⁰。原文の語感やリズムを正確に読み取るため、原文読解や分類、考察を終え、論文の構成がほぼ定まった最終段階において訳出を行った。訳は紙幅の都合で本稿末の[付録]に纏めて記したので参照されたい²¹。

3.1 仏の説得

①言仏告者、是仏相命之詞。緣仏於會上、告盡聖賢、八千菩薩、五百聲聞、

五・六種を「講経文B類」とし、以下のように述べている。「『講経文B類』においては経文の思想的解釈よりも、経文のもつストーリーに重点が置かれてくる。そこでは『経』として引用される経文は、解釈されるためのものではなく、ストーリーを進めるためのものになっているようにさえ思われる」。

²⁰ 本稿に引用の原文①から⑧の中で『變文選注』と『變文輯校』とで校勘意見が異なる部分は②と⑦に見られる以下の三点で、いずれも解釈の上での大きな意味の違いを及ぼすものではない(以下『變文選注』は選、『變文輯校』は輯と略称する)。②選「至仏而無人敢去」輯「至底而無人敢去」、選「具爾許多威名」輯「具爾許之威名」、⑦選「調颺玲玲之琵琶」輯「調瑟玲玲之琵琶」。

²¹ 既存の訳として『大乘仏典 中国・日本篇 10』(福井文雅他訳、中央公論社、1992年)に所収の松尾良樹氏の手によるものがあるが、本稿では論文の独自性を打出すために敢えて拙訳を作成した。

從頭遣問、盡曰不任。皆被責呵、無人敢去。酌量才辯、須是文殊。其他小小之徒、實且故非難往。失(適)來妙(善)德、亦是不堪。今仗文殊、便專問去。於是有語告文殊曰。

①は場面(1)冒頭の經文「仏告文殊師利、汝行詣維摩詰問疾」に続く語りであり、『仏が告げる』とは仏が文殊に命じるということである」という經文の「仏告」の語釈から始まり、この段の經文にはない仏が文殊に声を掛けるまでの経緯が描かれている²²。仏は法会の席で大勢の仏弟子達に維摩詰の見舞いを命じるが、誰もが悉く「私には務まらない」と辞退し、「皆仏に叱責されるも、見舞いに行く勇氣のある者が一人もない」「文殊の他の雜魚共にはそもそも務まるはずもない」といったように、仏が仏弟子達を叱り飛ばし、小者扱いしてなじるなど、經文・經疏には決して見られない通俗的な言い回しが使われている。この段の半分以上が四言句で構成され、四言句という短句の連続が語りのテンポの良さを生み出している。

②於是菴園會上、勅喚文殊「勞君暫起於花臺、聽我今朝勅命。吾為維摩大士、染疾毗耶、金粟上人、見眠方丈。會中有八千菩薩、筵中見五百聲聞。從頭而告盡遍差、至仏而無人敢去。舍利弗(子)聰明第一、陳情而若(苦)不堪任。迦葉是德行最尊、推辭而為年老邁。十人告盡、咸稱怕見維摩、一會遍差、羞着者怕於居士。吾又見告於彌勒、兼及持世上人、光嚴則辭退千般、善德乃求哀萬種。堪為使命、須是文殊。敵論維摩、難偕妙德。汝今與吾為使、親往毗耶、詰病本之因由、陳金僊之懇意。汝看吾之面、勿更推辭、領師主之言、便須受勅。況乃汝久成證(正)覺、果滿三祇、為七仏之祖師、作四生之慈父。來辭妙喜、助我化緣。下降娑婆、爾(示)現於菩薩之相。你且身嚴瓔珞、光明而以舒空、頂覆金冠、清淨而如蓮映水。一名[獨]超於法會、衆望(聖)難偕、辭辯迴播於筵中、五天讚說、慈悲之行廣布、該三途六道之中、救苦之心遍施、散三千界之剎內。當生之日、瑞相十般。表菩薩之最尊、彰大士之无比。而又眉彎春柳、舒揚而宛轉芬芳、面若秋蟾、皎潔而光明晃曜。有如斯之德行、好對維摩、具爾許多威名、堪過丈室。況以居士、見染纏疴、久語而上算不任、對論多應虧汝。勿生推辭、便仰前行。領大衆而速別菴園、逞威儀而早過方丈。龍神盡教引路、一伴同行、人天總去相隨、兩邊圍繞。到彼見於居士、申達慈父之言、道吾憂念情深、故遣我來相問。」

前掲①の末句「於是有語告文殊曰(そうして仏は文殊に告げる)」には仏のセリフである七言八句の唱が続き²³、仏は文殊の高徳を讃えつつ毘耶へ見舞いに行くよう命じる。それに継いで「^{あんらおん}そうして菴羅園の法会の席で文殊に命じて言

²² 前章第一節で言及のように「文殊品」は仏が文殊に見舞いを命じるところから始まっており、他の者達が見舞いを辞退する様は「文殊品」ではなく「弟子品」と「菩薩品」に見られる。

²³ 「三千界内總聞名、皆道文殊藝解精。體似蓮花敷一朵、心如明鏡照潭清。常宣妙法邪山碎、解演真乘障海傾。今日筵中須受勅、與吾為使廣嚴城」。

う」で始まる②の語りもまた仏のセリフであり、改めて文殊に毘耶行きを命じ、他の仏弟子達の辞退の模様を言い連ねる。「舍利弗は聡明さ随一であるにもかかわらず、あれこれ理由をつけて自分には到底務まらないという。大迦葉は品德を至極重んじているというのに、自分は体の衰えた老いぼれだからといって断ってきた」「十大弟子の全てに命じたが、皆維摩詰に会うのは恐ろしいという。法会の席の全ての者を名指ししたが、皆維摩居士との対面に怯えている」「弥勒や持世といった菩薩の面々にも命じたが、光嚴菩薩は何度も辞退し、善徳菩薩はご容赦下さいと幾度も哀願する」。こうして他の者達の不甲斐なさを言い連ねた後には、この使命に耐え得る者は最早お前の他にはいないと言葉を尽くして文殊を褒めそやす。「そなたは正覚成して久しく、三阿僧祇劫の修行を経て仏果を得、七仏の祖師、四生の慈父となった者」「珠玉の首飾りを身につけ、その輝きは夜空に広がる月明かりのよう。金の冠を戴く姿は清らかで水面に映える蓮のよう」「この広い宇宙でただ一人の超越した存在で、他に並ぶものがない。その言説は法会の席に遍く伝わり五天竺の者皆褒め称える」「眉は春柳のようで美しく広がる曲線が誠に美しい。顔は秋の月のように白く清らかに光り輝く」。褒め言葉の前後や合間には命令口調が差し挟まれ、「私の面前で辞退するなど断じてならぬ」「主である私の言葉を聴き入れ命を受けよ」「辞退はならぬ、見舞いに行け」と所々で釘を刺す。

大勢の弟子達が次々と見舞いを辞退する様を二者二様ずつ対にして言い連ね、文殊の徳高く見目麗しい様も対を成す美辞麗句で褒めちぎる、といったように対句や対句的表現が多用されており²⁴、対句の連なる排偶対を成している²⁵。これらの排偶対の中には数字を当て嵌める鑲嵌の技巧が見られ²⁶、「八千菩薩、五百個聲聞」「十人告盡、一會篇差」、「辞退千般、求哀萬種」「七仏之祖師、四生之慈父」「一獨超於法會、五天讚説」「三途六道之中、三千界之剎内」「一伴同行、兩邊圍繞」といったように前後句に字音と意味とでの繋がりが生じ、リズムカルな調子を生み出している²⁷。また、対句中には「而、之」といった類字が頻出し²⁸、これもまた対句の連なりの中に同音を断続的に繰り返す調子

²⁴ 字数が一字違いで揃わなくとも内容的に対と見なせる部分は原文中に破線で示した。対句に見られる「錯綜」については後述の注 41 参照。

²⁵ 黄慶萱著『修辭學』（台北・三民書局、1965 年）には「排対」の定義として「二つ以上の対句によって構成されたものであり、排偶対、排比対とも称する」（621 頁）とある。本稿では「排比」との区別が明確な排偶対を用いる。また、中国語の修辭法に関する定義や用語は著書によって異なることが間々あるので、本稿においては黄氏の『修辭學』に従うこととする。

²⁶ 鑲嵌は数字や東西南北、春夏秋冬といった特定の文字を言葉や文の中に当て嵌める技巧である（『修辭學』719-752 頁参照）。原文中のゴシック体は鑲嵌部分を示す。

²⁷ 他に「久成正覺、果滿三祇」の「久」は「九」と同音であり、その後に「七仏、四生」と続くことから、この部分も一連の鑲嵌と捉え得る。

²⁸ 同じ文字や言葉を連ねる疊字に対し、句中や句間において同じ文字や言葉を断続的に繰り返すのが黄氏の定義における「類字」である（『修辭學』532-533 頁参照）。原文中のゴシック斜体は類字部分を示す。

の良さを生み出している。このように様々な修辞技巧を駆使した表現によって他の弟子達の辞退の様子を言い連ね、文殊を褒めちぎっており、仏が他の弟子達の不甲斐なさをくどくどと嘆き、最後の頼みの綱である文殊を必死になって説得する感情豊かな有様を描き出している。また、文殊を言葉を尽くして褒めちぎりつつも所々で「辞退はならぬ」「仏命を遂行しろ」などと高圧的な言い方をするなど、アメとムチを使って説得する様が誠に人間味を帯びている。

③ 1 仏有偈告讚文殊、[唱]「牟尼會上稱(再)宣陳、問疾毗耶要顯真。受勅且希離法會、依言勿得有辭辛。維摩丈室恩吾切、臥病呻吟已半旬。望汝今朝知我意、權時作個慰安人」。²⁹

2 又有偈告文殊曰、[唱]「八千菩薩衆難偕、盡道文殊足辯才。身作大(七)僊師主久、名標三世號如來。神道(通)解滅邪山碎、智慧能銷障海摧。為使與吾過丈室、便須速去別花臺」。

3 [唱]世尊會上告文殊、a「為使今朝過丈室。傳吾意旨維摩處、申問懇勸勿得遲。前來會裏衆聲聞、個個推辭言不去。皆陳大士維摩詰、盡道毗耶我不任。衆中彌勒又推辭、筵內光嚴申懇款。八千大士無人去、五百聞聲(聲聞)沒一個過。汝今便請速排諧、萬一(萬)與吾為使去。威儀一隊相隨逐、銜勅毗耶問淨名。 b 菩薩身為七仏師、久證功圓三世仏。親辭淨土來凡世、助我宣揚轉法輪。巍巍身若一金山、蕩蕩衆中無比對。眉分皎潔三秋月、臉寫芬芳九夏蓮。堪為丈室慰安人、堪共維摩相對論。堪將大衆菴園去、堪作毗耶一使人。便依吾勅赴前程、便請如今別法會。若逢大士維摩詰、問取根由病所因。文殊德行十方聞、妙德神通百億說。能摧外道皆歸正、能遣魔軍盡隱藏。依吾告命速前行、依我指蹤過丈室。懇勸慰問維摩去、巧着言詞問淨名。」

③は②の語りに続く五十六句にも渡る七言の唱で、仏は再度言葉を尽くして文殊に見舞い行きを促す。最初の七言八句(1)では「維摩詰が病室で私のことを切に思っており、病に伏して既に五日が経つ」と病床で仏に思いを寄せる維摩詰を引き合いに「私の意を汲み暫し維摩詰の慰問役を務めよ」と見舞い行きを促し、次の七言八句(2)では「神通で邪念の山を打ち砕き、智慧で罪障の海を消し去る」などと文殊の高徳を讃えて「私の使者として方丈を訪れよ。蓮華座を離れて直ちに行くのだ」と促す。続く七言四十句(3)は、前半十五句(a)で「八千の菩薩誰一人として行こうとせず、五百の^{しょうもん}声聞どの一人も訪れようとしない」などと他の仏弟子達の辞退の模様を言い連ねて「さっさと身支度を整えよ。私の使者として必ずや行かねばならぬ」と使命遂行を促し、後半二十四句(b)では「空高く盛り上がるその身は金の山のように、遙か遠くまで広がるその様は多衆の中の無比の存在」「外道を挫いて正道に引き戻し、魔軍は追

