to that day!” But the film is not so positive. There is a wind blowing from the East, and we will all have to wait and see exactly what that wind will bring.

Between The Nomad & The Exile:
Some Thoughts on *To Liv(e)*

Ming-Yuen S. Ma

“But if exile is a condition of terminal loss, why has it been transformed so easily into a potent, even enriching, motif of modern culture?”

Edward Said, “Reflections on Exile”

Within the debate of post-colonial subject positions, the nomad emerged as a (de)central figure. Trinh T. Minh-ha wrote “Walking on beaten paths, she may laugh, and laugh at herself for she may realize she must and she can, at any moment, stray from the itinerary chosen, get rid many of her fears, and take pleasure in making abrupt turns and repeated detours, so as to outplay her own game, rendering impotent the master’s world of refined dissections and classifications.”

Straying from one’s path, in this text, becomes an act of resistance on the part of a post-colonial feminist subject; a constant eluding of the totalizing quest for absolute meaning on the part of hegemonic cultures. In Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari’s *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, the notion of “nomadism” is introduced as a theoretical paradigm that is capable of going “from the central layer to the periphery, then from the
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new center to the new periphery, falling back to the old center and launching forth to the new." The continuous journey from the center to the periphery destabilizes these as fixed positions.

In the context of these theoretical texts, the figure of the nomad is used as a metaphor for de-centeredness. "Nomadism" metaphorizes an ideological position that resists incorporation into dominant cultures’ binary opposites of male/female, black/white, self/other, center/margin, etc. For a theoretical "nomad," a series of constantly shifting ideological positions can be occupied and vacated as one "journeys" through a cultural "landscape." Positions of resistance, then, can be articulated outside of the hegemonic culture/counter culture paradigm. Hegemonic thinking can in fact be de-stabilized through this mobility of positioning.

In this process of theorization, the nomad becomes an abstract, stylized figure who is defined linguistically, rather than through specific social and historical contexts. Teshome H. Gabriel’s essay, "Thoughts on Nomadic Aesthetics and the Black Independent Cinema: Traces of a Journey," operates on a similar level, where a general framework of nomadic existence is aesthetized and used as a metaphor which Gabriel applied to black independent cinema. However, Gabriel’s essay differs from the previously mentioned texts in that it formulates nomadism in both a stylized as well as historical and culturally-specific manner, and applies it to the specific phenomenon of black independent cinema. In a text that combines myth, storytelling, and analytic and poetic writing, Gabriel’s definition of the "nomadic" is at once abstract and specific. Defining phrases that in their analytic tone resemble ethnographic writing, such as "To them art has two essential factors: (a) the ability to consolidate the community through ritual and performance and (b) collective participation in their dramatized, spoken and artistic forms," can be read alongside phrases such as "the conception of space is thus relative to seeing, feeling, and touching. To settlers, living in close proximity, distance and space are turned into an abstraction, into a greater introspection. We thus know less about more, and nomads know more about less," which in its poetic stylization is reminiscent of texts by Trinh and Deleuze and Guattari.

These shifts in writing style are perhaps Gabriel’s own demonstration of "nomadic aesthetics." However, the actual relationship between a nomadic existence and the conditions of contemporary black experience warrants further examination. In a section titled "Black Cinema/Traveling Cinema, Gabriel first attributes examples of nomadic peoples such as the Bedouin of Arabia, the Eskimos and the Indians of North and South America, and the Aborigines of Australia as having originated from Africa "where the first human cry was heard." He then follows this definitive generalization with a lengthy passage discussing the commonalities between a new abstractified nomad and black people.

Though black people and nomads may be racially and ethnically distinct, Language, in the broadest sense, unites them. The dominant aspect of this language is symbolism, metaphor, music and performance. They are also united in the very idea of space — they are both marginalized and (de)territorialized peoples. To both, collective memory, rather than official history, is of crucial importance. To both memory evokes mosaic images and sounds, and invades everyday existence. Both reject the idea of closure or termination, be it in their artistic manifestation or in their lifestyle. Just as the nomads are synthesizers of surrounding cultures, they pass through, so are blacks.

