

從拉岡到巴迪烏：

存有與話語之間的拓樸空間

劉紀蕙

2009年10月15日

一、拉岡與巴迪烏的拓樸空間：*a* 與集合

巴迪烏在《世界的邏輯》中指出，就語言與身體屬於真理之例外(the exception of truths)的問題而言，他是個堅定的拉岡支持者(steadfastly Lacanian) (Badiou, *Logics* 479)。拉岡將身體置於表記的效果之下，而表記又是在語言的結構之內。表面上，此從屬於語言結構的身體，似乎與他所要討論的主體出現形式距離甚遠，因為巴迪烏所討論的是純粹邏輯的問題。不過，巴迪烏強調，他們的距離並不遠。¹拉岡要著重的，是會思想的身體，是身體—思想，the body thinks, the body-thought；而巴迪烏要強調的，則是在消逝的事件的痕跡之下，從一點到另一點的出現，是尚未知的永恆真理的思想—主體(thought-subject)。²拉岡所說的表記，是在動物身上留下的標記，一個烙印，一個割除的痕跡shearing effect (effet de cisaille)，而巴迪烏對此說法的詮釋方式則是：這是一個要形成中的主體身體，而其分裂／割除則是一個反作用力的否定，甚至是晦澀的隱匿。

¹ “its presence [of the subject] is constituted by the signifier more than by the body,” “this body that I say is only affected by the structure,” the body as “an active composition, the support for the appearing of a subject-form, whose organs treat the world point by point.” (Badiou, *Logics* 478)

² the body, gathered under the trace of the vanished event, sets out point by point, and organically, the thought-subject of a yet unknown eternal truth” (Badiou, *Logics* 479)

the shearing effect, a powerful image which I interpret in the following way: the becoming of a subjectivated body establishes the present in the perpetual danger that its ineluctable division--its 'shearing', one could not put it better--becomes that of its reactive negation, or even of its obscure occultation. (Badiou, *Logics* 479)

巴迪烏強調，在消失的事件之後一個延後出現的印跡，正是標記著唯一可以被計算的身體的出現。作為事件後之痕跡的身體，是這個場所之挹注的所有元素的痕跡，是與此事件同一的存在之整體，是此事件之痕跡所啓動的所有元素的場所。³這個出現，可以讓我們衡量此事件之力量(the measure of the event's force)。這個被劃了割痕的印跡，是個透露事件的痕跡，標記著新的事件湧發的痕跡，從無到有的場所，而身體就是從無到有的器官。⁴在分裂／割除之下，才有新的在場得以出現。此外，此分裂，是說話者得以出現的前提，是說話者進入語言，進入大他者，透過大他者的話語結構以及此結構的烙印，而獲得一個出現的路徑。

the stigmata of the Other: "the trace of an event which absorbs disappearance in a deferred and maximal appearance. **The trace marks out the only beginning that counts, including the beginning of the body.** Lacan says it too: 'The primary, in its structure, only functions through the all or nothing of the trace'. It is then necessary that the truthful grasp of a subject over the world manifest itself **in the regime of the cut**, of the upsurge of a new present, and not in that of productive continuity: 'Only through the play of the cut is the world ready for the speaking being'. ... only through incorporation is there an effect of truth." (Badiou, *Logics* 480)

³ "a post-evental body is constituted by all the elements of the site which invest the totality of their existence in their identity to the trace of the event." "the body is the set of everything that the trace of the event mobilizes." (Badiou, *Logics* 467)

⁴ the inexistent projected into existence, the inapparent that shines within appearing. ... a body is composed of all the elements of the site that subordinate themselves, with maximal intensity, to that which was nothing and becomes all" (Badiou, *Logics* 468)