²⁹ 説明の際の便宜上、③と後掲⑧には区切りごとにアラビア数字やローマ字を付した。また、語り部の叙述に続く唱の部分は改行せず、[唱]と記すことによって唱の始まりを示した。

い遣られて姿消す」などと再度文殊を褒めそやし、「直ちに命に従って出立し、今すぐこの法会の席を去るのだ」「命に従い即刻行くのだ。指示通りに方丈を訪れよ」と促す。七言のリズムに乗って、「こうだから行け、ああだから行け、どうだから行け」というパターンが繰返され、ここにも仏が言葉を尽くし必死になって文殊を説得する様が鮮やかに描き出されている。bの文殊を褒め讃えて見舞い行きを促す部分には「堪、便、能、依」を前後句で繰り返す類字の技巧が見られ、「**堪**為丈室慰安人、**堪**共維摩相對論。**堪**將大衆菴園去、**堪**作毗耶一使人」「**便**依吾勅赴前程、**便**請如今別法會」「**能**摧外道皆歸正、**能**遣魔軍盡隱藏」「**依**吾告命速前行、**依**我指蹤過丈室」といったように、同音の繰り返しが七言の唱のリズムに更なる調子の良さを生み出している³⁰。

3.2 文殊の葛藤

④陳情謙讓、多為使於毗耶、讚彼淨名、表上人之難對。聲聞五百、證八智於身中、菩薩三千、超十地於會上。文殊雖承聖旨、當日思忖千般。「**只**擬辭退於筵中、**又**怕逆如來之語。**只**欲便(使)於方丈、有(又)恥衆內之高人。世尊若差我去時、今日定當過丈室。」

場面(2)の冒頭において、文殊は七言八句の唱で仏に感謝の意を表して命を受け³¹、更に七言八句の唱で維摩詰を讃える³²。④はそれに続く語りで、語り部の叙述を通して文殊の心中の思いが描かれている。見舞行きの命を受けたものの文殊の頭の中には様々な思いがよぎり始め、「法会の席で断りたいと思うけど、如来様のお言葉に背くななんてとてもできない」「お言葉通りに見舞いに行きたいとも思うけど、自分より高德の人達を差し置いて行くななんて、きまりが悪くてしょうがない」「それでも如来様のお指図を受けたからには、見舞いに行かなければならない」。このように、今この場で断りたい、釈迦に逆らうなんてとんでもない、他の優秀な人達を差し置いて行くななんて、などと、文殊の心の内が語られている。その前の仏命を受ける唱の中にも「私は能力に乏しく弁才もない。度量も智慧も十分でない」という言葉が見られるが、それは場面(1)の仏の賛辞に対する謙遜に過ぎず、④に見られるほど率直な心中を表す言葉ではない。

⑤文殊受仏告勅、起立花臺、整百寶之頭冠、動八珍之瓔珞。香風颯颯、搖玉佩以珊珊、瑞色氤氳、惹珠衣而瀝瀝。適蒙慈悲聖主、會上宣揚、大覺牟尼、

³⁰ 類字の他に、文殊への賞賛の「巍巍身若一金山、蕩蕩衆中無比對」には「巍巍、蕩蕩」といった同じ字音を繰り返す疊字の擬態語が用いられている。

³¹ 「特蒙慈父會中宣、感激牟尼爭不專。自揣荒虛無辯海、度量智慧未周圓。金人既遣過方丈、妙德須遵大覺僊。去即不辭為使去、幸憑聖力賜恩憐」。

³² 「方丈維摩足辯才、詞江浩浩衆難偕。能談妙法邪山碎、解講真經障海隈。六道每朝興教網、三途長日救輪迴。雖為居士同凡輩、心似秋蟾霧裏開」。

筵中告語。千般讚嘆、何以勝當、百種談論、實斯悚惕。世尊遣教為使、往問維摩詰、彼上之(之上)人、難為酬對。况文殊雖居菩薩之位、理未通和(知)、於仏會之中、言非出衆。世尊勅交(教)為使、不敢推辭。銜仏命而多恐不任、仗聖力而必應去得。伏以維摩居士、具四般之才辯、告以難偕、現廣大之神通、鹵莽不易。深達實相、善契諸仏之心、无滯詞峰(鋒)、法式婆薩之語。總持秘密、無不通和(知)、上中下之音、悉皆盡會。今我若自往問、實愧不任、須仗聖威、然乃去得。由是文殊受勅、大衆忻然、菴園草草盡商量、隨從文殊過丈室。

前掲④の語りの後、文殊は七言八句の唱で改めて命を受け見舞いに行く意を表す³³。⑤はそれに続く語りであり、ここにもまた語り部の叙述を通した文殊の心の内が表現されている。「お釈迦様は私を維摩詰の見舞いに遣わそうとなさるも、彼の偉大なお方と渡り合うなんて、困難極まりない。まして自分は菩薩ではあるとはいっても仏法の真理に精通している訳ではなく、弁舌が人より勝っている訳でもないのだし。でもお釈迦様自らのご命令、断るなんてとんでもない」「命を受けたものの自分にはとても務まらない。お釈迦様のお力に頼った上でというのならばちゃんと務まるとは思うが」「維摩詰相手に自力で見舞いに行くなんて、気が引けてとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の力に頼らなければ。それでこそやっと思えるというもの」。自信がないが断るに断れない、維摩詰相手に自力では到底無理、仏の力に頼らない訳にはいかない、といったように、命を受けて身支度を整えるに際しての心中の複雑な思いが描かれている。自信の無さや不安を表す言葉の合間には維摩詰への賛辞が差し挟まれ、「自分はそれほどの者ではないのに、それに引き換え維摩詰は…」というように、維摩詰の偉大さは文殊の自信の無さや不安を引き起こす要因の一つとして挿入されている。

④⑤ともに前掲②の語りと同様の対句や対句的表現を中心とした構成で鑲嵌・類字も多く使われ、リズムカルな語り口調を成している³⁴。このような修辞技巧を駆使した表現の中に文殊の複雑な胸の内が切々と語られており、中でも④の「只擬辭退於筵中、又怕逆如來之語。只欲使於方丈、又恥衆内之高人」は辭退の場合と承諾の場合との対比により、命を断るにしても受けるにしてもどちらを取っても困難が生じてしまう、と二者の間で揺れ動き思い悩む様が効果的に表現されている。また、⑤の「銜仏命而多恐不任、仗聖力而必應去得」「若自往問、實愧不任、須仗聖威、然乃去得」には自力の場合と他力の場合との対比により、文殊の自信無く不安になり仏にすがり頼む思いがまざまざと描き出

³³ 「既蒙聖主遣慰勸、不敢推辭向會陳。銜勅定過方丈室、宣恩要見淨名尊。金冠動處祥光現、月面舒時瑞色新。此日聖賢皆總去、吾為首領盡陪輪」。

³⁴ 鑲嵌・類字の他に、前半の身支度を整える様子の描写部分(香風颯颯、搖玉佩以珊珊、瑞色氤氳、惹珠衣而瀝瀝)には、芳しい風の吹く様に疊字の擬態語「颯颯」が、佩玉が鳴り響く様、辺りに満ちた瑞気が衣服に触れる様に疊字の擬音語「珊珊、瀝瀝」が用いられている。

されている。

⑥文殊啓白慈悲主、「蒙仏會中盡告語。教往毗耶問淨名、自慚詞淺如何去。世尊處分苦丁寧、不敢筵中陳懇素、若遣毗耶問淨名、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。維摩詰、金栗主、四智三身功久具、若遣須教問淨名、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。辯才无礙是維摩、深入諸仏之意趣、問疾毗耶恐不任、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。世尊會上特申宣、遣往毗耶方丈去、敵對維摩恐不任、須**憑大聖垂加護**。我今藝解實非堪、枉受如來垂蔭覆、問疾毗耶恐不任、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。金栗尊、號調御、示現白衣毗耶住、既沐如來教問時、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。往毗耶、辭化主、逡巡即是登途去、今朝銜勅問維摩、**遙憑大聖垂加護**。」

前掲⑤の語りの後、文殊は⑥の七言四十句の唱で仏に向かって心中の思いを吐露する³⁵。「毘耶へ維摩詰の見舞いに遣わされるなんて、私のような弁舌能力に劣る者がどうやって行けというのでしょうか」と無理難題を前に自分の能力に自信が持てず途方に暮れる様子から始まり、「毘耶へ維摩詰の見舞いに遣わされるなんて、どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすがらなければならない」「毘耶への見舞いなんて自力ではとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすがらなければならない」「維摩詰と渡り合うなんて自力ではとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすがらなければならない」「私のような修行不足の者ではとてもじゃないが任に堪えない。何が何でも如来様の庇護を受けなければならない」といったように、冒頭から中盤までの三十二句中に「毘耶行きは自力ではとても務まらない。何としてでもお釈迦様の力に頼らなければならない」という趣旨の字句が八回に渡って繰り返される³⁶。所々に差し挟まれる維摩詰への賛辞は、⑤と同様に文殊の自信のなさを引き起こす要因の一つとして挿入されている。自信のなさや仏を頼る思いを七言のリズムで何度も繰り返すことにより、沸々と湧き出てくる不安を仏にすがることによって必死になって打ち消そうとする、文殊の切実な思いが写し出されている。

この段の唱には「維摩詰、金栗主」といった三言句の二連続が三回差し挟まれている。ここで「○」は一字一音節、「|」は拍節、「×」は休音を表すと、七言句は「○○ | ○○ | ○○ | ○× |」のように表示され、七言句は拍数でいうと四拍、三言句は「○○ | ○× |」というように二拍となり、三言の二連続は七言一句と同じ四拍のリズムとなる³⁷。その一方で、七言一句の休音が一回

³⁵ この段には三言句の二連続が三回差し挟まれているが、ここでは三言二句を一つの単位と捉え、三言二句で七言一句分として数える。後述の三言二句と七言の拍節リズム参照。

³⁶ 同じ字を句中や句間で繰り返す類字に対して、同じ句を断続的に繰り返すのが類句であるが(『修辭學』533頁参照)、この段の類句「遙憑大聖垂加護」は断続的に六回繰返され、一字違いの「須憑大聖垂加護」も含めれば七回となる(類句に見られる「錯綜」については後述の注41参照)。「枉受如來垂蔭覆」は字面的には類句ではないが、意味としては同様である。原文中の類句は類字同様ゴシック斜体で示した。

³⁷ 古典詩歌の詩句は二文字が一つのリズムの基本単位となるということは多くの研究者の指摘するところであり、特に中国や台湾の研究者の間においては感覚的に自明のこととして捉え

のみなのに対して三言二句の休音は二回となり、短い単位で区切れる歯切れの良さを生み出す。七言多句の中の所々に三言二句を差し挟むことにより、四拍のリズムを保ちつつも短い単位で区切れるという変化をもたらし、調子の良さを生み出している。また三言二句はそれを冒頭句とする意味の上での切れ目ともなっている。