Of course, the most obvious difference between actual nomads and black people in America and Europe is the historical occurrence of
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5 Ibid., p. 66.
6 Ibid., p. 70.
slavery and emigration of Africans to Europe and England. In most of these cases, black people did not simply pass through, they were forced to do so. Edward Said wrote in “Reflection on Exile” of the different experiences of modern day displacement to the wanderings of the idealized nomad in Romantic literature: “It is not true that the view of exile in literature and, moreover, in religion obscure what is truly horrendous; that exile is irresistibly secular and unbearably historical; that it is produced by human beings for other human beings, and that, like death but without death’s ultimate mercy, it has torn millions of people from nourishment of tradition, family and geography.” In terms of historical similarities, isn’t the experience of slavery more similar to the massive displacement of peoples in contemporary societies than to the pre-industrial nomadic existence? Then, one may ask: why the metaphor of the nomad?

I would argue that Gabriel’s choice of using nomadism as a metaphor for black independent cinema stems from both his recognition of the diasporic nature of this specific cultural practice, which one needs to discuss in terms such as African American and British African as well as with African proper, and his nostalgia for an idealized past. Said wrote that “The pathos of exile is in the loss of contact with the solidity and the satisfaction of earth: homecoming is out of the question.” For African Americans, homecoming to Africa is also out of the question. In his discussion of nostalgia and televisial fetishization of the exile Iranian community in the United States, Hamid Naficy used the following quote from George Steiner: “It is not the literal past that rules us... it is images of the past... The image we carry of a lost coherence, of a center that held, has authority greater than historical truth.”

Speaking about the more recent experience of Iranian political exiles, Naficy interpreted the phenomenon of nostalgia for one’s homeland through the theoretical framework of fetishism in Freudian psychoanalysis. His study of the recurrent and idealized images of the “homeland” in Iranian television-in-exile led him to write: “Fetishization operates synecdochically, where by parts (fetishes) stand for the whole. To be sure, this focalization on fragments eases the pain of loss and masks the trauma of separation from home.” While realizing the potential problem of applying a eurocentric theoretical framework — Freudian psychoanalysis — to a people of Middle Eastern origins, I think that Naficy’s analysis can shed light on the formulation of Gabriel’s nomad metaphor. Could fetishization caused by the trauma of separation from one’s homeland, over several generations, have precipitated a longing for an idealized past?

Evans Chan’s film To Liv(e) was produced under circumstances quite different from the black independent cinema that Gabriel discusses. One of the few independent art films to come out of Hong Kong, a long time center for commercial cinema in Asia, To Liv(e) differs from commercial Hong Kong films in both its form and content. Its feature length format also places it in between full-length commercial releases and shorter format experimental films and videos, which it actually incorporates into its narrative. The film is a hybrid
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7 Most of the films that Gabriel discusses in his essay were produced by persons of African descent in America and Europe.
8 Said, p. 358.
9 Ibid., p. 361.
10 Although there have been movements of African Americans returning to Africa (Marcus Garvey comes to mind), my statement here does not refer to the actual journey back to Africa. Rather, I am referring to the idealized “Africa” that is constructed in African American popular culture such as rap, and how this ideal of “home” is in fact quite unrelated to the cultural, political and social realities in Africa today. Therefore, returning to Africa sometimes is less of a “homecoming” than it is a journey to a “foreign” country. I will discuss in depth this discrepancy amongst displaced peoples in the latter part of this essay.
11 From “Exile Discourse and Televisual Fetishism” by Hamid Naficy in Quarterly Review of Film and Video, 13/1-3: 111.
12 It is significant to note that To Liv(e), though produced in Hong Kong, is shown most widely in the international film festival circuit, which is more receptive to experimental films. The film had a very limited theatrical release in Hong Kong, and is made known primarily through interest on the part of local and overseas intellectuals and film scholars in endeavors such as this book.
13 Besides original segments in the film, it also incorporates works by Hong Kong-based media artists, such as Ellen Pau and May Fung. For example, Pau’s video “Love in the Time of Plagues,” made in collaboration with
of narrative, documentary, and experimental forms.