因此，這個「切口的體制」(the regime of the cut)，正是海德格所說的as-structure，話語邏輯的關係結構，既揭露又遮蔽，也是拉岡討論主體拓樸學所提出的表記結構(the structure of the signifier)的問題，所謂表記的切口功能(the function of the cut)，或是他所說的迴圈的拓樸功能(the topological function of the rim)，或是缺口的過程(a process of gap) (Seminar 11, 207)。從此處，我們已經注意到拉岡將詞語的裂隙，扣連到主體功能隨著demand/desire繞過大他者的場域而捕捉 a 這個表記時，已經被橫槓扣除自身。這個切口，就是巴迪烏所說的「點」，作為連結主體之真理程序以及在此世界出現的決斷的拓樸「點」。⁵如果不經過這個決斷之點，就是背叛於發生的事件。「點」是思想的決斷，是作為隱性存有 (the caesura of the onto-logy, the latent ontology of being)的拓樸點。⁶這個拓樸點，是多的子集合，是子集合與其內部區別的空間。⁷

拉岡與巴迪烏所要思考的問題，是介於phusis（物的湧發）與logos（話語結構）之間的交錯處，是在世界的關係結構中透過語言的appearance（出現）。巴迪烏以集合論(set theory)來說明這個發生的場所(topoi)；對他來說，當代哲學要思考的問題，就是要理解一個情境中的存有狀態如何可能是在不規律之邊緣的純粹多樣態，同時也是在出現之穩定而內在的扣連。

To rethink being according to what I regard as its contemporary programme: to understand how it is possible for a situation of being to be at once a pure multiplicity on

⁵ “We link this notion of point to that of decision. The point is ultimately a topological operator—a corporeal localization with regard to the transcendental—which simultaneously spaces out and conjoins the subjective (a truth-procedure) and the objective (the multiplicities that appear in a world.” (Badiou, *Logics* 399)

⁶ That is why points are metaphorically the indices of a decision of thought. This anonymous decision carries out the caesura of the word onto-logy. It makes that which is appear in the interlacing of logic. To put it another way, it indicates the latent topology of being.” (Badiou, *Logics* 410)

⁷ A topological space is given by a distinction, with respect to the subsets of a multiple, between a subset and its interior.” (Badiou, *Logics* 411)

the edge of inconsistency, and the solid and intrinsic binding of its appearance. ("Being and Appearance" *Theoretical Writings*, 175)

也就是說，當一個存有之出現使其局部在地之條件崩壞，而取消了所有當代的邏輯，這就是巴迪烏所要思考的生命之可能性。巴迪烏說，在這一點上，在這個沒有場所邏輯的空無中浮出表面的，就是這個具有創造性的不規律狀態。而巴迪烏所說的事件，便是當在地性的出現邏輯不再能夠規範多樣態的存有狀態。這個事件，促成了新的身體的發生。

For what comes to the surface at that point, displacing or revoking the logic of the place, is being itself, in its redoubtable and creative inconsistency, that is, in its void, which is the placelessness of every place." ("Being and Appearance" *Theoretical Writings*, 175)

這個具有拓樸空間性質的「點」，十分靠近拉岡所專注處理的拓樸式主體之概念。拉岡在精神分析四個基本概念（講座第十一講）中說明這個「主體拓撲學」(the topology of the subject)的問題，也就是說，在發言動作(enunciation)與發言內容(statement)之間，有兩種主體位置的落差。他用「內轉的8」(the interior 8)的圖形，來說明這個拓樸空間的問題。在作為主體而出現的「我」或是「第一表記」之處，一端是話語邏輯的要求，是無意識發展的區域，另一端是欲望主體的出現，是被遮蔽的「性欲現實」(sexual reality)區域。這兩種主體位置重疊在一個表面，如同兩重迴轉而交接的圓形。Libido是交接處 (point of intersection)，同時屬於這兩個區域，不過，這個重疊處看起來是個表面，其實是一個「空無」(void)之處，銜接莫比斯環(Meobius)的不同拓撲面。⁸

⁸ I have placed the libido at the point at which the lobe defined as field of the development of the unconscious covers and conceals the other lobe, that of sexual reality. The libido, then, would be that which belongs to both—the point of

拉岡用緊密空間(compactness)來說明這個不佔空間卻又是異質空間交會處 (the heterogeneity of locus)的拓樸概念，來說明這個異質空間的大他者場域，使得原本是一個封閉而被構成的有限空間，被不同質空間的交叉面穿越而無限延展。拉岡以集合概念來說明這個由有限而不可數的子集合系列構成的拓樸空間。

