

July 2012

Literary Theory Today

Culler Jonathan

Follow this and additional works at: <https://tsla.researchcommons.org/journal>



Part of the [Chinese Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Jonathan, Culler. 2012. "Literary Theory Today." *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art* 32, (4): pp.77-85.
<https://tsla.researchcommons.org/journal/vol32/iss4/10>

This Research Article is brought to you for free and open access by Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art. It has been accepted for inclusion by an authorized editor of Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art.

当今文学理论

[美国] 乔纳森·卡勒

【编者按】此文是卡勒教授 2011 年 10 月 20 日在南京大学人文社会科学高级研究院的演讲稿，文章经卡勒教授授权刊发并重新修订过。在这篇演讲中，卡勒教授首先厘清所谓的文艺理论中“理论”这一特殊文类的所指及其构成。在此基础上，卡勒教授高屋建瓴地归述了与文学理论密切相关的重要学科对于当今文艺理论的影响，然后从六个方面剖析当今文学理论的新发展。这六个方面分别但并非依次是：叙事学、解构主义、理论伦理学、人-动物间互研究、生态批评、后人类理论。在归纳这些方面的新进展之后，作者再次回到关于文学本体的美学研究。卡勒教授是美国艺术与科学院院士，当代英语世界最具影响力的文学和文化研究理论家之一，代表性成果包括《结构主义诗学》(*Structuralist Poetics*)、《论解构》(*On Deconstruction*) 等。

Literary Theory Today

Jonathan Culler

It is a pleasure to have the opportunity to address the topic “Literary Theory Today” in the West. In order to do this I need to speak very briefly about what happened in literary and cultural studies in the recent past in Europe and America, although what I say here is doubtless well known to many. Major transformations occurred in the field of literary and cultural studies in the US and Western Europe, beginning in the late 1960s, under the impact of what is usually called just “theory” – a very strange usage, I admit. If you ask “theory of what?” the answer is scarcely clear. What counted as “theory” was seldom theory of literature, in the sense of an account of the distinctive nature of literary works and the methodological principles for examining them as part of an academic discipline. Important works of theory by such authors as Friedrich Nietzsche, Sigmund Freud, Ferdinand de Saussure, Claude Lévi – Strauss, Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, Michel Foucault, Louis Althusser, Judith Butler, and many others did not deal with literature at all, or only marginally.

“Theory” began, really, with the structuralist movement, which addressed signification in general and so was of importance for people in all areas of the humanities and social sciences. What we call by the nickname “theory” is a miscellaneous genre: works that succeed in challenging and reorienting thinking in fields other than those to which they apparently belong. Writings from outside the field of literary studies have been taken up by people in literary studies because their analyses of language, or mind, or history, or culture, offer new and persuasive accounts of textual and cultural matters.^① Theory in this sense is not a set of methods for literary study but an unbounded group of writings about everything under the sun, from the most technical problems of academic philosophy to the changing ways in which people have talked about and thought about the body. The genre of theory? includes works of anthropology, film studies, gender studies, linguistics, philosophy, political theory, psychoanalysis, and social and intellectual history, which have become theory? because their visions or arguments have been suggestive or productive for people who are not studying those disciplines.

Literary theory draws on arguments from other fields in a speculative way , and in turn the work of literary theorists has been taken up in other fields—but that is a different story.

One reason why literary critics drew on other fields is that literary studies had previously been very under-theorized. Much literary study was a rather effete version of history: learning about authors in their historical context and their contribution to the history of literature , without reflecting on how literature functions as a cultural practice , what it would be for literature to have a history , or how a literary - historical approach could possibly address what is most interesting and challenging about great works of literature. Alternatively , literary study was based on an idea of “close reading” , which assumed that direct contact with the language of the text would suffice—no methodological framework was imagined to be necessary. Work from other fields offered powerful resources for rethinking literature and literary study , raising questions not only about the functioning of language and the signification in general , but about a host of other topics as well. After all , literature treats practically every topic under the sun , so literary scholars , as they freed themselves from a literary history that did not do justice to literary works , found themselves able to draw upon the most exciting , interesting theorizations of the different sorts of material that they encountered in literature. They also found in the genres of “theory” works that could help them think about the functioning of literature itself , in historical , psychic , linguistic , anthropological , and philosophical terms.