Its narrative plot revolves around the lives and concerns of a working-class-turned-middle-class family in Hong Kong as 1997 approaches. The narrative is triggered both by the family members' consideration of emigration as well as by actress-turned-international-refugee-advocate Liv Ullmann's public condemnation of the treatment of Vietnamese boat people in Hong Kong. In the film, the main protagonist, Rubie, writes a series of letters to Liv Ullmann in response to her statement of condemnation. The delivery of these "letters" are shot in a talking-heads format which directly addresses the viewer, and their "voice" can function as the voice of the director Evans Chan, the collective voice of Hong Kong people, as well as that of Rubie herself. Historical newsreel footage, scenes from recent Pro-Democracy demonstrations, and cityscapes of Hong Kong also appear as visual images that accompany these letters. The content of the letters echoes the documentary approach when it delineates the colonial history of Hong Kong, and analyzes its ironic position in the international refugee affair — not only was the position of first asylum for Vietnamese boat people assigned to Hong Kong by the British government and the international community without the consent of its people, but many fear that after 1997 and the reversion to Chinese rule, the fate of many Hong Kong citizens will not be so different from that which befell the Vietnamese. This anxiety is also heightened by the June 4th massacre that occurred less than a year before the film was made.

While emigration for most of the characters in the film, such as Rubie and her boyfriend, is considered in economic and political terms, another kind of displacement is introduced through her brother Tony and his lover Teresa. They see their emigration to Australia as an escape from the constricting social mores of traditional Chinese culture, personified by Tony's mother who disapproves of their relationship because Teresa is a divorcee ten years older than Tony. Thus, displacement in To Liv(e) is not only dealt with in political and economic terms; Tony and Teresa are seen as social outcasts (exiles) because of their unconventional sexual relationship.

Although To Liv(e) stemmed from a different cultural context, and was produced under different conditions than most of black independent cinema, the formal structure of the film fits remarkably well into Teshome Gabriel's definition of nomadic cinema. Its oscillations between narrative, fiction, and documentary allows the presentation of information through different levels of meaning. The various layers of representation, in the narrative, archival footage, and performance art sequences, as well as "sampled" video art tapes produced by local artists, cross-reference each other and build up to a multi-textuality that demonstrates the traveling aesthetics of Gabriel's notion of nomadic cinema. For example, the film's political message, self-reflexive in the letters and direct in the agit prop performance sequences, is reitered in the everyday conversation and actions of its characters. Furthermore, its delineation of the colonial history of Hong Kong is crucial to an understanding of the actions, thoughts and positioning of its characters. It does, in its subtle way, "smash down boundaries — between documentary, ethnographic, travelogue, experimental and narrative fiction."

The film's characterization of the people of Hong Kong's reaction to their "nomadic" status, on the other hand, is quite different from the Gabriel's notion of pastoral nomads reflecting "par excellence the lifestyle of a free people." Politically, the in-between status of Hong Kong citizens as British colonial subjects and Chinese compatriots is seen as being less than empowering. As the character Trini, Rubie's political activist friend, points out in the film, Hong Kong Chinese are subjected to the policies of both Britain and China, but often times are
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14 Gabriel, p. 64-66.
15 This statement applies most obviously to the characters of Trini and Elsie Tu (discussed later in this essay). However, we can also see the actions of Rubie's boyfriend (in refusing to leave Hong Kong) and her brother (in wanting to leave) as part and partial to Hong Kong's colonial legacy.
16 Gabriel, p. 73.
17 Ibid., p. 63.
not recognized by either. In her experience during the June 4th demonstrations in Beijing, she feels at once anger at the British government for abandoning them at a time of crisis, and detachment from the citizens of Beijing who were rushing to defend their city (and the Pro-Democracy Movement which they support) from the invading tanks. Tony and Teresa also represent another kind of outsider status that is characterized as a source of anxiety, and their unconventional relationship embodies the in-between status of Hong Kong citizens in another manner. As colonial subjects Hong Kongers are influenced by the impositions of “western” ideas upon traditional cultures. Tony and Teresa’s relationship represents the values of the younger, more “westernized” generation, who also have to grapple with “traditional” Chinese social mores. In fact, Tony’s mother illustrates quite succinctly the predicament of a people caught between two cultures when she accepts the marriage of Elsie Tů to a younger Chinese man (because she is a “foreign devil”) while at the same time rejects Teresa as a suitable partner for her son. While the “theoretical nomad” can wander in between different ideological positions, the characters in To Live(e) are caught in between these positions.