“A geometry implies the heterogeneity of locus, namely that there is a locus of the Other. Regarding this locus of the Other, of one sex as Other, as absolute Other,” “A formulation is given to us by **the topology** I qualified as the most recent that takes as **its point of departure a logic constructed on the investigation of numbers and that leads to the institution of a locus**, which is not that of a homogeneous space. Let us take **the same limited, closed, supposedly instituted space – the equivalent of what I earlier posited as an intersection extending to the infinity**. If we assume it to be **covered with open sets**, in other words, **sets that exclude their own limits – the limit is that which is defined as greater than one point and less than another, but in no case equal either to the point of departure or the point of arrival**, to sketch it for you quickly – it can be

intersection, as one says in logic. But this is precisely what it does not mean. **For this sector at which the field appears to overlap is, if you see the true profile of the surface, a void.**

This surface belongs to another whose **topology** I have described to my pupils at various times, and which is called the cross-cap, in other words, the mitre. I have not drawn it here, but I would simply ask you to note what is its most obvious characteristic. You can obtain it from the interior 8. **Bring the edges together two by two as they are presented here, by a complementary surface, and close it. In a way, it plays the same role as complement in relation to the initial 8 as a sphere in relation to a circle, a sphere that would close what the circle would already offer itself as ready to contain. Well! This surface is a Meobius surface, and its outside continues its inside.** There is a second necessity that emerges from this figure, that is, that it must, in order to close its curve, traverse at some point the preceding surface, at that point, according to the line that I have just reproduced here on the second model.

This image enables us to figure desire as a locus of junction between the field of demand, in which the syncope of the unconscious are made present, and sexual reality. All this depends on a line that I will call the line of desire, linked to demand, and by which the effects of sexuality are made present in experience.” (Seminar XI, 156)

shown that it is equivalent to say that **the set of these open spaces always allows of a subcovering of open spaces, constituting a finity**, namely, that the series of elements constitutes a finite series.” (Seminar XX 9-10, Fr. 14-15)

拉岡進一步以話語快感來說明此密集空間的來性欲痛快享受(sexual jouissance)。拉岡指出，「不全的女人」(not-whole women)並不牽涉到身體，而牽涉了**詞語邏輯之迫切必要**，也就是說，陽性話語之外的陰性位置，不在的位置，會透過話語邏輯而出現。大他者以性分化的身體具象出現，並且決定了這個「一」的出現。

“That is the case in the space of sexual jouissance, which thereby proves to be **compact**. The sexed being of these **not-whole women** does not involve the body but what results from a **logical exigency in speech**. Indeed, logic, the coherence inscribed in the fact that language exists and that it is outside the bodies that are moved by it – in short, **the Other who is incarnated**, so to speak, as sexed being – **requires this one by one (une par une).**”... “this requirement of the One, as the Parmenides strangely already allowed us to predict, stems from the Other. Where there is being, infinity is required.” (Seminar XX 10, Fr. 15)

拉岡說，在主動與被動的往復起落之間，某物出現，透過 a 而激活了人的靈魂。

The strange thing is that in this crude polarity that makes matter passive and form the agent that animates it, something, albeit something ambiguous, nevertheless got through, namely, that **this animation is nothing other than the a with which the agent animates** what? He animates nothing – he takes the other as **his soul**. (Seminar XX 82, Fr. 76)

這個作為中心的靈魂，可驅動其他事物的不動核心，會被各種事物佔據，例如神。這個核心，有各種說法，例如變化、發生、運動、變形、繁殖。

If I base myself now on the inscriptions on the blackboard, it is assuredly revealed that it is in **the opaque place of jouissance of the Other**, ... this unmoving sphere from which all movements stem, whatever they may be: changes, generations, motions, translations, increases, etc. (Seminar XX 82-3, Fr. 77)

因此，拉岡說，他所教導的，便是將 a 與 A 分離。他要指出 a 只存在於想像層中，而 A 只存在於符號層中。人通常在想像中，會將假象當真，而誤認 a 為 $S(A)$ ，大他者的表記：