場面(2)の前半に置かれた三つの七言八句の唱と⑥の唱はそれぞれ始まりの部分「文殊が偈にて仏に申すには(文殊有偈白佛)」「又も偈にて維摩詰を讚するには(又有偈讚維摩)」「その時文殊は偈にて(時文殊有偈)」「文殊が慈悲の聖主に申すには(文殊啓白慈悲王)」となっており、いずれの唱も文殊が発した直接の言葉である。一方④⑤の語りは語り部の叙述を通して間接的に発せられた文殊の心中の葛藤であり、これとは異なり直接の言葉である冒頭三つの唱には心中の率直な思いは唱われていない³⁸。つまり場面(2)において、唱は仏や法会の席の他者の面前での表立った発言、語りは口には出して言えない心中の思い、というように唱と語りの役割が分かれており、前半三つの唱では心中の葛藤は口にせず、この場面最後の唱である⑥においてようやく不安な思いを吐露している。仏や他の者の面前では毘耶行きを快諾しつつも心中不安で仕様がなく、一人密かに悩み葛藤し抜いた末に皆の前で心中の思いを吐露し毘耶行きを決意するのであり、文殊の表向きの顔とその裏での苦悩とが唱と語りの役割分担によって見事に描き出されている。

3.3 仏弟子達の日和見的态度

⑦由是文殊受勅、為使毗耶。將傳聖主之言、垂問維摩大士。會上有八千個菩薩、筵中五百個聲聞、見文殊問疾毗耶、盡願相命為伴。三三五五、皆願隨車。不論天衆夜叉、咸道陪充侍從。於是天人浩浩、龍衆喧喧。空中散百種之花、地上排七珍之寶。帝釋梵王之衆、捧玉幢於師子座前、龍王夜叉之徒、執寶幢(幡)於菩薩四面。雖即未離於仏會、威儀已出於菴園。鑼鈸擊琤縱(琤)之聲、音樂奏嘈讚(嘈)之曲。阿修羅等調颺玲玲之琵琶、緊那羅王敲駁犖犖之羯鼓。乾闥婆衆吹妙曲於雲中、迦樓羅王奏簫韶於空裏。是時菴園會上、聖衆無邊。文殊將別於世尊、大衆咸言於侍從。比丘尼等爭爇旃檀之香、優婆夷徒各競焚於龍腦。盡乞隨於大士、齊聲同白世尊。願仏聽許從文殊、往問維摩居士去。慈尊聽許、大衆歡忻。圍七仏之祖師、過一丈之石室。

場面(3)では冒頭の経文に続き、⑦の語りで大勢の者達が毘耶への随行を求め様が描かれる。「法会の席の八千の菩薩、五百の声聞は文殊の毘耶への見舞

られている。本稿では松浦友久著『リズムの美学—日中詩歌論』(東京・明治書院、1991年)に従い、「拍節リズム」「休音」という用語を使用する。

³⁸ 三つ目の唱に「法会の席で断るなんてできない(不敢推辭向會陳)」という一言があるが、④⑤における率直な言葉の数々に比べるとごく控えめである。

い行きを知ると、皆お供したいと願ひ出る」「我も我もと皆口々に随行を申し出て、天人も夜叉も皆従者になりたがる」といったように、場面(1)での弱腰から一転、皆態度を急変させて文殊に追隨する。皆が随行を求めて文殊を取り囲み、「空には百種の花を撒き散らし、地には七種の宝物を並べ立てる」「帝釈天・梵天は玉の経幢きょうどうを捧げて獅子座の前に位置し、龍王・夜叉は七宝飾りの旗を持って四方を固める」「阿修羅は琵琶をベンベンと弾き鳴らし、緊那羅は羯鼓きん な ら かっ こをトントンと打ち鳴らす」「乾闥婆けん たつ ばは美しい調べを雲間に吹き鳴らし、迦楼羅天は優美な音色を空に奏でる」「比丘尼は争って梅檀きそ せんたんを蒸たき、優婆夷う ぱ いは競って龍腦を焚く」、といったように、対句の連なる排偶対によってにぎやかで華やかなお供の行列の様が描かれる³⁹。

- ⑧ 1 維摩臥疾於方丈、仏勅文殊專問當。宣與天龍及鬼神、滿空滿路人無量。仏勅下、排儀仗、帝釋梵王亦令往。不揀迦樓乾闥婆、鼓樂清歌任吹唱。緊那羅、藥叉將、要去如來不攔障。讚法催(摧)邪左右排、浩浩喧喧皆悅暢。烈(列)英雄、皆拒抗、卓犖神姿魔膽喪。外振威(稜)蘊內慈、當時總願趨方丈。萬萬千千皆個儻、勢似滄溟排巨浪。雜沓奔騰盡願行、隊隊叢叢皆別樣。菩薩僧、小或長、盡白慈尊願隨往。善男善女亦陪行、一一如來无怪障。排枇(比)了、甚爽朗、簫瑟箏篪箏留(笛)嚮。爐焚沉檀雜寶香、萬萬千千皆合掌。文殊謙、世尊獎、菩薩聲聞小為長。便須部領衆人行、不要遲疑住時餉。
- 2 文殊辭、盡瞻仰、銜命毗耶論義廣。為看維摩說法功、**一齊禮別黃金相**。到彼中、見法匠、切磋琢磨要爽朗、普使人天悟正真、**一齊禮謝黃金相**。沐慈尊、總容放、去入毗耶宿因曩、得遇論空二上人、**一齊禮謝黃金相**。散香花、乘寶象、獅子金毛最為上、去送文殊問疾源、**一齊暫別黃金相**。語喧喧、樂嚮(響)亮、妙德威風上中上、八千菩薩與聲聞、**一齊暫別黃金相**。

⑧は前掲⑦に続く七言五十二句の唱で⁴⁰、大勢の随行者達の様子が再度描かれる。前半三十二句(1)においては、「仏法讚し邪を挫いて左右に居並び、わいわいがやがや皆心弾む」「英雄居並び互いに張り合い、卓越したその雄姿に魔物も肝を喪う」「何千何万の皆々が卓越した豪邁で、その勢いはまるで大海に居並ぶ大波のよう」「菩薩も僧も老いも若きも、皆が仏に随行を請う。善男善女も随行求め、如來は誰一人として阻むことない」といったように、勇ましく猛々しい隊列や人界天界の大勢の者達が随行を求めてにぎわう様子が描かれる。後半二十句(2)では随行者達は毘耶へと向かうべく、皆揃って仏に別れを告げる。「一齊禮別黃金相」「一齊禮謝黃金相」「一齊暫別黃金相」というように、間の一、二字を少し換えつつ「一齊〇〇黃金相」を五回に渡って繰り返す

³⁹ 前掲②④⑤の語りと同様に鑲嵌・類字が多く見られ、守護神達が琵琶や打楽器を奏でる様には「颺玲玲、駁犖犖」といった暈字の擬音語が用いられている。

⁴⁰ ⑧には三言二句の組み合わせが 11 箇所差し挟まれているが、注 35 で言及のように三言の二連続は三言二句で七言一句分として数える。

ており⁴¹、大勢の随行者達が心一つに声を上げて別れを告げる、歡喜に満ち溢れた様が表現されている。随行者達がにぎやかで華やかな隊列を成す様は⑦の語りにも描かれているが、⑧ではそれを七言のリズミカルな唱に乗せた異なる表現で再現し、また皆が口を揃えて分かれを告げる模様を繰返すことにより、総勢が一致団結し歡喜に沸く模様が巧みに描き出されている。また、この段には三言二句の組み合わせが総計十一箇所に見られ、前掲⑥に見られる三言二句と同様に意味の上での切れ目となるとともに短い単位で区切れる歯切れの良さを生み出している。

場面(1)では毘耶行きを尻込んでいた者達がこの場面では手のひらを返すように随行を求め、歡喜とにぎわいに満ち溢れた様が全段通して描かれている。場面(1)との劇的な落差が誠に物語的であり、形勢の変化を見て態度を急変させ、文殊に追隨する仏弟子達の様が実に人間味を帯びている。前章で言及のように、この段の経文の要は「大勢の者達が二人の聖賢の交わす妙法を聞きたがる」ことであるにも関わらず、講経文では冒頭から中盤以降に至るまで随行を求めてにぎやかで華やかな隊列を成す様ばかりが描かれている。終盤でようやく、「維摩詰訪ねて仏法聞くため、皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ」「彼の地へ行き仏法に精通した大師様に会い、切磋琢磨して全てが明瞭明白、人界の者も天界の者も誰もが仏法の真を悟る」「前世の因縁善くして毘耶行き叶い、二人の大師様の仏法談義を聞く機会がやってきた」、といったように仏法談義の聴講に言い及ぶ。結果として、態度を急変させて我も我もと文殊に追隨する仏弟子達の日和見的な言動が際立ち、仏法談義の聴講はまるで後付けの理由であるかのような印象を与える。

4. おわりに

講経文「文殊問疾」では仏や文殊、仏弟子達といった天界の人物が感情豊かで人間味溢れる存在として描かれており、仏は対句などの修辞技巧を駆使した語りの中で弟子達の不甲斐なさをくどくどと嘆き、最後の頼みの綱である文殊を美辞麗句で褒めそやしつつ強い口調で任務遂行を促し、アメとムチを使って懸命に説得する。更に七言の唱では「こうだから行け、ああだから行け、どうだから行け」というパターンが繰り返され、ここにも仏が言葉を尽くして必死に説得する様が鮮やかに描き出されている。文殊の心中の葛藤は語り部の叙述を通して切々と語られ、場面最後の七言の唱では自信のなさや仏を頼る思いを何度も繰返すことにより、沸々と湧き出てくる不安を仏にすぎることによって必死になって打ち消そうとする、文殊の切実な思いを表現している。また唱は

⁴¹ 注 36 に言及の通り同じ句を断続的に繰返すのは類句であるが、ここに見られるように間の一、二字を少し換えて繰返すのは「錯綜」で、類句のみならず、対句・排比・層遞といった字句数を揃える修辞法に変化が加わったものを指す(『修辞學』755 頁参照)。

他者の前での表立った発言、語りは口には出して言えない心中の思い、と使い分けることにより、法会の席では毘耶行きを快諾しつつも心中不安でしようがなく、一人密かに悩み葛藤し抜いた末に皆の前で心中の思いを吐露し毘耶行きを決意する、というように、文殊の表向きの顔とその裏での苦悩とを巧みに描き出している。見舞いを尻込んでいた仏弟子達は文殊の毘耶行きが決まるや否や手のひらを返すように随行を求め、にぎやかで華やかな隊列を成し、期待を膨らませて歓喜に湧き上がる。その劇的な落差は誠に物語的であり、形勢の変化を見て態度を急変させ、文殊に追隨する仏弟子達の様が実に人間味を帯びている。このように感情豊かな存在として描かれたそれぞれの登場人物は物語において相乗効果を生み出し、仏の過剰なまでの賛美の言葉は仏弟子達の不甲斐なさを強調すると同時に文殊を悩ませる重圧の元となり、仏が延々と口にして嘆く仏弟子達の見舞い辞退の様子は、後に手のひら返して随行を求める者達の日和見的な態度を際立たせる。「文殊問疾」は経文を引用しその大筋から外れ難いという制限がありながらもそこに物語的解釈を存分に施して何倍にも大きく膨らませ、様々な表現技巧を駆使して登場人物を人間味豊かに描き、物語としての面白さを徹底的に追求したものである。