Theory brought a general enrichment of the humanities and better thinking about all kinds of matters in texts. It also promoted a reading of literature more alert to presuppositions , methodological options , conceptions of the functioning of language and so on.

Much of this is well known. Literary studies in the West underwent a major transformation beginning in the late 1970s under the influence of theory , and such theoretical models or practices as Marxism , psychoanalysis , feminism , deconstruction , new historicism , queer theory. Theory changed things forever. By the turn of the 21st century , theory was no longer new , and we frequently hear claims about the death of theory. But in fact , theory has become an accepted part of the landscape , no longer something new and revolutionary. Its institutional and disciplinary presence now seems well established in American universities. Being well - established , of course , deprives it of much of the glamour of novelty or notoriety , though it makes it less of a target of attacks. It now seems widely accepted that any intellectual project has a basis in theory of some sort , that graduate students need to be aware of theoretical debates in their fields and able to situate themselves and their work within the changing intellectual structures of the professional landscape. For many , it is also clear that theory , far from being “too difficult” for undergraduates , is the sort of thing they ought to explore as one of the most exciting and socially - pertinent dimensions of the humanities. Of course there are doubters still , but talk of the death of theory is foolish , perhaps wishful.

Since theory not just an evolving corpus of works , but thinking about thinking , it calls us to question how a discipline frames questions , asking whether there are not other , better ways to proceed , and what we would mean by “better.” The impetus to theory is a desire to understand what one is doing , to question commitments and their implications. Theory is driven by the impossible desire to step outside one’s thought , both to place it and to understand it , and also by a desire—a possible desire—for change , both in the ways of one’s own thought , which always could be sharper , more knowledgeable and capacious , more self - reflecting , and for change in the world which our thought engages , so there will always be new developments , will always be changes in the realm of theory.

I want today to describe briefly some recent changes or developments in the field of literary theory.^② Since , as I have indicated , literary theory is not just the theory of the nature of literature but a large body of theoretical writings about things that are important for literature , what is happening is not some sort of system-

atic change but shifts in priorities , changes in particular areas , and sometimes , new domains of thinking. What I am offering is rather a mixed array of developments that strike me as significant.

First—and I don't take these in any particular order——Narratology , the formal study of narrative structure , which was a major aspect of structuralist literary theory , had for some time been a rather neglected enterprise , not very dynamic , but it recently has undergone renovation , has been making a comeback. There are two important developments here. First , while structuralist narratology had taken linguistics as a model , trying to produce something like a grammar of narrative , recent narratology has tried to link up with cognitive science , with work on how the brain processes information. It is yet not clear whether this will do more than translate narratological concepts into a different vocabulary , but cognitive science itself seems to be giving narrative a greater role in the frames and scripts by which people make sense of experience , and at any rate this is an important connection to explore.

Second , instead of focusing mostly on 19th and 20th century literary narrative , recent narratology has given an important place to stories people tell in ordinary life , and also to a broader historical range of narrative. The most important book here , Monika Fludernik's groundbreaking work , *Towards A "Natural" Narratology* (Routledge , 1996) , is now 15 years old , but only now being assimilated because in the 1990s , when narratology was not seen as an exciting field , the publisher produced a small very expensive edition. Hers is the first narratological account to deal with the full sweep of the history of narrative in English , from saints' lives to postmodern fiction. She also breaks with a plot - based narratology—for her something can be a narrative if someone *experiences* it. And she attempts to assimilate the best of recent cognitivist work into narratology , without abandoning the fundamental achievements of the narratological tradition. She has recently published a short *Introduction to Narratology* (Routledge 2009) trying again in textbook form to advance her distinctive approach. This joins two other excellent new introductory works , signs of a rebirth of this field: David Herman , who is also the author of *Story Logic: Problems and Possibilities of Narrative* (Nebraska , 2002) , has published *Basic Elements of Narrative* (Wiley - Blackwell , 2009) , and Rick Altman has produced an excellent *Theory of Narrative* (Columbia , 2008) . Altman , a well - known film theorist , explicitly sets out to construct a new theory of narrative based not on plot , much less on the assumption that the norm for narrative is an unbroken plot thread , but on what he calls "following" (this has affinities with Fludernik's concept of "experiencing") . A narrative follows one character or group or switches between one and another. So , narratives are distinguished by their different following patterns (different kinds of modulation from one scene or unit to another) , which yield an elementary typology: there are dual - focus narratives , single focus narratives , and multiple focus narratives. In crafting a narratology that is truly based on narrative in general and not just on literary narrative Altman uses many vivid cinematic examples. He is very deft at showing the advantages of his terminologically - simple scheme over traditional narratological analysis , and offers what ought to be a starting point for further refinements. So , these seem promising days for the theory of narrative.