The aim of my teaching, insofar as it pursues what can be said and enunciated on the basis of analytic discourse, is **to dissociate a and A by reducing the first to what is related to the imaginary and the other to what is related to the symbolic**. It is indubitable that the symbolic is the basis of what was made into God. It is certain that the imaginary is based on the reflection of one samblable in another. **And yet, a has lent itself to be confused with $S(A)$** , below which it is written on the blackboard, and it has done so by means of the function of being. (Seminar XX 83, Fr. 77)

無論是神、courtly love, Aufhebung, 或是Sade，總是 a 的問題。

二、真理／真相

我們想要知道的，就是feminine

jouissance是如何構成的？我們要知道大他者所知道的jouissance。然而，真相是，這個feminine jouissance是不可被知道的，而只能夠被經驗。

To retain a congruous truth – not the truth that claims to be whole, but that of the half-telling (mi-dire), the truth that is borne out by guarding against going as far as avowal, which would be the worst, the truth that becomes guarded starting right with the cause of desire. (Seminar XX 93, Fr. 86)

拉岡說，真相是經驗過的jouissance，但是無法全部說出，若要avowal，承認此真相，宣稱全部知道，則離真相最遠。真相只能夠透過其相似物之外衣，a的封套envelop，而說出一半(mi-dire)。

To retain a congruous truth – not the truth that claims to be whole, but that of the half-telling, the truth that is borne out by guarding against going as far as avowal, which would be the worst, the truth that becomes guarded starting right with the cause of desire.”

(Seminar XX 93, Fr. 86)

真理就是知識。Truth is knowledge. 但是，甚麼是知識？

The subjects know, they know. But all the same, they don't know everything. At the level of this not-everything (pas-tout), only Other doesn't know. It is the Other who constitutes the not-everything, precisely in that the Other is the part of the not-at-all-knowledgeable (pas-savant-du-toutin the not-everything. (Seminar XX 98, Fr. 90)

巴迪烏在 “The Formulas of

l'Étourdit”一文中，十分準確地說明了拉岡在1970—75年間反覆處理的，就是 knowledge-truth-

Real的triplet，以便修正傳統哲學的二元論。巴迪烏說，這個三元項正是兩種話語的邊際線(the borderline between two

discourses)。相對於「一是甚麼」，巴迪烏指出，拉岡要說的是「有一個一」(there is Oneness, *il y a de*

l'Un)；或者，換一種說法，巴迪烏認為拉岡要討論的是「純粹存有不被綁束的多」(pure being as unbound multiplicity) (“The Formulas of *l'Étourdit*.”

86)。「存有的多」與形式化之間，便有一個困境。如何能夠理解作為不在場的真實？巴

迪烏說，對拉岡而言，真實(the Real)可以定義為「遠離－意義」(ab-sense)的意義。只有遠離意義，從意義撤離，意義的不在場，纔會朝向真實開啓。⁹

甚麼可以使此不在場的意義，所謂的真實，得以出現呢？巴迪烏指出，只有透過行動(act)，透過真實的顯露“the Real’s demonstration.”

真實是不可知的，真實只有被經驗，只有在行動中顯露。“The Real is not known, it is demonstrated.” (“The Formulas of *l’Étourdit*.”

91)拉岡的反哲學，重點就在於他認為哲學無法使此真實顯露，無法傳遞此知識。巴迪烏強調，拉岡不是康德式的不可知論。拉岡的主要論點是：真實有其外顯 (the Real has an exteriority)，而可以展現自身。因此，巴迪烏認為，真實可以定義為形式化的困境(an impasse to formalization) (“The Formulas of *l’Étourdit*.”

92)。巴迪烏進而建議，真實沒有語言，而只有公式(formula)。只有在行動的向度中，真實得以開啓。

巴迪烏在《存有與事件》指出，拉岡從笛卡兒處延伸出的論點，會指出必然有一個主體，然而，巴迪烏要指出，其實沒有主體。主體的「有」，是事件的出現，某個真理透過有限的模態而出現。實際上，並沒有主體。

“The ‘there is’ of the subject is the coming-to-being of the event, via the ideal occurrence of a truth, in its finite modalities. By consequence, what must always be grasped is that there is no subject, that there are no longer some subject. What Lacan still owed to Descartes, a debt whose account must be closed, was the idea that there were always some subjects.” (Badiou, *Being and Event* 434)