【付録】

*引用文①から⑧の訳。仏語の語釈は()内に記す。

①経文の「仏が告げる」とは仏が文殊に命じることである。仏は法会の席で聖人賢人、八千の菩薩、五百の声聞達全てに見舞いを命じるが、誰もが悉く「私には務まらない」という。皆仏に叱責されるも、見舞いに行く勇氣のある者は一人もいない。色々と考えあぐねた結果、まさに文殊菩薩、これより他にいない。他の雑魚共にはそもそも務まるはずもない。ついさっき声をかけた善徳菩薩でさえも任に堪えられないというのだ。ここは文殊に頼り、見舞いに行かせよう。そうして仏が文殊に告げるには…。②そうして菴羅園あんらおんの法会の席で文殊に命じて言うには、「しばし蓮華座を離れ私の命に聴き従えよ。毘耶で病に罹った維摩詰、方丈(一丈四方の居室)の間に伏す金粟上人こんぞくしやうにん(金粟如来の化身、即ち維摩詰)のために。法会の席の八千の菩薩、五百の声聞達全てに見舞いを命じたが、行く勇氣のある者が一人もいない。舍利弗しゃりほつは聡明さ随一であるにもかかわらず、あれこれ理由をつけて自分には到底務まらないという。大迦葉かしょうは品德を至極重んじているというのに、自分は体の衰えた老いぼれだからといって断ってきた。十大弟子の全てに命じたが、皆維摩詰に会うのは恐ろしいという。法会の席の全ての者を名指ししたが、皆維摩居士との対面に怯えている。弥勒や持世といった菩薩の面々にも命じたが、光嚴菩薩は何度も辞退し、善徳菩薩はご容赦下さいと幾度も哀願する。この使命に耐え得る者はまさ

しく文殊、お前に他ならない。維摩詰と対等に渡り合うとしたら、妙徳(文殊)に並ぶものはいない。私の使いとして毘耶へ行き病気の原因を尋ね、私の懇意を伝えよ。私の面前で辞退するなど断じてならぬ。主である私の言葉を聴き入れ命を受けよ。そなたは正覚成して久しく、三阿僧祇劫(途方もなく長い時間)の修行を経て仏果を得、七仏の祖師、四生の慈父となった者。極楽浄土に別れを告げ、私の教化の手助けをせよ。人界に降り立ち菩薩の相を顕わすのだ。珠玉の首飾りを身につけ、その輝きは夜空に広がる月明かりのよう。金の冠を戴く姿は清らかで水面に映える蓮のよう。この広い宇宙でただ一人の超越した存在で、他に並ぶものがない。その言説は法会の席に遍く伝わり五天竺の者皆褒め称える。慈悲はありとあらゆる場所に広がり、三途六道の全てを覆い尽くす。苦難を救う心は遍く施され、三千大千世界の国々に行き渡る。生誕の日には十種の瑞祥が現れ、菩薩の中で最も尊く無比の存在感を放つ。眉は春柳のようで美しく広がる曲線が誠に美しい。顔は秋の月のように白く清らかに光り輝く。このような品德を備えているのだから維摩詰と渡り合うのにぴったりで、こんなにもたくさんの威名を博しているのだから維摩詰の見舞いに十分堪え得る。ましてや維摩居士は長患いの身、長く話せば他の弟子達相手でも持ち堪えられないだろうし、そなたと一対一となれば到底敵わないであろう。辞退はならぬ、見舞いに行けよ。皆の者を率いて菴羅園を離れ、従者を連れ立ち即刻方丈を訪ねよ。龍神達が先払いを務めて行列の一辺に侍り、人界の者も天界の者も皆付き従って左右を取り囲む。彼の地で維摩居士に会い私の言葉を伝えよ。仏の憂いの念誠に深く、我を見舞いに遣わしたのだと。③1 仏は偈(韻文体)にて文殊に告げる。「この法会の席で改めて宣告する。毘耶へ見舞いに行き、仏法の真を顕わせよ。命を受けこの法会の席を去るのだ。言いつけ通りにせよ。労苦を辞してはならぬ。維摩詰が病室で私のことを切に思っており、病に伏して既に五日が経つ。私の意を汲み暫し維摩詰の慰問役を務めよ。2 仏は又も偈にて文殊に告げる。「八千の菩薩の一人として並ぶ者がなく、皆が弁舌に優れた文殊こそ見舞い役に相応しいという。七仏の師と成って久しく、三世に渡って如来と称す。神通で邪念の山を打ち砕き、智慧で罪障の海を消し去る。私の使者として方丈を訪れよ。蓮華座を離れて直ちに行くのだ」。3 a 世尊は法会の席で文殊に告げる。「使者となり今すぐ方丈を訪れよ。維摩詰に私の意を伝え、懇切丁寧に病状を尋ねるのだ、一刻も早く。法会の席で声聞達は誰も彼も辞退し行かぬという。皆口々にいうのだ、相手は維摩詰という大人物、毘耶行きは自分には務まらないと。弥勒菩薩も他の大勢の者達同様に辞退するし、光厳菩薩は法会の席でご容赦下さいと懇願する。八千の菩薩誰一人として行こうとせず、五百の声聞どの一人も訪れようとしな。い。さっさと身支度を整えよ。私の使者として必ずや行かねばならぬ。供の者どもを従え、命を受け毘耶に浄名(維摩詰)の見舞いに行くのだ。b 文殊菩薩は七仏の師で、正覚久しく功德

円満な三世の仏。浄土を離れて俗世に行き、我に代わって仏法を広く知らしめよ。空高く盛り上がるその身は金の山のように、遙か遠くまで広がるその様は多衆の中の無比の存在。眉は白く清らかに輝く秋の月明かりのよう。顔は芳しい香りを放つ夏の蓮の花のよう。方丈の慰問役に堪え、維摩詰との渡り合いに堪え、菴羅園の皆を率いるに堪え、毘耶への使者となるに堪え得る。直ちに命に従って出立し、今すぐこの法会の席を去るのだ。維摩詰に会ったら病の原因をしっかりと尋ねよ。文殊の徳は十方遍く伝わり、妙徳の神通は百億の者を説く。外道を挫いて正道に引き戻し、魔軍は追い遣られて姿消す。命に従い即刻行くのだ。指示通りに方丈を訪れよ。ねんごろに維摩詰をいたわり、言葉を尽くして浄名を見舞うのだ」。④(文殊は)毘耶行きは誠に重要な使命とかしこまり、渡り合うには実に難しい相手と浄名を褒め称える。法会の席にいる五百の声聞達は八の智慧を身につけており、三千の菩薩達は十の境地を超えている。仏命を受けたものの、文殊の頭の中には様々な思いがよぎり出す。法会の席で断りたいと思うけど、如来様のお言葉に背くななんてとてもできない。お言葉通りに見舞いに行きたいとも思うけど、自分より高德の人達を差し置いて行くななんて、きまりが悪くてしょうがない。それでもお釈迦様の指図を受けたからには、維摩詰の見舞いに行かねばならない。⑤文殊は仏の命を受けて蓮華座から身を起こし、宝石の鏤められた冠と珠玉の首飾りの位置を整え身支度する。慈悲の聖主、釈迦牟尼様は法会の席の皆の前で申し渡された。お褒めの数々、これに勝るものはない。お言葉の数々、誠に恐れ多い。お釈迦様は私を維摩詰の見舞いに遣わそうとなさるも、彼の偉大なお方と渡り合うなんて、困難極まりない。まして自分は菩薩ではあるとはいっても仏法の真理に精通している訳ではなく、弁舌が人より勝っている訳でもないのだし。でもお釈迦様自らのご命令、断るなんてとんでもない。命を受けたものの、自分にはとても務まらない。お釈迦様のお力に頼った上でというのならばちゃんと務まると思うが。維摩居士ときたら、説法にすこぶる長けておりその弁舌に敵う者はない。そのとてつもない神通力を振るわれたらちょっとやそつとの者ではどうにも相手にならない。諸法実相(宇宙永劫の不変の真理)に深く達しており、諸仏の心意にぴたりと合致する。弁舌爽やかで滞ることなく、その言葉は菩薩の規範となる。密教にも精通しており、信仰の度合いの異なるどんな人の声を聞いても全てを理解することができる。こんな維摩詰を相手に自力で見舞いに行くななんて、気が引けてとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の力に頼らなければ。それでこそやっと思えるというもの。こうして文殊が命を受けると菴羅園の者達は皆大喜び。たちまちざわざわとさざめき出し、文殊の見舞いについて行こうと言い始めた。⑥文殊が慈悲の聖主に申すには、「仏様の法会でのお言葉の数々承りました。毘耶へ浄名の見舞いに遣わされるなんて、私のような弁舌能力に劣る者がどうやって行けというのでしょうか。お釈迦様があまりにも懇ろに

申し付けなざるものだから、断りたいなんて法会の席ではとても言い出せませんでした。毘耶へ浄名の見舞いに遣わされるなんて、どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。維摩詰は金粟如来の化身、四種の智慧と三種の姿を備えている。浄名の見舞いに行くなんて、どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。弁舌爽やかな維摩詰、諸仏の心に深く入り込む。毘耶への見舞いなんて自力ではとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。お釈迦様は法会の席で特別に申し渡された。毘耶の方丈へ見舞いに行けと。維摩詰と渡り合うなんて自力ではとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。私のような修行不足の者ではとてもじゃないが任に堪えない。何が何でも如来様の庇護を受けなければなりません。毘耶への見舞いなんて自力ではとても務まらない。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。金粟上人、調御丈夫じょうごじょうぶの称号持ち、在家の御身で毘耶に住まう。命を受けて見舞いに行くこの時、どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。毘耶に往かんと教化の師主に別れを告げ、この場を退き出立する。今まさに命を受けて維摩詰の見舞いへと行く。どうしたってお釈迦様の御加護にすぎなければなりません。⑦こうして文殊は命を受け、毘耶に使わされることになった。お釈迦様のお言葉を伝え、維摩居士を労わりに行くのだ。法会の席の八千の菩薩、五百の声聞は文殊の毘耶への見舞い行きを知ると、皆お供したいと願ひ出る。我も我もと皆口々に随行を申し出て、天人も夜叉も皆従者になりたがる。こうして人界の者も天界の者も龍王達も皆わいわいがやがや騒ぎ立てる。空には百種の花を撒き散らし、地には七種の宝物を並べ立てる。帝釈天・梵天は玉製の経幢きょうどう(経文を刻んだ玉柱)を捧げて獅子座の前に位置し、龍王・夜叉は七宝飾りの旗を持って四方を固める。まだ法会の会場を離れていないというのに、お供の行列は既に菴羅園から溢れ出ている。法螺どうぼや銅鈸どうぼつ(銅製のシンバル)の音が高らかに鳴り響き、音楽奏でて誠ににぎやか。阿修羅は琵琶をベンベンと弾き鳴らし、緊那羅きんならは羯鼓かつかをトントンと打ち鳴らす。乾闥婆けんたつばは美しい調べを雲間に吹き鳴らし、迦楼羅天かるらてんは優美な音色を空に奏でる。この時菴羅園の法会の場にはあまたの諸神が廣大無辺にひしめき合う。文殊はお釈迦様に別れを告げんとし、大勢の者達がお供を申し出る。比丘尼きそは争って栴檀せんたんを熱き、優婆夷うはいは競って龍腦を焚く。皆が文殊の随行を乞い願ひ、声を揃えて仏に許しを請う。お釈迦様、文殊に随行して維摩居士の見舞いに行くこと、どうかお許しください。仏様のお許し出て、皆大喜び。七仏の祖(文殊)を取り囲み、維摩詰のいる石室へと向かう。⑧1 維摩詰は方丈の間で病に伏し、仏は文殊に見舞いを命じる。天龍や鬼神にも申し渡すと、空も道も数えきれないほど多くの者達で満ち溢れる。仏は命を下してお供の行列を差配し、帝釈・梵天も遣わされる。迦楼羅天も乾闥婆も誰も彼も、樂器鳴らし歌声上げる。緊那羅も夜叉も、