2. A second change: recently we have heard less about Foucault and Lacan and more of Derrida. For some time Freud , Lacan , and psychoanalysis were unavoidable references in the realm of literary theory; but that is less the case in the US (Lacan is still very much to the forefront in France , where controversies help to keep him and his work in view) . Michel Foucault seemed for a while the dominant figure in literary theory in the US , despite the fact that he did not work on literature: his work on the history of sexuality , on power and discipline was the inspiration for a range historicist projects involving literature: how literary works contribute to discourses about various cultural phenomena and thus to the cultural construction of these phenomena. This also seems to have receded and we have recently seen a resurgence of work on Derrida , both through the publication of his own seminars , which will continue for many years , and a lot of new books about him. I will just

mention J. Hillis Miller's *For Derrida* (Fordham, 2009), a collection of very clear and pedagogical essays about various aspects of Derrida's work, mostly written after his death. These essays make evident the vast range of subjects on which Derrida had something important to say, and give us very valuable accounts of topics from Derrida's special theory of performativity to his writing about mourning, decision, or touch. But I would single out one very remarkable book, Martin Haggglund's *Radical Atheism: Derrida and the Time of Life* (Stanford, 2009). This reassesses the entire trajectory of Derrida's work, arguing against recent claims that it has been marked by an ethical or religious turn and showing that from the outset Derrida's concern with temporality goes along with a valuing of survival, the mortal, and the temporal and a rejection of the desire for immortality and transcendence that structures so much thought. Pursuing the question of temporality and living on, Haggglund explores Derrida's relation to the thought of Kant, Husserl, and Levinas, as well as to current debates about democracy, ethics, and the return of religion. This book has received a lot of attention and been the subject of conferences and debates in academic journals, an indication of theory's continuing intimate involvement with the work of Jacques Derrida, to whom I will return later.

3. Next, there has for some time been talk in the realm of theory about an ethical turn or a turn to ethics. Certainly it is true that previously there had been a turn away from one form of ethics: in the 1980s and 90s, theory had vigorously *discouraged* a focus in literary education on how to act — discouraged using novels to talk about the behavior of characters, something students enjoy more than analyzing fictional technique. Literary theory encouraged a focus on how language functions, how characters and themes are *constructed*, rather than on ethical judgment, and this was very salutary, putting in question a lot of pieties about man and the world. But literature has always been linked to discussions of ethical decisions and how to relate to people who are different from you.

What is sometimes called “the turn to ethics” can be seen as a continuation of the general movement that has characterized theory from the beginning (particularly deconstruction), of contesting the hierarchical oppositions that have set aside certain groups to create norms: male versus female, white versus black, heterosexual versus homosexual, where the first term has been taken as normative and the second as inferior. The undoing of exclusions based on gender and race led to the broadening of the literary canon; the recognition of exclusions based on sexual orientation led to gay and lesbian studies and queer theory. This critique of an oppositional logic of exclusion led to an expanding of the theoretical domain by focusing on what has been rejected in order to create the norm; this procedure leads to a questioning of further oppositions, such as the distinction between the human and animal.