主體的概念涉及void的localization， “the localization of the void” (Badiou, *Being and Event* 432)一則是主體效果被視為一個void-

⁹ “He is asserting that an opening onto the Real cannot be breached save through the presupposition that it is an absence in sense, an ab-sense, or a subtracting of something from, or out of, sense.” (“The Formulas of *l’Étourdit*.” 83)

set，而在一致的經驗網絡結構中重複的出現，另則是主體被視為稀有的例子，其發生可以從事件懸置，從介入懸置，從忠實之路徑懸置，而扣連了存有。後者只有從數學的思維模式才可以理解。(Badiou, *Being and Event* 432)

對巴迪烏而言，void是存有，真理是不被辨識的多樣性，而事件是主體出現的促因。巴迪烏認為，拉岡沒有處理的問題，便是事件。拉岡所欠缺的，是他沒有透過真理的激進懸置而將在處境中存有從空無分離的事件。

What Lacan lacked--despite this lack being legible for us solely after having read what, in his texts, far from lacking, founded the very possibility of a modern regime of the true--is the radical suspension of truth from the supplementation of a being-in-situation by an event which is a separator of the void." (Badiou, *Being and Event* 434)

巴迪烏說，事件必然是多數的，而不是「一」。巴迪烏稱呼此事件式的多數集合為「跨越一存有」(trans-being)的「極端的一」(untra-

One)。巴迪烏指出，如何認知事件之發生而避免陷入重新建立「一」的形上學欲望，正是當代哲學的核心關注，海德格、拉岡、維根斯坦都處理此問題。

哲學如何詮釋此事件的發生？巴迪烏說，哲學總在兩端之間游移：真理是尚未出現而將出現的真理，還是真理是存有的展現？

這兩端的距離其實難以彌合。巴迪烏強調，重要的是要維持真理之多數性。無論是真理的來臨，或是真理之存有狀態，都是多數性的。沒有單一的大寫真理，而只有無法被總體化的各種小真理。因此，現代哲學的重要工作是：從形式上的真理判斷扣除自身，同時決定本體之多數性。(Badiou, "The Event as Trans-Being," *Theoretical Writing*, p. 102)¹⁰

¹⁰ The whole point is to maintain, as far as possible, and under the most innovative conditions of thought, that, in any case, truth itself is nothing but a multiplicity. In the twofold sense that **both its coming** (a truth elicits the advent of a typical multiple, a generic singularity) **and its being** (there is no Truth, there are only truths, disparate and untotizable) are multiplicities.

This requires a radical inaugural gesture, which is the hallmark of modern philosophy: **to subtract the examination of truths from the mere form of judgment**. This always means the following: **to decide upon an ontology of multiplicities**.

Badiou認為拉岡提出了現代哲學家的真貌：拉岡說明，只有透過transference，才可能真正愛真理，此真理是無力與軟弱的。愛好真理，便是愛好無力與軟弱(powerlessness and weakness) (**“Truth: Forcing and the Unnameable”**

119)。真理是閹割，真理是遮蓋不可能完全說出的遮蓋布，既是只能說出一半，又是此無力說出的掩飾物。真理是飾演自身軟弱的面具。¹¹閹割是結構性的，也就是說，文化與語言的結構性無力，使得真理無法完全說出。(**“Truth: Forcing and the Unnameable”** 120)

¹²真理不是完全的說出。真理只有在減除的狀態下才是可以被承受的。閹割顯露自身被剝除的純粹型態；以哲學方式來說，便是已被減去的面向，以被減除的方式，說明了真理的無能。¹³巴迪烏指出，

拉岡很清楚真理與知識之間的區分，而且，他強調，真理基本上是不可知的。真理是「知識的孔隙」(a hole in forms of knowledge) (**“Truth: Forcing and the Unnameable”**

123)。因此，巴迪烏認為，拉岡所指出的是，「精神分析不是知識，而是思考模式」。(Lacan declared that psychoanalysis was not a form of knowledge but a way of thinking” (**“Truth: Forcing and the Unnameable”** 124)

拉岡強調真理與其他知識型態之間的異質性，這也就是所謂「真理是說一半的部分」的意義。

三、政治與倫理

(Badiou, “The Event as Trans-Being,” *Theoretical Writing*, p. 102)