行くと言えは如来は阻まぬ。仏法讚し邪を挫いて左右に居並び、わいわいがやがや皆心弾む。英雄居並び互いに張り合い、卓越したその雄姿に魔物も肝を喪う。外見勇ましく内に慈悲の心を秘め、その時全ての者が方丈行きを乞い願う。何千何万の皆々が卓越した豪邁で、その勢いはまるで大海に居並ぶ大波のよう。がやがやざわざわ随行求め、どの隊列も皆特別で一様でない。菩薩も僧も老いも若きも、皆が仏に随行を請う。善男善女も随行求め、如来は誰一人として阻むことない。隊列整い気分朗らか、簫・瑟・笙篳・箏・笛の音響く。香炉には沈香・檀香などの貴重な香木を焚き、何千何万の者どもが皆手を合わせる。文殊はかしこまり仏は褒め称え、菩薩も声聞も老いも若きも、皆を率いていざ出発。猶予はならぬ、一刻も早く。2文殊は仏を仰ぎ見て別れを告げ、命を受けて毘耶へ仏法談義に行く。維摩詰訪ねて仏法聞くため、皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ。彼の地へ行き仏法に精通した大師様に会い、切磋琢磨して全てが明瞭明白、人界の者も天界の者も誰もが仏法の真を悟るため、皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ。随行望む全ての者がお釈迦様のお許しいただいた。前世の因縁善くして毘耶行き叶い、二人の大師様の仏法談義を聞く機会がやってきた。皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ。芳しい花を撒き散らし宝で飾った象に乗る。文殊の乗った金毛の獅子が一番上等。文殊に付き添い見舞いへと、皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ。わいわいがやがや音楽高らか、妙徳の威風はとびっきり。八千の菩薩と声聞、皆で揃ってお釈迦様にお別れ。

参考文献

- 平野顕照(1960)「敦煌本講経文と仏教経疏との関係」『大谷学報』40 大谷学会
平野顕照(1961)「敦煌本講経文と仏教経疏との関係-続(完)-」『大谷学報』41 大谷学会
黄慶萱(1975)『修辭學』台北・三民書局
北村茂樹(1975)「敦煌出土所謂『維摩詰経講経文』の二つの系統について」『北陸史学』24 金沢・北陸史学会
項 楚(1988)『敦煌變文選注』成都・巴蜀書社出版
松浦友久(1991)『リズムの美学-日中詩歌論』東京・明治書院
周紹良・張湧泉・黄征(1998)『敦煌變文講経文因縁輯校』南京・江蘇古籍出版

本論文於 2024 年 7 月 4 日到稿，2024 年 10 月 28 日通過審查。

**Ambivalence and Ambiguity:
Truths Veiled and Truths Revealed in
Euripides' *Hippolytus***

吳瑜雲 / Yu-Yun Wu

淡江大學英文學系助理教授

Department of English, Tamkang University

【摘要】

*Parrhesia*一詞源於尤里庇狄思的希臘悲劇。傅柯在《說真話》一書中系統性地探討 *parrhesia* 意涵，將其界定為一種傳達「無畏懼地說真話」口語實踐，蘊含五大核心要素：坦率、真理、批評、責任和極端的不計冒險。傅柯明確指出此概念不僅是一種需要勇氣的修辭性真理遊戲，更是一種深刻的道德立場。本文旨在剖析此概念在個人和古希臘政治層面中的關鍵意涵，檢視《希帕里特斯》作品中，主要角色如何透過自由言說真相的活動彰顯此字的真義。此外，本文亦揭示尤里庇狄思以出色技巧將這部悲劇賦予了統一而貫串的主題論述：闡明說真話與隱藏真話的重疊並置，以及突顯真相及虛假之曖昧難辨。

【關鍵字】

尤里庇狄思、《希帕里特斯》、傅柯、無畏懼地說真話、重疊並置、曖昧難辨、真相

【Abstract】

The term *parrhesia* originates in Euripides' Greek tragedies. In *Fearless Speech*, Foucault systematically explores the critical meaning of *parrhesia* as a verbal commitment of truth-telling comprising five essentially core elements: frankness, truth, criticism, obligation, and, in the utmost form, without regard for risk-taking. He pointedly identifies the concept as not simply a rhetorical truth game demanding courage but as a profound

moral stance. This paper aims to analyze the distinctly vital features of *parrhesia* in both personal and ancient Greek political contexts, focusing on the word's meticulous applications to the occurrences of *parrhesiastic* enunciation by key characters in *Hippolytus*; moreover, this article also demonstrates how Euripides brilliantly imbues this tragedy with the unified thematic points: the enigmatic ambivalence of truth-revealing and truth-hiding, highlighting the representation of the ambiguous interplay between truth and falsehood.

【Keywords】

Euripides, *Hippolytus*, Foucault, *parrhesia*, ambivalence, ambiguity, truth

The term *parrhesia* [παρρησία], first appearing in Euripides' drama *Hippolytus*, was analyzed by Foucault in six lectures delivered at the University of California, Berkeley in the fall of 1983, later published as *Fearless Speech*. In his seminar, entitled "Discourse and Truth," Foucault systematically discloses the core meaning of *parrhesia* as the verbal activity of truth-speaking, involving five constituent elements: frankness, truth, criticism, obligation, and, in its most extreme form, risk-taking; he also investigates the term in the philosophic-literary context of Euripides' dramas. This article analyzes the prominent attributes of *parrhesia*, both in personal and ancient Greek political contexts, and exhibits its splendid applications to the speech actions of central characters in *Hippolytus*. My explicit purpose is to uncover the unifying themes of Euripides' work: the ambivalence of truth-telling and truth-hiding, as well as the ambiguous interplay of truth and falsehood.

In literature, a character who wishes to avoid veiling a belief or who does not want to exert any rhetorical or sophistical device—the *parrhesiastes* [παρρησιαστής], typically translated as "one who speaks the truth" or "truth-teller"—"frankly" endeavors to affect other people's hearts through the most direct expression possible. In Foucault's words, "The specific 'speech activity' of the *parrhesiastic* enunciation thus takes the form: 'I am the one who thinks this and that'" (13). Here, Foucault links *parrhesia* to *parrhesiastes*, compelling us to recognize the speaker as both the enouncing subject and the subject of the utterance (the speaker's own opinion); "frankness," moreover, merits the position as the primary feature of *parrhesia*.

Second, following Foucault, we must distinguish negative *parrhesia*—a type of logorrhea (Zapata 151)—from positive *parrhesia*, which represents a concord of faith and truth. On the one hand, "there is a pejorative sense of the word not very far from

‘chattering,’ and which consists in saying any—or everything one has in mind without qualification . . . —even the most stupid or dangerous things” (Foucault 13). However, in most Greek texts from the late fifth century B.C., *parrhesia* carries a more positive sense, leading us to its second attribute: a precise consistency between belief and truth. “It is not improbable to envisage positive *parrhesia*, a concordance of *logos* and *bios*, as an exercise of the self enacted on the self” (Zapata 151). From Foucault’s perspective, the Greek literary *parrhesiastes* knows what is true and sincerely expresses what he believes to be true (since it really is so), never imagining his statement or proposition as false; his possession of certain moral and social qualities secures this truth achievement (Foucault 15). That is, the real truth-teller cultivates a singular relationship to truth through frankness and belief.

Third, *parrhesia* is unquestionably related to the demands of risk-taking (sometimes, but not always, the risk of one’s own life), and there is a danger in entering the *parrhesiastic* game: “. . . in its extreme form, telling the truth takes place in the ‘game’ of life or death” (ibid. 16). Thus, in practicing *parrhesia*, the genuine truth-speaker forges a bond to his own life, even as he establishes a specific relation between himself and the Other—for danger can, and often does, emanate from the Other. As such, a notable mark of the truly earnest *parrhesiastes* is the courage to elevate oneself to the position of truth-teller, notwithstanding the dangers involved. For instance, the fourth-century B.C. Greek philosopher Socrates is portrayed by Plato in *The Apology of Socrates* as a real-life incarnation of the literary *parrhesiastes* (though Plato never uses the word). By persisting in his philosophy and faith, Socrates challenges and criticizes his interlocutors, exposing the fallacies in their beliefs. He asserts his right to be a gadfly, to sting the sluggish horse (thereby implying that Athens is in decline), and to persuade his fellow Athenians to prioritize the pursuit of justice, truth, and piety in a time of chaos. He dedicates himself to identifying universal Truth and emphasizes the immortality of the soul. However, in the aftermath of their defeat by the Spartans, the Athenians, tired of this *parrhesiastes*’s voice, tried and executed Socrates in 399 B.C.

The fourth characteristic of *parrhesiastic* activity is criticism, directed towards both the self and the Other, but ultimately aimed at the interlocutor. The enounced truth and beneficent advice offered by the *parrhesiastes* may wound or enrage the interlocutor; when a true confession is made to a social superior, the *parrhesiastes* risks incurring castigation for perceived wrongdoing. Foucault makes this point in *Fearless Speech*:

“This is the way you behave, but that is the way you ought to behave.” “This is what I have done, and was wrong in so doing.” *Parrhesia* is a form of criticism, either towards another or towards oneself, but always in a situation where the speaker or confessor is in a position of inferiority with respect to the interlocutor. The *parrhesiastes* is always less powerful than the one with whom he speaks. The *parrhesia* comes from “below,” as it were, and is addressed towards “above.” (17-18)

According to Foucault, the fifth and final characteristic of *parrhesia* is the obligation imposed by a sense of duty. The forthright advisor or frank confessor, who is at liberty either to utter the truth or choose silence for safety, acknowledges a moral imperative to engage in the *parrhesiastic* enunciation; this may be directed towards self-improvement or towards caring for others. In essence, the verbal activity of *parrhesia* reflects the fact that “the speaker uses his freedom and chooses frankness instead of persuasion, truth instead of falsehood or silence, the risk of death instead of life and security, criticism instead of flattery, and moral duty instead of self-interest and moral apathy” (ibid. 20).

In *Hippolytus*, the thematic corpus involves several dichotomies: man and woman, speech and silence, truth and falsehood, moral ethics and blind drives, moderation and hubris, forgiveness and revenge, culture and nature, loyalty and betrayal, passion and callousness. While the word *parrhesia* itself does not function as a central motif, the Euripidean tragedy nevertheless offers scenes of *parrhesia* that merit concern and consideration, scenes that call forth its meanings and qualities, particularly its associations with the ambivalence of truth-speaking and truth-hiding. By examining occurrences of *parrhesiastic* utterance in *Hippolytus*, I elucidate the ambiguity between truth and deception.

In *Fearless Speech*, Foucault expounds on occurrences of *parrhesiastic* enunciation in Euripides’ six tragedies, notably *Ion*, which he deems representative of *parrhesiastic* tragedy. The play is, in fact, dedicated to “the problem of *parrhesia* since it pursues the question: who has the right, the duty, and the courage to speak the truth? This *parrhesiastic* problem in *Ion* is raised in the framework of the relations between the gods and human beings” (27). Regarding *parrhesia* in *Hippolytus*, I raise the following questions: Who is empowered to utter the truth? In what situations is truth-telling paramount? What are the consequences of disclosing the truth? Correspondingly, the *parrhesiastic* scenes themselves suggest related problematics: Who fabricates falsehoods or conceals reality? Under what conditions is concealing the truth deemed critical? What are the consequences

of such concealment? My subsequent analysis of these questions underscores the profound disunion between truth-telling and the employment of deceptive speech or silence.