Here we have an interesting recent development in the realm of theory, my third development, which certainly has an important ethical dimension. The characterization of the animal as *other* has long helped to define the human. Aristotle and Descartes used this logic—animals lack reason, lack souls. But what is the nature and the impact of the distinction between the human and the animal? How is this distinction made, on what grounds, and with what values? With “the question of the animal,” Animal studies’ or “Human – Animal studies,” as it is called, has become a burgeoning interdisciplinary field, and of course more than a field of study: for many, a political movement driven by a sense of injustice. After women's liberation and gay liberation, animal liberation seems a further step — or if not animal liberation, recognition that the human treatment of animals for our own convenience is difficult to defend. Some critiques of the human/animal opposition show the commonalities and continuities. Pioneering work by Vicki Hearne, an animal trainer and philosopher, work which has recently come to figure in the realm of theory, explores communication between humans and animals, and other theorists promote a ‘being with’ animals.^③ On the other hand, a powerful strain of recent theoretical work focuses on the *discontinuities*, the radical *otherness* and inaccessibility of animals, whom

we cannot presume to understand (especially once we move beyond animals Westerners like to believe they understand , such as dogs and horses) .^④ Stressing the role that notions of the animal have played in defining the human , this approach demands respect for the otherness of animals and accuses proponents of the first approach of anthropomorphizing , treating animals according to human models. There is quite a lively debate here.

In *The Animal That Therefore I Am* (Fordham , 2008) , Jacques Derrida articulates the “desire to escape the alternatives of a projection that appropriates and an interruption that excludes”. He nevertheless emphasizes both the difficulties of understanding the animal’s point of view and what he considers the human – centered violence of grouping everything from ants to zebras together as instances of “the animal. ” What happens if we move beyond thinking of cute middle – sized mammals and consider insects or birds , for instance? Any attempt to give a single answer concerning the conceptual relation of the human to the animal seems grotesquely human – centered. The effect of recent theory here is to begin exploring the difficulties of maintaining a firm barrier between human and other species. It cannot but lead to a recognition of the our irreducibly multiple , complex , and reconfigurable relations with other animals.

As in the case of human others , literature may be a privileged site for the consideration of the construction of the animal and its bearing on the human and for the recognition of values that might be served by treating animals differently. There are representations of animals in literature , Laura Brown argues in a new book on this topic , that escape some of the paradoxes that theory has explored because the creatures of literature are simultaneously anthropomorphized and other , they “mingle human – associated and human – alienating impulses , anthropomorphism and alterity , in a way that takes the question of the human – animal relationship in a different direction” from the theoretical dichotomy: more varied and speculatively fantastical and thus more exploratory of true otherness.^⑤ Animals may be used to bring abstractions into the realm of everyday experience , offering unusual perspectives on effects of hierarchy , diversity , and difference. Poems featuring animals may be unusually imaginative attempts to think in sympathy with the singularity of animals while foregrounding the impossibility of finding words that do not appropriate them for human purposes. There are interesting and complex theoretical issues here.

4. A *fourth* recent development is a very broad and amorphous movement called “ecocriticism. ” I referred earlier to theory’s questioning of the binary oppositions through which we define ourselves. One central opposition is between man and nature. How has this distinction helped construct a humanism in which nature in the West even now is treated as matter to be exploited? Critiques of the human/animal and of the man/nature oppositions sometimes belong , explicitly or implicitly , to an encompassing ecological movement that challenges the anthropocentrism of humans (we make ourselves the center of all things) and that seeks to promote respect for the environment and all non – human others. Both of the broad theoretical approaches to the problem of the animal that I mentioned—— the undoing of the human/animal opposition to explore respects in which we are like other animals and the highlighting of the otherness of animals , which demands respect —— can be consonant with an emerging “ecocriticism , ” an earth – centered approach to literary studies , enlisting literature and literary sensibilities in thinking about the environment and human impacts on it , challenging us to bear this always in mind. Ecocriticism does not have a distinctive method of reading so much as a dominant question , a change of scale , a focus on the diverse modes of violence of human anthropocentrism.^⑥ It may explore writings about nature , how different groups treat nature differently , or highlight celebrations of nature in order to promote ecological consciousness; or it may take on human uses of nature more directly. In a recent PMLA essay on Ecocriticism , entitled “Sea Trash , Dark Pools , and the Tragedy of the Commons , ” the editor of the journal , Patricia Yeager , pursues the “oceanic turn” in literary studies , whose premise is that we have

been myopic about the role oceans have played in creating cultures; now oceans can no longer be conceived as unlimited resource or sublime horizon but have become a shared environment all too easily degraded.^⑦ Yeager reads literary representations of the sea against oceanic realities.