At this point, I would like to return to the earlier discussion of the difference between an idealized construction of a nomadic past and the contemporary experience of often enforced mass migration and political exile. In To Live(e), characters who are experiencing literal displacement, whether they be social or political exiles, actually resist rather than adopt the theoretical and psychological subject position of nomads. Teresa exhibits an abjection that is interestingly echoed in Said’s description of exiles as “anyone who is really homeless regards the habit of seeing estrangement in everything modern as an afflication, a display of modistic attitudes. Clutching difference like a weapon to be used with stiffened will, the exile jealously insists on his or her right to refuse to belong.”18 Teresa’s attitude could partially be attributed to the importance of the notions of home and family in Confucian Chinese culture: her marginalization from the “traditional” family also translates to her alienation from the very basis of her cultural identity. She is the ultimate outsider in the film. In To Live(e), the characters are dealing with two kinds of home space — the literal homeland of Hong Kong, itself a hybridized colonial society that is “anonymously threatened” by the impending reversion to an authoritarian govern-ment, and the traditional family, which is going through a process of redefinition partially due to the imposition of “western” ideology and morality since colonization. The coexistence and overlapping of these two notions of home in To Live(e) creates a series of inclusions and exclusions that creates a fluctuating sense of belonging and alienation. Since Hong Kong is in many ways a “successful” colony built upon capitalism, the relationship between oppressor and oppressed in Hong Kong society is more ambiguous than in other colonized countries. Elsie Tů, an interesting figure in the film because of her difference from and affinity with Ruby’s family, is an example of this predicament. She came to Hong Kong as a missionary — as a part of the colonizing culture, yet had decided to “go native” in best sense of the word, and became an important activist and advocate for the poor and the underprivileged of Hong Kong.

From many Hong Kong citizens, and certainly some of the characters in To Live(e), exemplified by Ruby’s boyfriend, the prospect of becoming an exile/refugee/nomad is viewed with apprehension. However, in more ways than one that identity is already embodied by a hybridized Hong Kong society. Yet, for those who are already “homeless,” for whom “homecoming is out of the question,” a nomadic subjectivity can be a source of empowerment. Naficy saw the exile’s assimilation into the host culture as “a liminal process of becoming, which is never final nor complete nor univocal (at least for the first generation immigrants), because it involves the constitution of a new subjectivity in exile, one that is based on fetishization, double incorporation, ambivalence, hybridity, and syncretism — involving articulation of the home with the host cultural values and practices.”19 This process, I think, is also a process of (re)defining the centers and margins for oneself, and that of (re)locating oneself within that particular framework. The different historical circumstances of black slavery and colonialism in Asia
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18 Said, p. 363.

19 Naficy, p. 113.
have produced different points of identification and alienation. Certainly, the process of displacement and assimilation is a continuous one, in which an individual’s perception of his or her experience will shift according to the circumstances involved. Between the exile and the nomad are a number of positions that will be occupied more as the conditions of displacement are being re-defined by contemporary experiences.

遊牧與流放之間：
對《浮世戀曲》的一點思考

馬明遠

「假若流放是永遠的失落，那為何它竟又如此輕易地轉換為現代文化中一個如此活潑、涵具衍生力的主題？」

艾德華·薩伊特《思考流放》

遊牧者(The Nomad)是芸芸有關後殖民主體(Post-colonial subject)定位的辯論中，最顯著的一個(離)中心人物。鄭明霞就曾經這樣寫：「步下那千萬人踏過的老路，她可以縱情歡笑，或嘆笑自己──因爲明知自己必須，也可以隨時隨地做非原定的行程；摒除顧慮，盡情享受那急轉彎及兜路走的快感，不但在自己的遊戲中勝出，並把主子製造的那界限分明、座落有緻的世界粉碎。」[2]鄭明霞於上文中，以後殖民女性主體(post-colonial feminist subject)的反抗行動等同「越離常軌」，因而得以常決脫離文化對終極意義(absolute meaning)的全盤掌握。

在紀爾·特雷斯和菲里斯·柴塔里的《千座高原：資本主義與精神分裂》一書中，「遊牧主義」更被進一步建立為一個理論範例(theoretical

paradigm)。這範例描繪了各種不同的遊牧活動：「從中心到邊緣層，然後從新的中心到新的邊緣層，形成新的中心再往新的中心推展。」(頁53)中心與邊緣的兩點之間不斷穿梭，能令兩者無法完全固定或固定的觀點。