¹¹ “That which affect truth with its very insurmountable restriction is, obviously enough, castration. Truth is the veil thrown over the impossibility of saying it all, of saying all of truth. It is both what can only be half-said and what disguises this acute powerlessness that restricts the access to saying—in an act of pretence, whereby it transforms itself into a total image of itself. Truth is the mask of its own weakness.” (120)

¹² For castration is structural, it is structure itself, so that for Lacan there can be no place for the primordially uncastrated, which is what the pre-Socratic thinkers and poets ultimately are for Heidegger.”拉岡說，the love of truth is the love of that weakness whose veil we have lifted; it is the love of that which is hidden by truth, and which is called castration. (1970 seminar) (Badiou 120)

¹³ truth is bearable for thought, which is to say, philosophically lovable, only in so far as one attempts to grasp it in what drives its subtractive dimension, as opposed to seeking its plenitude or complete saying.” (120)

巴迪烏認為，國家是與正義、政治、真理完全無關的：對於正義的定義，立即會成為國家的行動。國家其實與正義無關，因為國家不具有主體身分，對具有真理性的政治傾向漠然，只會為了特定功能而操作共識。具有真理的政治陳述，不是在社會秩序穩定狀態之下所發生的。一般人以實證經驗之政治操作，是無法靠近真理的，他們只會基於主觀立場而操作權力與民意。然而，歷史上的確有一些政治行動是靠近真理程序的，這就是值得哲學思考的問題。

“The vast majority of empirical political orientations have nothing to do with truth. We know this. They organize a repulsive mixture of power and opinions. The subjectivity that animates them is that of the tribe and the lobby, of electoral nihilism and the blind confrontation of communities. Philosophy has nothing to say about such politics; for philosophy thinks thought alone, whereas these orientations present themselves explicitly as unthinking, or as non-thought.” (Badiou, Alain. “Philosophy and politics,” 70)

“Historically speaking, there have been some political orientations that have had or will have a connection with a truth, a truth of the collective as such. They are rare attempts, and they are often brief, but they alone can act as a condition of philosophy’s thinking.” (Badiou, Alain. “Philosophy and politics,” 70)

至於倫理， Badiou

批評當今西方世界人道主義之道德口號，這些強調人權的倫理意識型態，認為對於罪惡的懲罰是絕對必要的，倫理便是判別的標準，而善是藉以區分惡的原則。此類意識型態有四個前提：（1）有一個一般性的人類主體，（2）政治從屬於倫理，（3）善不同於惡，（4）人有免除惡的權利。但是，此倫理共識立基於辨識「惡」，依此而集

結人群為善，反而成為惡之源頭。此類控訴是二十世紀後半期對於革命、集體、集權的惡的反省。（*Ethics* 9-13）

Badiou十分精彩地指出，政治性地要求「我們同在一起」是十分弔詭的問題，因為，首先便需要定義這個集合體的範疇。當猶太人被歸類為德國內部，此被建構出來的「外部」就可以在內部執行監視控制。而希特勒之所以可以透過軍事執行殲滅猶太人的行動，正是因為此政治範疇將猶太人納入內部。Badiou因此而強調，納粹屠殺事件並不是單一的惡之行爲，而正是當共同體的集體論述與共識共處與常態的論調成立時，惡便會透過政治而產生。所謂的惡，其實是「主體」所產生的範疇，(Badiou, *Ethics* 65-66)。

Badiou指出，對於擬像的忠誠(fidelity to simulacrum)，時常是對自己執行恐怖鎮壓，然而，此忠誠卻具有誘惑。(Badiou 79)

巴迪烏指出，真正的倫理，就是真理的複數。The only genuine ethics is of truths in the plural – or, more precisely, the only ethics is of processes of truth, of the labour that brings some truths into the world.” (*Ethics* 28)

Badiou提出以「事件」來解消政治之惡的可能性，也就是讓其他事物與狀態可以發生，讓此處之情境結構、意識型態、知識體系之外的事物，可以發生。(Badiou 67)

“the event, which brings to pass ‘something other’ than the situation, opinions, instituted knowledges; the event is a hazardous [hasardeux], unpredictable supplement, which vanishes as soon as it appears; (Badiou 67)