Although he does not detail the specific scene in *Hippolytus*, Foucault identifies Phaedra's confession of her ignominious love for her stepson as a demonstration of personal *parrhesia*, contrasting it with *parrhesia* as a political act performed by a male citizen for the state. Here I offer a more meticulous examination of this instance. Following the scene depicting Hippolytus' arrogant disdain for the love goddess Aphrodite, an interrogation ensues between Phaedra and her trusted Nurse; this stichomythic match—a verbal fencing contest—brings a significant secret to light. As Roisman points out, “Scholars’ appraisal of the Nurse in the *Hippolytus* is not laudatory. She is usually seen as a parody of the sophists: pragmatic, cynical, and full of doubt” (47). Afflicted by her mistress's desperate suffering, the devoted Nurse relentlessly questions Phaedra, ultimately eliciting the queen's veiled confession of her incestuous love for Hippolytus:

PHAEDRA: I will. For I respect your rights in pleading so.
NURSE: Then I'll be silent. Now it is for you to speak.
PHAEDRA: O my mother, what a love, poor thing, you fell into!
NURSE: Is what you mean, my child, her passion for the bull?
PHAEDRA: You too, my wretched sister, Dionysus' wife.
NURSE: What is it, child? You speak ill of your family....
PHAEDRA: Ah! I wish that you could say the words I have to say.
NURSE: I am no prophetess to make the dark things clear.
PHAEDRA: What do they mean when they say people are in love?
NURSE: Something most sweet, my child, and also painful too.
PHAEDRA: I must be one who feels the painfulness of it.
NURSE: What's this you say? You are in love, my child?
With whom?
PHAEDRA: There is a man I know, the son of the Amazon . . .
NURSE: Hippolytus?
PHAEDRA: You heard it from your lips, not mine. (Euripides 488)

Like Creusa in *Ion*, Phaedra “manifests the same reluctance to say everything, and manages to let her servant pronounce those aspects of her story which she does not want to confess directly—employing a somewhat indirect confessional discourse” (Foucault 56). Instead of voicing a public critique of Athenian political or military life (women being

confined to the domestic sphere), Phaedra, in a mode of “truthful self-criticism and reproach,” unveils not only her own vulnerability and illicit love, but her family’s scandalous and tragic erotic legacy; this includes her mother Pasiphae’s unnatural desire for a wondrous white Cretan bull and her sister Ariadne’s abandonment by Theseus on Naxos. In so doing, Phaedra discloses her own perceived disgrace with a degree of “courage.”

Another example of *parrhesia* emerges immediately after Phaedra’s confession of her infatuation with Hippolytus. Although consumed by the torment of a shameful attachment to her chaste stepson, the otherwise respectable Queen still demands of herself the role of a loyal and honorable wife. Far from moral apathy and self-interest, she confides to her Nurse her resolution to sacrifice her own life to solve her quandary. As wife and mother, she refuses to dishonor the marriage bed and her children’s future; she longs for her sons to live unencumbered by scandal, proud of their royal lineage and mother, and free to perform political *parrhesia*. Here, we see that Phaedra, like Medea and Clytemnestra, is driven to take a dark action by her “intense emotional commitment to house and family” (Segal 1993, 228):

PHAEDRA: And then I hate the women who in words are chaste,
while hiding secretly their bold dishonest deeds....
This is the thing, my friends, that drives me to my death:
lest I be found to have brought shame on my husband
and on the children whom I bore. I want them free
to live and **free to speak** and prosperous to dwell
in glorious Athens, famous for their mother’s sake.
Consciousness of a father’s or a mother’s sins
enslaves a man, however stout his heart may be.
(Euripides 490; emphasis mine)

This frank speech thematically mirrors the play’s pivotal conflict: the tension between truth-speaking and truth-hiding, honor and dishonor, reason and desire, light and dark, reality and illusion. Although remaining silent about her passionate desire torments Phaedra, to utter such a truth would unmask both dishonor and depravity. Despite her internal turmoil, at this moment, the queen “criticizes candidly” the deceitful doings of other disingenuous women, elevating honor over personal gratification; she does so from a sense of familial obligation to her family and a womanly “nature,” a construct, in truth,

imposed by prevailing Greek ideology. The dominant ideology of gender oppression at the time demanded that women were “sound-minded” and confined themselves to the domestic sphere of the *oikos* (family), or housework management. As moral agents, women strove to embody *aretê* (virtue) and fulfill their assigned “nature.” They aspired to female *kleos* (renown); as Blondell states, “A woman achieves *kleos* who is least talked about among men, either with blame or praise” (51). While men were generally considered to possess a heightened sense of honor, any male contaminated by family stigma or disgrace would be despised, imprisoned, or even exiled. Consequently, “As a force potentially threatening to their male relatives’ honor, to the legitimacy of their children, to the stability of the *oikos* and the *polis*, women require constant vigilance from men” (ibid. 52).

The function of *parrhesia* in the assembly and the law courts, as exercised by male citizens, stood out as the stabilizing cornerstone in direct Athenian democracy; however, the ability to practice public *parrhesia* or frank political criticism was not universally accessible. Generally, it was “not a right given equally to all Athenian citizens, but only to those who [were] especially prestigious through their family and birth” (Foucault 51). In the phallogocentric Greek society, women, slaves, and foreigners, publicly invisible and silenced, were in general deprived of using political *parrhesia*: “Attic women were formally excluded from the political and military life of their city.... They could not attend assemblies, serve on juries, or even speak in court” (Foley 7). Similarly, an enslaved man could not engage in *parrhesiastic* activity, for this privilege belonged to those who possessed the necessary moral qualifications and social reputation. In the gendered hierarchy of Greek society, the act of political truth-uttering, as a masculine prerogative, was denied to marginal and oppressed groups. Thus, “truth” itself was ideologically constructed.

There were a few exceptions. For example, Foucault sees in Euripides’ *Bacchae* a *parrhesiastes* who “is not an entirely free man, but a servant to the king—one who cannot use *parrhesia* if the king is not wise enough to enter into the *parrhesiastic* game and grant him permission to speak openly.... But Pentheus, as a wise King, offers his servant what we call a ‘*parrhesiastic* contract’” (32). Another such instance can be found in the opening exposition of *Hippolytus*, where an attendant demonstrates a *parrhesiastic* contract. This passage follows the wrathful Aphrodite, Goddess of Sexual Passion, and her vow to take swift vengeance upon the chaste youth Hippolytus, son of the Amazon Hippolyta, for his rejection of her domain. Although Aphrodite makes an open and critical declaration, her discourse does not constitute personal *parrhesia*. The love goddess is not portrayed as engaging in this type of contract because the *parrhesiastes* must take a risk when uttering

truth. The powerful goddess, like a superior king, cannot fulfill the requirements of *parrhesia*, for Aphrodite incurs no personal danger in her speech; furthermore, there is no reciprocal verbal game between a truth-teller and an interlocutor.

As the son of Theseus, King of Athens, Hippolytus is a figure of considerable power. Throughout the course of the dramatic action, his character is defined by the consistent attributes: overweening hubris, aloofness, and immoderation. His fervent devotion to Artemis, the virgin goddess of the hunt, and his scornful rejection of Aphrodite, illustrate a hint of pathological misogyny and sexual revulsion:

ATTENDANT: Sir, for “master” is a word I use for gods
if I gave good advice, would you receive it from me?
HIPPOLYTUS: Of course I would. It would be stupid not to do so....
ATTENDANT: People hate pride and an exclusive attitude.
HIPPOLYTUS: Quite right. An arrogant person is always hated.
ATTENDANT: And people are grateful when you talk to them kindly.
HIPPOLYTUS: Certainly. It does much good, and costs little trouble.
ATTENDANT: And do you think that the same thing is true of gods?
HIPPOLYTUS: Yes. Since we mortals live by the same rules as they.
ATTENDANT: Then why do you not say a word to a great goddess?
HIPPOLYTUS: Which one? Be careful that you name what can be named.
ATTENDANT: The one that stands there. The Cyprian at your gates.
HIPPOLYTUS: Since I live cleanly, I greet her from a distance....
ATTENDANT: Then I wish you happiness, and the sense you ought to have.
(Euripides 482)

Within this stichomythic dialogue, themes of profound disunity—piety and blasphemy, humbleness and hubris—predominate. As Blaiklock puts it, “Hippolytus is alleged, in Greek view, to have aimed at a degree of virtue which was in fact a blasphemy against the nature of man” (37). Following Hippolytus’ display of misogyny and sexual puritanism, his servant, conscious of his own humble status yet shocked by his master’s extremism, cautiously inquires if he might offer counsel. In venturing this form of criticism towards his superior, the servant proposes to engage in *parrhesia*, though he dreads Hippolytus’ rage. Hippolytus, however, grants his “vulnerable but courageous” servant license to speak freely and fearlessly. That is, the interlocutor Hippolytus, from a higher position, permits his subordinate attendant to take part in the *parrhesiastic* contract.

According to Foucault, “[t]he sovereign, the one who has power but lacks the truth, addresses himself to the one who has the truth but lacks power, and tells him: if you tell me the truth, no matter what this truth turns out to be, you won’t be punished” (32). In *Hippolytus*, the prudent attendant, by forging a bond of “courageous frankness” with the Other, does not risk his life, though he may offend the Other with his candid speech. As expected, the case places more emphasis on moral conscience and obligation over institutional systems: this *parrhesia* is directed from an inferior to a superior, with esteem or even awe for the interlocutor.

A similar instance appears later in *Hippolytus*, involving a *parrhesiastic* contract between the Messenger and King Theseus. Hippolytus, through the spite of the goddess Aphrodite, is banished by his jealously misled father and condemned by the sea god Poseidon. As Hippolytus lies mortally wounded, the Messenger arrives to report his fate to the king. Driven by a sense of obligation, the Messenger offers advice, and a truthful criticism of the Other, to King Theseus:

MESSENGER: Let me speak plain. Hippolytus no more exists.
He sees the light, but life is hanging by a thread.
THESEUS: Who killed him? Was it one who hated him because
his wife, like mine, was violated and defiled?
MESSENGER: It was the chariot he drove that caused his death;
that, and the curses from your mouth which you called down
from the sea’s governor, your father, on your son....
THESEUS: In hatred for the man who met this fate I was
pleased with your news....
MESSENGER: What are we now to do to please you? Shall we bring
this suffering creature here, or what are we to do?
Think carefully. And my advice to you would be
Not to be cruel to your own son in his pain.
THESEUS: Bring him to me, that I may see before my eyes
him who denied that he had made my bed his own,
that I by words and acts of gods may prove him wrong.
(Euripides 508-10)

Due to his inferior rank, the Messenger risks punishment if King Theseus, from his superior position, becomes carried away or enraged at the servant’s words. Indeed,

Theseus' conduct towards this forthright advisor reveals exactly his skill in employing the *parrhesiastic* contract, a crucial element of leadership in classical Greece.

Now I turn to the recurring themes of truth-telling and truth-concealing, the dichotomy of truth and falsehood, and *polis* and *oikos*, all of which permeate the tragedy. To illustrate these themes, I will examine Hippolytus' relationships to Aphrodite, Phaedra, the Nurse, Theseus, and Artemis. Bernard Knox asserts that the "choice between speech and silence is the situation which places the four principal characters in significant relationship and makes an artistic unity of the play" (92). While I concur with Knox, I would further suggest that the oscillation between truth-revealing and truth-hiding serves as a pivotal force that propels the action of the play. In the Euripidean proleptic Prologue, Aphrodite delivers an explanatory speech, openly confessing her blazing wrath against the haughty Hippolytus, and her intention to exact revenge by ensnaring Phaedra in a scheme against Hippolytus. Manifestly, "the freedom of the human will and the importance of the human choice are both, in the prologue of the *Hippolytus*, expressively denied" (ibid. 91):

APHRODITE: ... I shall let Theseus know of it. All will come out.
Then this young man, my enemy, will be destroyed
by the curses of his father; for the lord of the sea,
Poseidon, gave to Theseus as an honored right
that he should pray three times and have his prayer fulfilled.
As for the women, Phaedra, she shall keep her name,
but none the less shall die. I shall not think her pain
of enough importance to prevent my enemies
from suffering the punishment that I think fit.
But now I see the son of Theseus coming here,
Hippolytus, fresh from his hunting exercise.
I therefore shall be gone. Behind him comes a great
and merry band of hunters, singing to Artemis,
hymning the goddess's praise. He does not know the gates
of Hell are open and this day he sees his last.
(Euripides 480-81)

From this juncture on, Aphrodite's motives and frank revelation perpetrate the inevitable action of the play, while simultaneously offering insight into the goddess' anthropomorphic nature. Her potency, temperament, arbitrary irrationality, and capacity

for violence must be considered in any interpretation of her true character as portrayed in this play. It is crucial to remember that a *parrhesiastes*, rather than cloaking genuine thoughts behind a veil of rhetoric, must honestly disclose the truth with criticism and a sense of obligation, even in the face of danger. Not every truth-teller is a *parrhesiastes*. The goddess' opening speech is not an act of personal *parrhesia*, but a rhetorical construction of truth-uttering; this clarifies that the root cause of Hippolytus' undoing is partly in the inherent structure of his character.