For ecocriticism, the well-being of the full range of life forms, human and non-human, and of the environment is an end to which other purposes should answer. A representative work of ecocriticism is Ursula Heise's *Sense of Place, Sense of Planet: The Environmental Imagination of the Global* (Oxford 2008). This book is ambitious and substantial in its promotion of the aesthetic imagination of the planet, working to explore the relations between environmentalism, cosmopolitanism, globalization, risk theory, and the thinking of cultural difference, in an "ecocosmopolitanism," to which the literary imagination contributes. Heise speaks to a broad comparative and interdisciplinary audience, in a book perhaps not immediately recognizable as literary theory, though it enlists various literary works, by authors such as Don DeLillo and Christa Wolf, in its attempt to lay out relations between the local and the global.

But celebration of nature or the natural is not a posture with which theory, especially post-structuralist theory, can remain content. Like the oppositions between Man and Nature, and between man and animal, the opposition between man and machine has had an important cultural and ideological function: in each case the second term has been used in oppositions to define the human, and same logic that works to undo the first two oppositions applies to the third. We have had a stake in defining ourselves as different from machines, but just as we are animals, are we not also machines? The critique of the opposition man/machine is a logical development of the movement of contemporary theory, which has contested the traditional model of the human subject as autonomous, rational, self-conscious, and possessed of free will. (Marxism and psychoanalysis offer two powerful accounts of subjects that are products of a range of forces, social and psychic, that they do not control.) Conscious agency, we could say, is just a story consciousness tells itself in order to explain what in fact happens as a result of the interaction of a complex of factors. The critique of the autonomous human subject thus leads logically not to "machine liberation" exactly, but to a questioning of this man/machine opposition in explorations of what some theorists have called the "post-human." This is the *fifth* development I want briefly to consider.

5. The primary function of the notion of the "post-human" is to mark a passage beyond the traditional conception of the human subject. Though studies of the post-human frequently draw on science fiction, cybernetics, and systems theory, the argument is not just that computers and other machines have changed the world, creating a situation where we are part of complex systems or circuits that we do not control. The fundamental claim is that we have always been post-human, always other than that image of the human suggested by humanism. Computers and other devices have only made evident what was the case all along: the psyche with its drives, for example, was never a device that we controlled, and our bodies are extremely complex mechanisms that have always in many ways escaped the understanding of science. Granted, today we increasingly experience ourselves as controlled by our machines as much as we control them: as I was writing this, my machine repeatedly summoned me to read messages, mostly ads or announcements generated by other machines. In fact, it is the structure of controller and controlled that the notion of the post-human puts in question.

Donna Haraway's "A Cyborg Manifesto" of 1985 first articulated what was later to be picked up by theory and become the notion of the post-human: "we are all chimeras, theorized and fabricated hybrids of machine and organism; in short, we are cyborgs."^⑧ The cyborg, hybrid creature of science fiction, part person and part robot, "is a creature in a post-gender world," (this was a feminist, socialist manifesto) and "can suggest a way out of the maze of dualisms in which we have explained our bodies and our tools to ourselves."

Once we question the idea of a self or mind that controls its bodies and its tools and grasp that the skills that enable us to function are embodied, both in our own bodies and in those extensions of our bodies in the environment, from simple tools to the most elaborate computer systems, we can see that, living in the world, we are part of systems of “distributed cognition,” some of it embodied in our minds, some in the smart environments that we and our machines have created. Katherine Hayles’s *How We Became Posthuman* (Chicago, 1999) charts this shift in understanding which she also tries to advance: from autonomous subjects to nodes of embodiment in increasingly complex systems with feedback loops. The systems of which we form a part are now able to fly airplanes, set stock prices, find information and do a host of other things more quickly and efficiently than mind by itself ever could. Though for many purposes we still have recourse to traditional notions of individuals, free will, and agency, these are seen as heuristic fictions, which we use to try to make sense of a world in which pattern emerges against a background of randomness, through recursive operations. What we call the human, for instance, would be a selection of features from machinic systems and processes.^⑨

The claim that we are post-human is, of course, an aggressive theoretical move, and it is easy to become impatient with claims that we are *post* this or that: we are *post-modern*, *post-structuralist*, *post-racial*, and now *post-human*. Why not say that traditional notions of the human have been challenged, so that what we have is a new, more accurate conception of the human which takes account of its embeddedness in increasingly complex systems?