“the fidelity, which is the name of the process: it amounts to a sustained investigation of the situation, under the imperative of the event itself; it is an immanent and continuing break; (Badiou 67)

“the truth as such, that is, the multiple, internal to the situation, that the fidelity constructs, bit by bit; it is what the fidelity gathers together and produces. (Badiou 67-68)

“You might then ask what it is that makes the connection between the event and that ‘for which’ it is an event. This connection is the void [vide] of the earlier situation. It means that at the heart of every situation, as the foundation of its being, there is a ‘situated’ void, around which is organized the plentitude (or the stable multiples) of the situation in question.” (Badiou 68)

巴迪烏強調，事件是無法以主體語言命名的。社群與集體都是無法命名的政治真理；任何企圖政治性地為群體命名，都會引發災難。宣稱法國人，也是對居住在法國的外國人的迫害。“

The unnameable is unnameable *for* the subject-language. Let us say that this term is not susceptible of being made eternal, or not accessible to the Immortal. In this sense, it is the symbol of the pure real [réel] of the situation, of its life without truth.” **“the community and the collective are the unnameable of political truth: every attempt ‘politically’ to name a community induces a disastrous Evil** (which can be seen as much in the extreme example of Nazism as in the reactionary usage of the word ‘French’, whose entire purpose is to persecute some of those who live in France under the arbitrary imputation of being ‘foreigners’). (Badiou 86)

「惡」便是執意為了真理之目的進行為無法命名者命名。

“Evil in this case is to want, at all costs and under condition of a truth, to force the naming of the unnameable.” (Badiou 86)

四、生命

Badiou

在《世界的邏輯》這本書的結論處，扼要的提出了幾個關於生命的總結性觀點。首先，他指出，It is not a world as given in the logic of its appearing (the infinite of its objects and

relations,) which induces the possibility of living.

此處，援用海德格所說明的世界的話語關係邏輯，我們可以理解巴迪烏所談論的問題。在此話語邏輯之下，會有無限多隨著事件的發生與逝去而出現的印跡。這些印跡總是有最大可能性的張力與密度的存在。這些印跡將世界的過去納入了當下。這個印跡的誕生，是眾多的出現某個閃現。但是，只是辨識這些印跡是不足夠的。若要成為當代，若要成為一個具有主動性的元素，我們仍須要讓自己被納入這個印跡認可的後續發展(One must incorporate oneself into what the trace authorizes in terms of consequences. ... To accept and declare this body is not enough, if one wishes to be the contemporary of the present of composition, to become an active element of this body.) 這個將自己併入世界的緊密結合(the incorporation into his immanent cohesion of the world)，構成了新的誕生。

但是，此事件之印跡所構成的後續發展，並不是拋物線的軌道，而是一點到另一點的序列(in sequences, point by point)。每一個當下，都有其肌理。每一個點都有其二選一的可能性，就像是其纖維的經緯軸線。Every present has a kind of fibre.

生命必然是主體的範疇。然而，此當下如何出現，如何形成，或是被抹除，或是被隱匿，都是取決於此個體的主觀形式。

To live is thus an incorporation into the present under the faithful form of a subject. If the incorporation is dominated by the reactive form, one will not speak of life, but of mere conservation. It is a question of protecting oneself from the consequences of a birth, of not relaunching existence beyond itself. If incorporation is dominated by the obscure formalism, one will instead speak of mortification. (508—509)

巴迪烏說，生命便是賭注，the wager。生命不陷入保存式的反應，也不陷入自毀的死亡趨力。生命具有創造力，這個創

造力，不會是對於過去的戀物固著，不會是再民主唯物主義中被民主唯物主義透過文化的語言與密度，而熱情擁抱的過去。

In democratic materialism, the life of language-bodies is the conservative succession of the instants of the atonic world. It follows that the past is charged with the task of endowing these instants with a fictive horizon, with a cultural density. This also explains why the fetishism of history is accompanied by an unrelenting discourse on novelty, perpetual change and the imperative of modernization. The past of cultural depth is matched by a dispersive present, an agitation which is itself devoid of any depth whatsoever. (509)

