在 Avery F. Gordon 所寫的 Ghostly Matters: Haunting and the Sociological Imagination 一書中, Gordon 透過對 Toni Morrison 的小說 *Beloved* 的解析，讓讀者了解到關於美國在廢奴以前的奴隸制度(slavery)對於整個美國社會所產生的巨大影響，並進一步探索 *Beloved* 一書中因反抗奴隸制度而殺嬰之主角Sethe 的深度心理狀態，以及討論 Sethe 這個主人翁的原型: Margaret Garner 女士之所以憤然以殺害自己子女的方式來反抗蓄奴制度的人倫悲劇.

其中 Gordon 引用他人文章的部分節錄於下:

    The slave writers' purpose, as an instance of the sociological imagination, was to describe the "intricate connection between the patterns of their own lives and the course of world history…[and] what this connection means for the kinds of men [and women] they are becoming and for the kind of history-making in which they might take part" (Mills 1959:4). In its most general outlines, the slave narrative tried to connect its audience to the foundationally divisive social relations that underwrote the slave experience, an experience most of its readers were able to keep at a distance from themselves.

    This was arguably a challenge for the writer, and as William Andrew notes, "in the two decades before Emancipation, black autobiography served as a kind of sociocultural crucible I which some of the era's most interesting….experiments were conducted in how to tell the truth about experience….By the mid-nineteenth century, black autobiographers had recognized that their great challenge was much more than just telling the truth; they had to *sound* truthful doing it" to those, including a "noted leader of the American Anti-Slavery Society," who, in his own words, "'thought that the slave, as a general thing, is a liar'". How could known liars sound truthful? They would have to display, with the utmost genuineness, just those qualities that we associate with a conventional sociological realism: a plain unembellished style of writing that conveyed only the *believable* facts, a balanced assessment with no "exaggeration" and nothing that smacked of 'the imagination'".

    A system is denounced, but gently so too is the need to keep refuting, in the late twentieth century, that "Blacks became slaves, finally" (Robinson 1983: 176); that slavery created so total a condition of subjection that all trace of humanity vanished; that slavery became these African Americans as the totality of their ontology. As Cedric Robinson and Morrison both suggest, it is indisputable that "slavery altered the conditions of their being" but also indisputable that slavery "could not negate their being".

註解 [ccy1]: 在這段文章中, Gordon 引用了 Mills 對於 slave narrative 的描述, 並在下方的文字中表現出自己對於 slave narrative 的看法.

註解 [ccy2]: Gordon 表示 slave narrative 其實並非如自傳一般"可信", 而是如 Andrew 所說的" 聽起來" 真實, 實則為被剝奪主體性的奴隸為了取信於白人而以白人所謂受過教育 (literal) 的文字書寫方式來紀錄白人認為的真實.

註解 [ccy3]: Indisputable(明確地) 是 Gordon 對於 Robinson 這段關於 slavery 描述的評論.

The mistake Sethe makes in thinking that Mr. Bodwin, who has done her no harm, is schoolteacher is a carefully cultivated one, the ground well laid. It is also an insightful mistake. As George Lipstiz nicely puts it, "People who appear to be 'mistaken' about another…sometimes really know things that can not be represented easily because their knowledge is illegitimate by existing standards and paradigms"(1994:162)

註解 [ccy4]: Nicely 爲 Gordon 對於 Lipstiz 這段話的評論.

A story that is no longer located in the vice of the morality of verisimilitude, which the abolitionist, with honorable motivations, nonetheless demanded. And, indeed, much that distinguished Morrison's story from Coffin's can be found in their respective hat stories: Coffin trying to hold on to it, obsessed with its property rather than its spirit, and Morrison conjuring up the complicated nexus that is the thing behind it, offering reconciliation and a future without propertied domination.

註解 [ccy5]: Gordon 對於 Coffin 所紀錄之真實事件: the story of a hat 與 Morrison 所著之虛構小說所做的兩極評論. 深爲一個廢奴主義者, 而且所寫的爲真實紀錄, Coffin 依然把奴隸視爲一種 property, 然而 Morrison 的虛構故事卻掌握到事件的核心, 就是奴隸不該被視爲財產, 而是完整的個體, 一個有思想的人類.