There are doubtless two reasons: first, the notion of the human, however redefined, still seems to imply an opposition between humans and animals on the one hand and humans and machines on the other. The explicit claim of “the post-human” is that these are gross oversimplifications. Second, a new term, a neologism such as *post-human*, has a power to mark shifts in thought that otherwise are easy to forget or neglect. Whether the idea of the post-human will have any staying power—it is not a term I myself favor—or whether it will give way as we become accustomed to new accounts of the human is hard to predict. No doubt it will depend on what our search engines decide!

6. Return to Aesthetics. But what of art and literature in this post-human world? Strangely, an interest in the post-human may have contributed to the revival of aesthetics, the theory of art in general, which had been pushed aside by literary and cultural theory of late 20th century. Theorists had themselves always made strong claims for particular aesthetic practices, just not for the idea of the aesthetic, and the reasons for the eclipse of aesthetics are not hard to understand. Traditional aesthetic concepts, such as artistic genius, the autonomy and universality of art, and its inherent spiritual value, were inextricably tied to conceptions of the subject and of the independence of discourse from social forces that theory of various schools was engaged in combating.^⑩ The triumph of theory and the widespread assumption that the concepts of aesthetics belonged to an outmoded elitist and universalizing conception of art left open a space—a vacuum of sorts—that permitted, and even seemed to demand, a return of aesthetic issues in new guise. What is sometimes called a “new formalism” or a “new aestheticism” denotes a renewed attention to literary and artistic form in the context of the theoretical developments that seemed to have disabled or rendered reactionary traditional aesthetics or approaches to literary form. Without aesthetics, the French theorist Jacques Rancière has argued, there is no art: without specifically aesthetic values or perspectives, so-called art will merge with everything else—into a sea of consumer objects, we might say. A discrete understanding of art is needed to frame things as art and to keep art distinctive. Similarly, literary works are not just language but products of specifically literary practices and systems of convention which need to be understood: how does poetic meter work, for example? Even though literature is a social product and practice, entwined with ideology, it ultimately poses for critics and other thinkers the question of the specificity of the literary objects: are there distinctive features of

literary works and the experience of literary works, or is that an illusion? How should we conceive of literary or artistic invention? There is interest in the singularity of the literary work, as a distinctive event, in the ways in which works may disclose a world. What sort of role does literary form play in the effects literature achieves? People speak of a: “new formalism” or a “return to aesthetics.”^⑪

Jacques Rancière has been particularly important in reversing the critique of aesthetics as elitist. Western aesthetics, what Rancière calls “the aesthetic regime,” replaced in the early 19th century what he calls the “representative regime,” inherited from Aristotle, a regime based on literary and artistic genres and structured by rules concerning appropriate and inappropriate subjects for art and for particular means of representation.^⑫ In the late 18th century, at the time of the French Revolution, these rules were challenged—henceforth anything could be the subject of art or literature. Victor Hugo wrote that he had put a revolutionary hat—“un bonnet rouge”—on the old dictionary: no longer were there noble words and ignoble words. The romantic revolution in literature and art was a democratizing project, Rancière has vigorously reminded us, leading to the breaking of links between art and aristocracy, to the foundation of museums, and to general projects of aesthetic education. The realm of Theory is definitely experiencing a return to aesthetics.

Today, the questions of aesthetics and democratization are connected with the subject of new media. The world of new digital media, hypertext, and computer games poses new aesthetic questions: is the move from a print-based to an electronic-based culture one that will have repercussions for the concept of literature and hence for literary theory? The notion of the literary text as a finished verbal artifact may change, as electronic form makes texts into potentially mutable instances. Katherine Hayles notes that while literature has always functioned as a technology designed to change the cognition of the reader, in new electronic systems feedback loops enable different levels of interaction between text and reader to continuously inform and mutually determine one another, transforming texts as readers perform them. In electronic texts, words and images may actually shift, through algorithms or programs that create an infinite number of possible recombinations.^⑬ We have been accustomed to say, of great literature, that the text always has surprises in store, so that readers always find something new in it. Electronic texts can literalize (and perhaps trivialize) this condition. More significantly, they can lead to a reimagining of the literary work as an instrument or game to be played.