於上述文章中，「遊牧者」成爲「離棄中心」(de-center)的寓像。「遊牧主義」意味著某種意識形態的立場：就是抗拒被納入主流文化的「男/女」、「黑白」、「自我/他我」、「中心/邊緣」等二元對立歸納法。在理論層次上，「遊牧者」可以佔據、遊離不同的意識形態；站立點，在文化景觀的廣闊天空下，能夠不屈、任意飄浮。因此，抗衡的立場可以在「霸權」的範圍以外被闡述。「霸權的思考方式亦因而喪失其中心的主導地位。」

在這理想化過程中，「遊牧者」被抽象化、風格化了；它的概念不只受制於特定的社會或歷史背景，而是於語言上(linguistically)被界定。在特奴姆、加布里爾的（有關遊牧美學及黑人獨立電影之思考）*一文中，「遊牧式的生存」成為一種理念架構，被美化及寓言化，然後用於黑人獨立電影的探討上。但有別於前述作者之處，是他把「遊牧主義」用於一個特定的電影運動。加布里爾的文章融合了神話、說書、分析性及詩意的文字，他勾畫出「的遊牧」涵義即抽象又具體，有時令人聯想人類學（ethnographic）的意義。例如：「對他們來說藝術有兩大要素：(1) 有透過儀式及表演以鞏固群體關係的能力；(2) 其語法化、藝術化的創作形式能讓群體參與。」(頁43)他指出，是對他們的意義又讓人聯想赫克明、史泰特和薛多里，「他們是相對於觀眾，感覺及觸覺而言的。對於密集群居的拓荒者來說，距離變為抽象的，更廣漠的內省。我們因而變得更以大觀小，而遊牧者卻更能以小觀大。」(頁66)

這種書寫風格的轉移也許是加布里爾的「遊牧式美學」的現身示範。然而，遊牧者的生存方式與當代黑人經驗之間有何實際關連卻尚待考究。在「黑人電影/旅行電影」一節中，加布里爾列舉各種的「遊牧者」例子：阿拉伯的貝都因人（Bedouin）、漢斯基摩人、印第安人、澳洲的原住民等，並指出他們皆源自「人類初發啼聲」的非洲。於定義普遍性的陳述後，加布里爾比較這抽象化的遊牧人與黑人之間的異同：

雖然黑人與遊牧人既不同族又不同種，但在最廣義的言論上，卻有共通之處。這言論的重大特色是象徵、寓意、音樂及演出等。在空間的感知上，他們也有共通之處——他們都是失去土地及邊緣化的人種。對他們來說，集體記憶遠比官方記載的歷史更重要。因此，記憶引發的聲音與映象的拼圖傳達著日常生活，不論在生活方式及藝術的抒發上，他們都抗拒尋求開闢。遊牧者不斷吸納重組他們途徑的不同文化，黑人亦是如此。(頁70)

當然，歐美地區的黑人與真正的遊牧者的明顯區別是：奴隸制度的實現及非洲人移民至英國、歐洲等史實。*在這章中，黑人不是簡單地「途徑」，而是被迫「抵達」。艾德華·薩依特在〈思考流放〉中，曾論及浪漫文學中理想化的遊牧者的飄泊，與近代人流放所的經驗之區別：

文學與宗教中的流放觀往往掩蓋了這現象最恐怖的一面：流亡是無可救贖地世俗的，難以承受的歷史性的。流亡是一些人對另一些人創造的恐怖，墮入死亡，卻沒有死亡終極的解脫的一面。流亡令千百萬人痛失傳統、家族及地域的浸潤慰藉。*在歷史的共通性而言，黑奴的經驗是在不類似當代社會中離鄉別井的人海飄流，更多於前工業時期的社會遊牧生涯？於是我們會問：為什麼遊牧者這象喻？