巴迪烏指出，相對於民主唯物主義，物質辯證主義恰恰相反。表面上當下沒有任何變化，真理程序卻會發生，某一個發現，某一個突破，某一個片斷。

On the basis of some truth-procedures that unfold subjectivizable bodies, point by point, one reconstitutes a different past, a history of achievements, discoveries, breakthroughs, which is by no means a cultural monumentality but a legible succession of fragments of eternity. That is because a faithful subject creates the present as the being-there of eternity. Accordingly, to incorporate oneself into this present amounts to perceiving the past of eternity itself. (510)

此處，命名是重要的。“To live” and “to live for an Idea” are one and the same thing. (510)

對於巴迪烏而言，命名既不屬於經驗世界的秩序，也不是表達(expression)，更不是潛力與語言之間的符應，而是納入(incorporate)一個真理的例外。語言的武斷性與絕對化通常決定了生命的出現，只有例外的狀態，才使我們看到新的個體。巴迪烏說，這個新的個體的出現，不是對於語言權威之屈從，而是對於一幅畫的沈思的喜悅，對於理解一個公理的快樂，對於遭遇之力量的熱衷。

It is true that, if there is nothing but bodies and languages, to live for an Idea necessarily implies the arbitrary absolutization of one language, which bodies must comply with. Only the material recognition of the 'except that' of truths allows us to declare, not that bodies are submitted to the authority of a language, far from it, but that a new body is the organization in the present of an unrepresented subjective life. I maintain that the real experience of such a life, the comprehension of a theorem or the force of an encounter, the contemplation of a drawing or the momentum of a meeting is irresistible universal. This means that, for the form of incorporation that corresponds to it, the advent of the Idea is the very opposite of a submission. Depending on the type of truth that we are dealing with, it is joy, happiness, pleasure or enthusiasm. (510-511)

巴迪烏批評民主唯物主義所強調的意識形態的終結，to live without Idea,其實是主觀的禁令。

當他們說，我們要對他者尊重時，這種寬容只會讓我們看到更多的狂熱分子。民主唯物主義者自稱是人道主義者，然而，此人道主義者只會講人權，而無法理解人道主義或是人性所壓抑的非人。(511)

巴迪烏強調，活著，意味著要對發生過之事件的後續過程願意去面對，並且去work through，讓新的身體得以出現。這是值得討論的問題。甚麼是work through, 甚麼樣的新的身體？

I have used the metaphor of grace, in order to indicate that what is called living always involves agreeing to work through the (generally unprecedented) consequences of what happens. (512)

他說，一個被創造出來的主體身體，並不是一直在此，而仍然需要依賴世界之偶發事件，場所性質的偶然，身體器官的效力，以及主體的恆常性：

Its process of creation does not—since it depends on the contingency of worlds, the aleatory character of a site, the efficacy of the organs of a body and the constancy of a subject. (513)

甚麼是主體的出現？巴迪烏說，相對於文化主義、相對主義、或是被眼前事物與現成語言所佔據的人們，主體是從局限的在地法則中扣除自身而出現的身體。是歷史的例外，是新的創造。創造是超越邏輯的，因為它擾亂了其出現的秩序。

What appears only shines forth in its appearance to the extent that it subtracts itself from the local laws of appearing. A creation is trans-logical, since its being upsets its appearing. (513)

因此，對於巴迪烏來說，所謂的**grace**，就是純粹出現的邏輯，是重新開始的可能性，是即將發生的思想，是肯定創造之喜悅的英雄主義，而不是要求犧牲的英雄主義。

Badiou, Alain. *Logics of Worlds: Being and Event II*. trans. by Alberto Toscano. Continuum 2009.

Badiou, Alain. *Being and Event*. (1988) Trans. by Oliver Feltham. Continuum 2005.

Badiou, Alain. "The Formulas of *l'Étourdit*." trans. by Scott Savaiano. *lacanian ink* 27 (Spring 2006): 80-95.

Badiou, Alain. *Ethics: An Essay on the Understanding of Evil*. Trans. By Peter Hallward. London, New York: Verso, 2001.

Badiou, Alain. "Philosophy and politics," *Infinite Thought*.