If, as a result of such developments, literature comes to be seen less as a fixed text and more as an event, a specific instance of singular interaction with a reader or audience, this may require an aesthetics of evaluation that explores the potential value of various interactive programs or systems. Thus, performance studies may take on a new centrality in literary studies, as it comes to treat texts less as signs to be interpreted than as performances whose conditions of possibility and of success can be elucidated.^⑭ Will more focus on event and evaluation lead to shifts in literary aesthetics in the electronic era?

I have mentioned six rather miscellaneous developments, with no particular hierarchy or clear overall direction. I would say, though, that there is a growing awareness in the realm of theory that we are in an interdependent world and that we need to think about the relation between western theory and literary and cultural theories elsewhere. Literary theory is seen in West as a Western thing, even though other cultures had very well-developed accounts of literature before the West did, and one of the big challenges of the future is working out the relations between Western theory and other accounts. One could imagine that the sort of movement that constituted theory in the West in the 1970s and 1980s will be repeated on a global scale. Some discourses from other parts of the world will be found insightful, challenges to local common sense, perhaps, and will be incorporated and developed, and others will not. Just as theory in the West learned a lot from other disciplines, so theory in each country can assimilate and develop theoretical possibilities from elsewhere. Whatever happens, I do feel confident that there will continue to be a very active, extremely engaging, theo-

retical enterprise——the activity of literary theory.

注释 [Notes]

- ①For discussion of “theory” see Jonathan Culler , *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction*. Oxford University Press ,1997 , chapter 1. There now exists a new edition with a revised bibliography and new final chapter, “Ethics and Aesthetics ,” published in 2011.
- ②For some discussions of the current situation of theory see Derek Attridge and Jane Elliott , eds. *Theory after Theory* , Routledge ,2010; Jonathan Culler, “Critical Paradigms ,” Introduction to “Literary Criticism for the 21st Century ,” *PMLA* , Vol. 125 , No. 4 , October 2010 , and also the new final chapter of Culler , *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* , Oxford University Press , revised edition ,2011.
- ③Vicki Hearne , *Adam’s Task* (Knopf ,1986) . For “being with animals ,” see Donna Haraway , *When Species Meet* (Minnesota ,2007) .
- ④Two general sources for the question are Matthew Carlucci , *Zoographies: The Question of the Animal from Heidegger to Derrida*. (Columbia ,2008) , and *Zoontologies: The Question of the Animal* , ed. Cary Wolfe (Minnesota ,2003) .
- ⑤Laura Brown , *Homeless Dogs and Melancholy Apes* (Cornell ,2010) .
- ⑥Lawrence Buell , *Writing for an Endangered World: Literature , Culture , and Environment in the U. S. and Beyond* (Harvard , 2001) is an important early example. Greg Garrard , *Ecocriticism* (Routledge 2004) is a short , accessible introduction.
- ⑦Patricia Yeager, “Sea Trash , Dark Pools , and the Tragedy of the Commons ,” *PMLA* 225 (May 2010) .
- ⑧Donna Haraway, “A Cyborg Manifesto ,” collected in her *Simians , Cyborgs and Women* (Routledge , 1991)
- ⑨See also , Cary Wolfe , *What is Posthumanism?* (Minnesota ,2010) .
- ⑩For the ideological critique of aesthetics , see Terry Eagleton , *The Ideology of the Aesthetic* (Blackwell ,1991) .
- ⑪See Derek Attridge , *The Singularity of Literature* (Routledge ,2004) ; Marjorie Levinson, “What is New Formalism?” *PMLA* 122. 2 (March 2007) and Jonathan Loesberg , *A Return to Aesthetics* (Stanford ,2005) .
- ⑫Jacques Rancière , *Aesthetics and its Discontents* (Polity Press ,2009) .
- ⑬N. Katherine Hayles , *My Mother Was a Computer: Digital Subjects and Literary Texts* (Chicago ,2005) .
- ⑭See Richard Schechner ed. *Performance Studies: An Introduction* (Routledge ,2006) .

(责任编辑: 范静哗)