我要指出的是：加布里爾選擇了遊牧主義去比喻黑人獨立電影運動是基於這運動的跨地域性質——這點就美國黑人及非洲本土黑人個別的源流去理解——及他對一個理想化的過去底沉澱。薩依特說：「流放的恐怖源自無法重獲鄉土的充實與安撫，再不可能歸家了。」(頁361) 歷史黑人來說，歸家的可能性再也不復存在了。*談起美國的伊朗人社區對電視的盲目崇拜，哈米德·納法斯引述了喬治·斯坦納(Stanine Steiner)討論鄉愁的
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1. Said, p. 358
2. 加布里爾在這文章中討論的電影大部份是現今美國地區非洲裔的創作。
的聲音箇片中人敘貞的，也是香港的眾體的聲音，當然也可視之為導演陳耀成自己的聲音。歷史新聞片、八九民運的示威場面、香港都市面貌等不同的形象伴著誦詠的獨白、信的內容與記錄片的手法互相呼應，逐一陳述香港的殖民歷史，及她在國際上承擔越南船民重大包袱的可笑及矛盾處：不單止「第一收容港」這角色是英國政府和聯合國協商香港身上的，根本不曾取得港人的同意；還有九七回歸後，香港市民的未來亦在他人股掌之間，香港人與越南人的命運最後可能不過是同一調子的變奏而已！香港的焦慮燃燒在香港大學城事件後進一步惡化，就在這種氣氛下，《浮世懺卷》誕生了。

移民問題對片中眾多角色，例如敘貞和她男友守中，主要類性質的政治的考慮出發。然而另一種離家的衝動卻透過敘貞弟弟俊俊（Tony）和愛情文娜（Teresa）堅決。他們視移民澳洲為逃離中國傳統的社會規範，保存二人愛情的出路。傳統宗祠的約束在片中以俊俊母親為代表。她不滿文娜為已婚婦人，又比俊俊年長十歲，遂堅決反對兩人關係。換句話說《浮世懺卷》中的人的退路，不但從政治經濟因素探討，亦當俊俊和文娜違反傳統的性愛關係，這雙被社會放逐的情侶的角度透視。

《浮世懺卷》產於香港，表面看來與黑人獨立電影有南轅北轍之別。但《浮世懺卷》的形式結構卻與加布里埃爾有關的遊牧電影頗有吻合之處，《浮世懺卷》在敘事、記錄片、原創故事三者之間穿梭，資訊因而能透過多元文化的層面傳遞。敘事、新聞片、舞台表表演的片段，還有穿插全片互相呼應的數段由香港繪畫工作者提供的片段，構成多層次的表達方式，達到多元文本性的效果，展現了加布里埃爾的遊牧者電影的流浪式美學。例如，《浮世懺卷》片的政治訊息，既透過自省的書簡及直率的實務性舞劇表演表達，又不時反射於劇中人物的家常閒話及生活瑣事裏。再者，對片中人物的行頭、思想及人物關係的理據，又往往要透過片中香港殖民史的鋪陳才得以全面。《浮世懺卷》確實巧妙而不著痕跡地「破除一切界限—記錄性的，民族學的、遊記式的、實驗性的和敘事性電影之間的界限。」

---


10 必須指出，《浮世懺卷》雖是港產片，卻是在較支持實驗性創作的電影節這些國際性的場合上得到最大的收視。在香港本地，該片放映時間不長，主要靠本地及海外的知識份子大力推介，今此片揚名，此書的出版亦是这份力量的成績。

11 除了原創拍攝的片段外，《浮世懺卷》中採用了不少香港メディア創作者的作品，例如鮑華倫（Ellen Fung）和馬美華（May Fung），鮑的錄像作品《愛在瘟疫蔓延時》本來是《在進二十一面體》表演劇集的拍段，介紹文娜出場時，她電視屏幕上的正是其片段。用之既是一個因為愛上一個比她年輕的男子而受社會排斥的女人，恰如其份。
但在《浮世戀曲》中香港人對自身的「遊牧」性處境的描畫，卻顯然
與加布里埃爾歌繪「自由人的至佳生活方式」(頁63)為命題的田園式遊牧觀
念截然不同。在政治上，港人模棱兩可地僅具英國屬土公民及中共港胞的
身份，但兩者都談不上給予港人什麼政治本質。正版中片語的友人，政
治活躍份子卓尼(Trini)指出，香港華人同時要選於英國及中國的政策，但
兩個政府往往都不大認識他們的權益。卓尼的北京四處經驗令她一方面對
不明責任的英政府感到激憤，另一方面，她對以單車拖坦克的北京市民的
護城決心亦感到隔膜。佳俊與文婉則代表了兩種——充滿焦慮的——外
人處境。二人的反世達俗的關係以某一姿態表現了港人模棱兩可的境況。
作為殖民地的順民，我們正在受著新舊思潮橫加於中國傳統文化的影響。
佳俊文婉的關係正表現了年青一輩的價值觀，是較西化的一代，然而他們
仍得與傳統的社會規範抗爭。事實上，佳俊的母親可以接受曾援助她的政
客葉錫恩嫁給她年輕的中國男子——因她是「洋鬼子」——卻不能接受文
婉成為她兒子的伴侶。她的態度涵括了港人在東西文化夾縫中的種種困
局，理念上的遊牧者也許可以在不同的意識形態立足點上流動，但《浮世
戀曲》中的人物卻在這些定位點間被模擬住了。

