

正確的引用與轉述，不啻是對原作者、原著的尊重，顯示自己對於相關領域的博學與掌握，更是協助讀者參照文獻的最佳利器。

以下，我隨機選取一篇感興趣的國內清華大學碩士生撰寫之學位論文「再述王爾德美學：論《多利安·葛雷的畫像》呈現的顛覆現象」，節錄前言(introduction)之中含有引述與轉述的段落，以觀摩他人是如何引用與轉述相關文獻、研究。

該論文以三個面向—唯美美學理論、同志情欲流動、及後殖民論述，反思王爾德如何以愛爾蘭籍英國作家，又同時身陷同志疑雲的藝術筆觸，顛覆大英帝國的文化霸權，故在文獻回顧部分，多以這三方面的相關研究為主。

**Re-reading Oscar Wilde's Aestheticism: The Subversion in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*.**

## 再述王爾德美學：論《多利安·葛雷的畫像》呈現的顛覆現象

簡文珍，清華大學外國語文研究所(2004)

【page1, paragraph 2, line 3】

In the context of Irish study, Liebman **observes** that *Dorian Gray* is unique from the typical Victorian novel in which cosmic justice<sup>1</sup> is often confirmed and is completely different in plot to the classic Bildungsroman which portrays the development of characters from adolescence to maturity.

從紅色字 **observes** 及其後附屬字句未加引號，可推論作者轉述了 Liebman 的言說，不過 **justice** 之後的註釋 1（於頁末記載原文風貌），卻又顯示作者的轉述不甚完美，句型結構與理念與原文過於相近。

【page2, paragraph 1, line 2】

The *Picture of Dorian Gray* signifies the end of the fin de siècle, the last ten years of the nineteenth century, and “looks forward to those other turn-of-the-century and pre-World War I novels of cosmic despair and moral paralysis.... Not merely a ‘nineties romp,’” Wilde’s novel [*Dorian Gray*] stands among them, as an important work of the period, addressing the major moral issues of the day and can still be applied to modern day. A significant contribution is made not only to aestheticism, but to modernism (313).

---

<sup>1</sup> Liebman states that *The Picture of Dorian Gray* is different from those typical Victorian novels, in which cosmic justice is confirmed (the good are rewarded, though chastened, and the evil are punished), more certainty is attainable (indeed, experience itself, though sometimes cruel and harsh, teaches morality), personal responsibility is assumed, and self-unification is possible. (“Character Design in *The Picture of Dorian Gray*.” *Studies in the Novel* 31.3 [1999]: 313).

接續前文，讀到段落結束看見 (313) 的頁碼，才恍然發覺這一大部分論述也是從 Liebman 的著作轉述，而其中有引號的部分，可能是直接引述 Liebman 的原用語。

【page2, paragraph 3, line 1】

The debate about the evaluation of Oscar Wilde's *The Picture of Dorian Gray* has been in dispute. Edward Roditi and Ted R. Spivey simply regard it as a badly written work, which reflects Wilde's irresolution to the main character's impasse.

作者開始剪輯與研究文本相關之評析論戰，首先從 regard 判斷出作者轉述 Edward Roditi 和 Ted R. Spivey 的話語，不過 which reflects 之後的評論，無從得知是作者的詮釋或只是原文的轉述。

【page2, paragraph 3, line 4】

For Philip K. Cohen, in the allegorical framework, Wilde seems to give a moral lesson, but this concept of morality contrasts to his aesthetic theory of sin as an essential element of human progress.

接著以 for 開頭，「對 Philip K. Cohen 來說…」，轉述 Cohen 的說法。

【page2, paragraph 3, line 6】

Kerry Powell views the homoerotic element as Wilde's personal confession of his own homosexuality and thus autobiographically prophesies his later miserable fate. However, the recent critics like Kiberd read the novel as Wilde's powerful challenge to Victorian orthodoxy of culture, morality and gender division.