As the dramatic process unfolds, Phaedra, ignorant of the goddess's malevolent intent, is induced to confide her secret love to the Nurse, which illustrates her transition from silence to honest enunciation. Loyal to her mistress and seeking to alleviate Phaedra's agony, the Nurse, "affectionate and officious" (Griffin 133), urges her mistress to relinquish her pride and to yield to her love, for "It is a god that willed all this" (Euripides 491). As an anxious confidante, the Nurse conveys to Hippolytus the startling message of Phaedra's ardent infatuation, in the hopes that her frankness will serve as a remedy for her mistress's affliction. It is not to be so: enraged at Phaedra's incestuous desires and her betrayal of his father, Hippolytus likens Phaedra to Pandora, the woman who unleashed all the ills of mankind. His radical reaction to the Nurse's imprudent proposal, including his initial claim to tell Theseus the truth, is replete with misogynistic invective and insulting tirade; his relationship with Phaedra—now, cast as the Other—is consequently undermined. In *Hippolytus*, Euripides shows us "a rigid character caught in a mesh of circumstance" (Blaklock 37); he endeavors to do what he perceives as virtuous and decent to the point of excess, ultimately leading to his tragic destruction.

Phaedra is presented as a woman who is left with no other alternative than suicide: on the one hand, she desires vengeance for the rejection of her sexual advances, and on the other she fears Theseus' wrath if she confesses the truth. She chooses suicide to safeguard the *parrhesiastic* right of her children and destroy her scornful adversary. As Erich Segal describes it, "Phaedra—who is no Alcestis, but surely no Medea either—is denied rescue from dilemma" (3). Phaedra forbids the Nurse to offer any disingenuous counsel, for she has devised the one sure scheme to solve her dilemma: an "honorable" death that will keep the truth hidden. To ensure this, she implores the women of the Chorus to hide what they have heard in silence. In the polarized ideology of gender in classical Greece, women's citizenship was enacted not politically, but domestically and religiously; they were strictly confined to the domestic sphere. But in this case, as a figure who must conceal her shame (transitioning now from speech to silence), Phaedra is never positioned to play the *parrhesiastic* role, to demonstrate moral obligation and engage in frank self-criticism.

Moreover, she lacks the courage to jeopardize her reputation by candidly confessing her transgression. By exploiting her husband's devoted love and her role as queen to obscure her own faults, Phaedra acts as the *anti-parrhesiastes*. Ironically, she is both a truth-revealer and a truth-concealer. Euripides superbly explores the ambiguity between truth and falsehood through the figure of Phaedra.

We also perceive, as Phaedra's lifeless body is revealed, that the grief-stricken Theseus, far from his rational norm, is misled; lamenting his wife's ruin, he expresses his own wish to die. Ironically, convinced that Phaedra's suicide note—which serves in the play as a symbol of falsehood and “darkness”—represents the truth, Theseus laments that there is no certain measure to distinguish a true friend from a false one. This provides a more subtle exploration of the ambivalence of reality (truth) and appearance (falsehood). In his pursuit of truth, Theseus becomes blindly impulsive, rejecting his son's defense. He exclaims: —

Alas! there should have been for men some certain sign
to mark their friends, some way of regarding in their minds
which one is true and which one not a friend at all;
everyone should have had two different tones of voice,
one for his plain just dealings; one for all the rest.
Then words from false minds could have been compared and Judged
by what was true, and I should not have been deceived.
(Euripides 502)

He opts instead to believe his wife's accusation against Hippolytus: her dead body and incriminating letter appear to offer irrefutable evidence of Hippolytus' wickedness and transgression. Although “Hippolytus' defense speech is not a mechanical, fumbling, schoolboy rendition, but a carefully thought-out piece of argumentation that convinces those who can be convinced” (Roisman 145), without any method of investigating Hippolytus' refutation, his headstrong father cannot gain access to the truth, unable to discern who is telling the truth.

At the end of his argument with his son, Theseus concludes, “I know well young men are no more reliable than women are when Cypris brings confusion to their youthful hearts.... But why should I thus meet you in a strife of words, when this dead body here is surest evidence” (951-52). He later adds: “This letter here, with no prophetic stamp on it, is evidence enough against you” (1037-38). As Charles Segal asserts, “it is partly his

own temperament, lustful and passionate, which makes him incapable of believing Hippolytus innocent” (202). Indeed, “Theseus would not be Theseus without his womanizing, cruelty, ingratitude, and manipulateness” (Roisman 132): Hippolytus himself is the product of Theseus’ liaison with the Amazon Hippolyta. In confronting the false accusation of his entanglement with Phaedra, Hippolytus is barred from playing the role of a *parrhesiastes*. Although Hippolytus’ sexual asceticism is universally known, Theseus’ obsessive love for Phaedra blinds him to Hippolytus’ moral qualifications, and he pronounces a guilty verdict. To Theseus, his son is a sanctimonious impostor with boastful and insincere words. From the political point of view, his rash judgment is not unbecoming of a good ruler who must preserve his ability to enter the *parrhesiastic* contract.

Facing condemnation, Hippolytus is rendered mute, his speech shifting to silence, although when Phaedra’s corpse is being laid out, he says to his father: “Surely it cannot be right to hide your misery from friends and even more than friends” (Euripides 894-95). Ironically, despite his inherent inclination towards *parrhesia*, Hippolytus is constrained from speaking freely and frankly. Without any witness to corroborate his integrity, he resorts to defending his innocence by asserting his renowned chastity, refusing to admit that he was captivated by Phaedra’s splendor, and swearing by Zeus, the guardian of oaths. He swears before his father that:

. . . . One thing has never touched me, —what you think my guilt.
This body to this moment is unstained by love.
I do not know the action, except what I hear
in talk or see in pictures, and I have no wish
to know about such things. I have a virgin soul.
Perhaps my purity does not convince your mind.
Then you must show in what way I became corrupt.
Was it this woman’s body was more beautiful
than that of all the rest. . . .
Now, I swear to you by Zeus,
Guardian of oaths, by earth’s floor, that I never touched
your wife, nor could have wished to, nor conceived the thought.
And may I die inglorious, without a name,
without a house or city, exiled and wandering,
and, after death, let neither sea nor land receive

my body, if in truth I am a wicked man.
And, if it was from terror that she threw away
her life, I do not know. More than this I must not say.
(Euripides 504-05)

As Roisman argues, “If Hippolytus shows naiveté in this speech, it is not the naiveté of a callow, uncertain youth.... The idea that he seduced or raped Phaedra is so unlikely, so out of line with who he is and how he has lived, that it is difficult for him to grasp that anyone would believe this...” (145). More profoundly, “Hippolytus’ inability to defend himself springs from the two aspects of his character with which we are by now most familiar: his sense of honor (which prevents him from breaking his oath of secrecy to the Nurse) and his somewhat alienating quality of aloofness” (Conacher 30-31). Insisting on upholding his pledge to the Nurse and the gods out of his sense of honor, and lacking the Argus-eyed perception of the fatal danger that hangs over him, Hippolytus refrains from conveying the truth to others or from making criticism of the Other with obligable courage—even at the point of crisis, and even though he has been branded by Theseus a shameful knave who pollutes the air with false arguments. Ironically, by honoring his oath to remain silent about Phaedra’s incestuous love, Hippolytus is compelled to be a truth-concealer.

As the son of a king, his royal lineage, Hippolytus is endowed with the privilege to execute *parrhesia*. But as the accused, he is deprived of the right of free speech, failing to achieve a harmony of *logos* (speech, principle) and *bios* (life, conduct), unable to employ *parrhesiastic* activity to criticize the Other’s misdeeds and expose the truth about Phaedra’s death. Upon learning of Theseus’ curse and decree of banishment, he laments: “I know the truth, but do not know how I can speak” (Euripides 1072). Tragically, this youth who is indeed in the right cannot establish his innocence, and in the end meets his doom for not uttering the truth. I concur with Judith Fletcher’s assertion that “[e]ven if he were to commit perjury and reveal the truth about Phaedra, he would not be saved, for nothing he can say has more potency than her dead body, the most powerful text of the drama” (40). Stated simply, both Phaedra and Hippolytus construct themselves as truth-hiding figures, the antithesis of the *parrhesiastes*. Yet we can discern that Phaedra’s concealment differs fundamentally from that of Hippolytus, owing to their inherent character differences. The former embodies the *anti-parrhesiastes*; the latter, a truth-hider who nevertheless yearns to tell the truth. Through the ambiguity and the ambivalence between truth and falsehood in his play, Euripides depicts truth construction to be both fluid and blurred.

Foucault explains that “[i]t was traditional in ancient Greek tragedy for the god who constituted the main divine figure to appear last” (43); eventually, it is divine enunciation that makes possible the full revelation of truth. However, “Euripidean tragedy sometimes invites us to adopt the cold and remote perspective of the gods, like that of Artemis at the end of the *Hippolytus*” (Segal 1993, 234). The goddess Artemis, whom Hippolytus worships above all, appears as the *deus ex machina*, the contrived dramatic device, who unveils the whole truth to Theseus. It is through Artemis’ utterance that all comes to light: Theseus uncovers the hidden truth, as the dying Hippolytus forgives his father.

At the denouement of *Hippolytus*, mortals are eventually guided to the path of truth by the divine voice, despite the efforts of some to obscure it. I believe that Hippolytus’ question of truth is analogous to what Foucault calls the Oedipal problem of truth, which “is resolved by showing how mortals, in spite of their own blindness, will see the light of truth which is spoken by the god, and which they do not wish to see” (Foucault 41). In *Hippolytus*, Aphrodite watches Hippolytus fulfill the truth of her prediction; similarly, in Sophocles’ *Oedipus the King*, Apollo, God of Truth and Light, watches Oedipus enact his foretold fate. However, the playwrights’ attitudes toward the role of the gods seem very different. In *Oedipus the King*, Oedipus exhibits a strong free will and strives to circumvent his destiny (though in vain); the throne of the Delphic oracle, which guides mankind to know divine will, poses as the center of truth where no shadow of falsehood can exist. In *Hippolytus*, the fates of human protagonist and antagonist are not foretold by an oracle, and the tragic figures are not compelled to perform actions predetermined by the gods (in this case, by Aphrodite); instead, characters exert their free will in defiance of divine will. After all, Euripides incorporates Aphrodite, Poseidon, and Artemis into his play to ridicule the Olympians, to present them as insensible, inordinate disorder rather than a solacing source of order and rationality.

In a nutshell, the exploration of *parrhesia*, a frank and courageous verbal activity or rhetorical truth game demanding courage and conviction, is brilliantly displayed in Euripides’ *Hippolytus*, drawing on Foucault’s analysis of the term. This concept, serving as a multifaceted practice, is exquisitely elucidated in the play through interactions like those between Hippolytus and his servant, and the Messenger and Theseus; these instances highlight the complexities of speaking truth to authority in ancient Greek society. Furthermore, Euripides masterfully manipulates *parrhesia* to expound the interplay of truth-revealing and truth-concealing. Phaedra’s confession of her love for Hippolytus, while an act of personal *parrhesia*, is intertwined with her efforts to conceal her disgrace and safeguard her family’s honor. This eventually leads to tragic undoing, as her suicide and false accusation against Hippolytus trigger Theseus’s rage and his son’s catastrophic demise. Conversely, Hippolytus, defined by his virtuous nature and hubris, is

constrained by societal norms and an oath of keeping silence, hindering his full exercise of *parrhesia* to defend himself; his inability to disclose the truth contributes to the calamitous discord and his tragic downfall.