寫到這裡必須重申較早時討論到的一個課題：對批遊牧生活的理想
化的描畫，與近世的政治流亡眷子及被迫遷徙的龐大人流，二者之間有何
區分？在《浮世戀曲》裏，幾個面對離散的角色(不論是政治或世俗被
流放的人物)，在理論及心理層面上是抗拒多於接納遊牧者的立場。文婉
的自暴自棄，與陸依伊對流放者的描述異曲同工：『勃動不就喚醒大
的事物令人流離流這態度對終無家的人來說是一種情緒，一片時髦的姿勢
而已。流放者總把歧異用作武器，顯然而又充滿嫉妒地堅持他/她擁有的
「拒絕融入新社會的權利」。』14文婉的態度，從某一角度看，顯示傳統
孔孟思想賦予家庭觀念的權威性：她被邊緣化了，與其文化身份的基礎相
剝離了。文婉是片中終極的「外邦人」。

《浮世戀曲》中的人物所面臨的，其實是兩種不同的家的空間。首
先，香港作業實體的家園，其實是個雜雜的殖民社會，活在即將回歸中國
的權威統治(authoritarian)的無名恐懼中。另一種是傳統家庭觀念的空間—
因受殖民主義及歐風美雨的吹襲而不斷重新自我界定。這兩種家的觀念重
疊又共存，既開放後排斥，在《浮世戀曲》中製造出一份搖擺往復的疏離
及安感。

也許因之從很多方面來看，香港都不愧為資本主義製造的一個「成
功」的殖民地。所以壓迫者與被壓迫者的關係要細辨的殖民地更為獨特幽
曲？片中的葉錫恩是個頗有興味的人物。她與政敵的相異與契合之處正是
這種隱微關係的實例！她由英國往中國傳教——自然是殖民文化的一員，而
她甘願以最佳的方式「本地化」，成為重要的社運鬥士，為窮人、為被剝
削的草根階層請命。

在淺流放者/難民/遊牧者的前景令人興味吧！這從許多香港市民，也
肯定能《浮世戀曲》中職員左右身上找到佐證！然而，從多方面來
說，香港這東西混雜的社會中，這身份早已形成了。可是，對那些已經
無家可歸，或己歸家無望的人來說，掌握流放者的主體性又來自不是重新
自我振奮的途徑。納法斯視融入主流文化為

心理門檻上悠長的過程——非時即刻，永不終止，不會完成(最低限
度對第一代移民如是)；因這五漂亮放段到月中一個主體的構成。而新
主體莫基於物、和、綜合、愛恨矛盾、兩面參照吸納等等；這適
變過程亦牽涉主流文化的價值及習尚，把家的意念重新表達。15

這個過程，我想也是個人(重新)界定甚麼是中心，甚麼是流放的過程，同
時又是在這架構中把自我重新進行定位的時候。黑奴制度與亞洲地區的殖
民史各自產生了不同的認同或流離的交接點。誠然，離鄉背井與融入主流
是個流連不斷的過程，當中個人對自身經歷的觀感及理解亦隨著周遭變動
的人與物不斷衍生變化。流放者與遊牧者之問是一連串的位份，它們指向
不同的離鄉的處境，隨著當代經驗的變易不斷更替其意義。

譯者：黎肖卿

14 Said, p. 363.
15 Naficy, p. 113.