之後又轉述 Kerry Powell、Kiberd，從整個第三段看來，作者收集很多相關資料，並嘗試以不同動詞，如 regard、seems to、views、read as，拼貼詮釋引文的意義與相關性。

【page3, paragraph 3, line 1】

Wilde's aestheticism plays an essential role in terms of his life philosophy, social and artistic creations. His aesthetic theory is diverted from that postulated by Matthew Arnold. This thesis also re-examines the nineteenth-century literary aesthetic tradition. In the late nineteenth century, Matthew Arnold, Walter Pater and Oscar Wilde represent three critical phases. Matthew Arnold is the pioneer of these three who tries to write criticism (Ellmann 92).

第三頁第三段，談到王爾德的唯美主義，作者寫了與王同時期評論家 Matthew Arnold 與 Walter Pater 之比較。不過 (Ellmann 92)出現處，轉述部分不明，無法確知是否從本段落起至該頁碼處，都為 Ellmann 之論述，或者其中參雜

本文作者的思想(如段落一開始關於王之美學的定位)。

而其後(接續 Ellmann 92 之後文，即下頁內文)，頁碼出現處亦顯示出轉述不明。(93)是否只用來標示“*It made the critic’s own work more important as well as more subjective*”這句直接引用於 Ellmann 文章的第 93 頁？或者表示這句話及其之前都是引用來的，差別只在於直接與間接引述？

They all agree that the critic should claim the independence of books. But they differ in how they define the “independence” of criticism. Ellmann argues about this issue in “The Function of Criticism at the Present Time.” Arnold writes that the “aim of criticism is to see the object as in itself it really is.” This statement went with his demand for “disinterested curiosity.” Nine years later Walter Pater, on his preface to *Studies in the History of the Renaissance*, was “pretending” to agree with Arnold’s definition of the aim of criticism, but he shifted the focus from the perspective of the object to the perceiver’s sensations. “It made the critic’s own work more important as well as more subjective” (93).

【page7, paragraph 2, line 7】

Influenced by his mother’s His mother was involved in reclaiming Ireland, and Wilde has surpassed her. “She had wished to repossess Irish folklore and the native language, but he would go one better and achieve a total mastery of English” (Kiberd 1996: 35). Out of national consciousness, Wilde plunged himself into subverting the cultural hegemony by undermining British cultural imperialism.

這裡，又再次顯示，引用頁碼出現的位置，似乎容易引起模糊或誤會。例如一個大段落裡，突然出現一個引號，之後又出現引用之頁碼，讀者無法確定是否只有引號處出自他人。

除非如接續的下段，同時並列兩個引用的文獻(Walsh 76)和(Kiberd 1996: 35)，可以清楚看見轉述或是引述的不同部份。

Wilde’s literary career is an English writer but from a position of identification with and allegiance to Ireland (Walsh 76). “I am Irish by race, but the English have condemned me to speak the language of Shakespeare” (Kiberd 1996: 35).

【page7, paragraph 3, line 1】

小結：

轉述時，為避免抄襲之嫌，我們可以改變句型結構、用字，並加上自己的詮釋，將自己的思想與引用文獻合而為一；但是，此舉會使轉述與接下來(或先前)自己鋪成或衍義的文句混淆，讀者不易區分孰為孰作。藉著閱讀他人論文，我覺得，若真要區別轉述與自述的分野，或可理出一個脈絡。假如自述在轉述後面，可於轉述結尾處標上引用的頁碼，如：

男人都有戀母情結 (佛洛伊德，xxx)，顯示出…….

( 轉述 ) ( 自述 )

相反的，如果是自述在前轉述在後，那麼誰誰誰說，就必須於文中講明，並且別忘了在轉述結尾處標上頁碼，例如：

男小女大老少配其來有自，佛洛伊德說男人都有戀母情結(佛洛伊德，xxx)

( 自述 ) ( 轉述 )

(Virginia 收集整理)