In essence, the play contrasts these human conflicts with the divine perspective. Aphrodite's Prologue and Artemis's final revelation frame the tragedy, highlighting the limitations of human knowledge and the consequences of both truth-telling and truth-veiling. The play *Hippolytus* superbly serves as a splendid exploration of *parrhesia* and its connection to truth, falsehood, and power dynamics in ancient Greece. The play in effect prompts the reflection on the importance of truth-revealing and the pursuit of unveiling truth, while acknowledging the challenges and potential risks involved in speaking freely.

References

- Arthur, Marilyn B. "Liberated Women: The Classical Era." *Becoming Visible: Women in European History*. Houghton, 1997, pp. 60-89.
- Blaiklock, E. M. *The Male Characters of Euripides: A Study in Realism*. New Zealand UP, 1952.
- Bloom, Harold, editor. *Comprehensive Research and Study Guide, Bloom's Major Dramatists: Euripides*. Chelsea House Publishers, 2003.
- Blondell, Ruby, Mary-kay Gamel, Nancy Sorkin Rabinowitz, Bella Zweig, editors. Introduction. *Women on the Edge: Four Plays by Euripides*. Routledge, 1999, pp. 1-89.
- Cairns, D. L. *AIDOS, the Psychology and Ethics of Honor and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Clarendon P, 1993.
- Conacher D. J. "Realistic Tragedy: *The Medea*." *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme, and Structure*. U of Toronto P, 1967, pp. 183-98.
- Euripides. "*Hippolytus*." *The Norton Anthology of World Masterpieces*, Maynard Mack, general editor, translated by Rex Warner, 4th ed., vol. 1, W. W. Norton, 1980, pp. 479-515.
- Fletcher, Judith. "Women and Oaths in Euripides." *Theatre Journal*, vol. 55, no.1, March 2003, pp. 29-44.
- Foucault, Michel. *Fearless Speech*. Edited by Joseph Pearson, Semiotext(e), 2001.
- Griffin, J. "Characterization in Euripides: *Hippolytus* and *Iphigeneia in Aulis*." *Characterization and Individuality in Greek Literature*, edited by Christopher

- Pelling, Clarendon P, 1990, pp. 128-49.
- Guven, Ferit. *Madness and Death in Philosophy*. State U of New York P, 2005.
- Knox, Bernard M. W. "The *Hippolytus* of Euripides." *Euripides: A Collection of Critical Essays*, edited by Erich Segal, Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 90-114.
- McClure, Laura. *Spoken Like a Woman: Speech and Gender in Athenian Drama*. Princeton UP, 1999.
- Peters, Michael A. "Truth-telling as an Educational Practice of the Self: Foucault, *Parrhesia* and the Ethics of Subjectivity." *Oxford Review of Education*, vol. 29, no.2, 2003, pp. 207-23.
- Roisman, Hanna M. *Nothing Is As It Seems: The Tragedy of the Implicit in Euripides' Hippolytus*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.
- Saxonhouse, Arlene W. *Free Speech and Democracy in Ancient Athens*. Cambridge UP, 2006.
- Segal, Charles. *Euripides and the Poetics of Sorrow: Art, Gender, and Commemoration in Alcestis, Hippolytus, and Hecuba*. Duke UP, 1993.
- Segal, Erich. Introduction. *Euripides: A Collection of Critical Essays*. Prentice-Hall, 1968, pp. 1-12.
- Zapata, Fernando R. Rev. of Fearless Speech, by Michel Foucault. *Foucault Studies*, vol. 2, May 2005, pp. 150-53.

本論文於 2024 年 10 月 19 日到稿，2024 年 12 月 29 日通過審查。

敬悉者，您好：

《淡江外語論叢》為學術性期刊，內容含外國文學、文化、翻譯、語言等，本刊已定期出刊至第 42 期。

本刊為半年刊，全年徵稿。敬請惠予公告並鼓勵貴校相關系所之教師、博士生惠賜稿件，以光篇幅。

※第 43 期投稿截止日：2025 年 4 月 15 日

※第 42 期已於 2024 年 12 月出刊

投稿相關資訊如下：

《淡江外語論叢》徵稿辦法

108年6月修訂

111.5.10 110學年度第2學期第1次《淡江外語論叢》編輯委員會議 修訂通過

一、稿源性質：

- (一)《淡江外語論叢》為學術性期刊，內容包括外國語文教學及研究：外國文學、比較文學、外國語文、語言學、比較語言學、外國文化、翻譯學、華語教學、外國文學及語言之教材教學法及作為第二外語的華語教學等領域。
- (二)刊載文章須為首次發表之著作，且為上述範圍內的原創學術論文。
- (三)本刊不接受曾以其他語言發表，或翻譯成其他語言且內容雷同之論文著作。

二、徵稿對象：本院專兼任教師、研究生及國內外專家學者。

三、篇幅與語言：來稿除英、法、德、西、日、俄文等6種外語外，亦可使用繁體中文，且以不超過2萬字為原則。

四、內容與格式：

- (一)論文需符合科技部「國內學術性期刊評量參考標準」。
- (二)所有來稿務請完全依照「《淡江外語論叢》論文書寫格式」處理妥當，否則礙難接受。

五、評審：著作經本刊編輯委員會初審後，委請校內外專家採匿名方式審查。審稿辦法由本刊編輯委員會另定之。

六、文責：本刊刊載之著作，文責由作者自負。論文經送審查後，不得要求撤回。

七、版權：投稿本刊時須檢附著作權授權書，著作文稿經本刊決定刊用後，其著作權仍歸著作者所有。本刊具「第1次使用權」。歡迎著作者(或其授權人)日後以任何形式引用或轉載，不須徵求本刊同意，但務請註明「原載《淡江外語論叢》第○期○頁民國○年○月」字樣。

八、酬勞：本刊為純學術服務性質，無法致送稿酬，所獲得之權利金歸淡江大學外語學院所有。每位作者贈送兩冊。

九、投稿本刊者，應繳交審查費，該費用悉數轉交審查人，本刊無法開立正式收據，僅提供收費證明。

十、本辦法經本刊編輯委員會通過後實施，修正時亦同。

本刊賜稿處及聯絡方式：

25137 新北市淡水區英專路 151 號 淡江大學外語學院 淡江外語論
叢

Phone:(02)2621-5656 x 2558 (02)2622-4593

Fax:(02)2623-2924

E-mail : jtsfee@gmail.com

《淡江外語論叢》審稿辦法

110 年 12 月修訂

- 一、所有來稿先由本刊編輯委員會就論文寫作格式、稿件的書寫及排版是否符合本刊規定進行形式審查。不合格者退回請修正。
- 二、經形式審查合格者，送交審查人初審。
- 三、審查人名單由編輯委員會提名校內外專家學者產生，審查人之姓名皆不公開。內稿送 2 位校外審查人初審；外稿以送 1 位校內審查人及 1 位校外審查人為原則。

刊登標準如下：

審查意見	結 果
2 位通過	直接接受或修正後再接受
1 位通過，1 位不通過	送第 3 位審查人複審
2 位不通過	退稿

- 四、評審費：每篇論文每位評審費用 1,000 元，共 2,000 元由投稿人自行負擔，於投稿時以郵局現金袋掛號寄至本刊，送第三人審查者仍由作者自行負擔 1,000 元。
- 五、本辦法經本刊編輯委員會會議通過後實施，修正時亦同。

《淡江外語論叢》書寫格式

111年9月修訂

本刊為統一格式，敬請配合版面格式，以利作業。相關事項如下：

- 一、所有來稿請以電子檔傳送至本刊 jtsfee@gmail.com 信箱。
- 二、無論中外文稿件，一律由左向右橫寫，A4 規格。版面上下各空 2.54cm；左右各空 3.17cm，以 12 號字體隔行繕打。最小行高；18PT。中文、日文每行 34 個字，每頁 38 行，西文每行 69 字元，每頁 38 行。
- 三、論文採「隨文注」；補充說明之注則採「隨頁注」；引述出處標寫如（張大春 2000:27）、（Catfort 1968:35-38）；引言後置如下：一國文字和另一國文字之間必然有距離，譯者的理解和文風跟原作品的內容和形式之間也不會沒有距離，而且譯者的體會和他自己的表達能力之間還時常有距離。〔…〕因此，譯文總有失真和走樣的地方，在意義或口吻上違背或不盡貼合原文。那就是『訛』（錢鍾書 1990：84）
- 四、「中、英文摘要」及「中、英文關鍵詞」請附於論文首頁，「中、英文摘要」字數以一頁 A4 為宜。
- 五、論文後面僅列出「引用書目」即可。書目呈現方式如下：

金緹（1989），《等效翻譯探索》，北京：中國對外翻譯出版公司，167 頁。

吳錫德，〈如果新小說變成經典〉，《中國時報》，1997/10/30，頁 42。

Cotford, J. C. (1965), *A Linguistic Theory of Translation*,

London: Oxford Univ.Press,

Chevrel, Y. (1989), *La littérature comparée*, (比較文學),

Paris: PUF, 中譯本：馮玉貞譯，台北：遠流。

六、中文正文採用「新細明體」，引文採用「標楷體」。西文正文及引文採用「Times New Roman」；日文採明朝體。

七、請提供論文作者英文姓名及文章篇名英譯。

八、校正

所有文稿均請作者自行校正，務請細心謹慎。

若審查人表示文稿須修正後刊出，本刊將先退回稿件，請作者於 2 週內修正後送回，逾期則不予刊登。

九、各語言書寫格式可參閱前期刊登文章。

(淡江大學外語學院網址：<http://www.tf.tku.edu.tw>)

淡江外語論叢 第42期 2024年12月

Tamkang Studies of Foreign Languages and Literatures No.42, Dec. 2024

淡江大學外國語文學院 發行

Published by College of Foreign Languages and Literatures, Tamkang University

發行人/ Publisher: 林怡弟/ Yi-ti Lin

主編/ Chief Editor: 林怡弟/ Yi-ti Lin

執行編輯/ Executive Editor: 曾郁景/ Yu-ching Tseng

編輯委員/ Editors: 曾郁景/ Yu-ching Tseng、楊鎮魁/ Chen-kuei Yang

何萬儀/ Wan-i Her、古孟玄/ Meng-hsuan Ku

康鈺珮/ Yu-pei Kang、蔣之英/ Chih-ying Chiang

張志成/ Jyh-cherng Chang、許友芳/ Yu-fang Hsu

王佑心/ Yu-hsin Wang、林慧君/ Hui-jun Lin

陳兆麟/ Jaw-lin Chen、葉相林/ Hsiang-lin Yeh

執行秘書/ Executive Secretary: 蔡金蓮/ Chin-lien Tsai

編輯助理/ Editorial Assistant: 吳珮嘉/ Pei-jia Wu

地址: 25137 新北市淡水區英專路 151 號

淡江大學外國語文學院

電話: 886-2-2621 5656 ext. 2558

886-2-2622-4593

電子信箱: jtsfee@gmail.com

版權所有 未經同意不得轉載或翻譯

Address: Tamkang University

College of Foreign Languages and Literatures

No.151, Yingzhuan Rd., Danshui Dist., New Taipei City 25137, R.O.C.(Taiwan).

Tel: 886-2-2621 5656 ext.2558

886-2-2622-4593

E-Mail: jtsfee@gmail.com

All rights reserved. Reprint and translation rights must be obtained by writing to the address above.

ISSN 1562-7675