

新旅程

国际大学英语语言文学教授协会 2013 年北京年会论文集

New Pilgrimages

Selected Papers
from the IAUPE Beijing Conference in 2013

主编

曹 莉 金 莉

Edited by
Li Cao & Li Jin



清华大学出版社
TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY PRESS

新旅程

国际大学英语语言文学教授协会 2013 年北京年会论文集

New Pilgrimages

Selected Papers
from the IAUPE Beijing Conference in 2013

主编

曹 莉 金 莉

Edited by

Li Cao & Li Jin



清华大学出版社
TSINGHUA UNIVERSITY PRESS

北 京
BEIJING

内 容 简 介

本书为国际大学英语语言文学教授协会（IAUPE）于2013年7月16-20日在清华大学举办的第22届年会的论文集，共收录了来自12个国家的24位学者的研究论文，所涉领域包括古英语文学、文艺复兴早期文学、莎士比亚研究、18世纪文学、维多利亚文学、英国浪漫主义、现代英国文学、早期美国文学、现当代美国文学、文学理论、英语史、词汇语义学，以及传记和文本研究等；此外，还设立了“英语语言文学研究在中国”的专题。这些研究论文视野开阔，思路清晰，内容丰富，可帮助读者了解国际上英语语言文学研究的最新动态和成果，并对自身的研究工作有所裨益。

版权所有，侵权必究。侵权举报电话：010-62782989 13701121933

图书在版编目（CIP）数据

新旅程：国际大学英语语言文学教授协会2013年北京年会论文集 / 曹莉，金莉主编. —北京：清华大学出版社，2015

ISBN 978-7-302-38569-1

I. ①新… II. ①曹… ②金… III. ①英语—文化语言学—文集 IV. ①H31-05

中国版本图书馆CIP数据核字（2014）第273609号

责任编辑：刘琦榕

封面设计：平原

责任校对：王凤芝

责任印制：李红英

出版发行：清华大学出版社

网 址：<http://www.tup.com.cn>，<http://www.wqbook.com>

地 址：北京清华大学学研大厦A座

邮 编：100084

社 总 机：010-62770175

邮 购：010-62786544

投稿与读者服务：010-62776969，c-service@tup.tsinghua.edu.cn

质量反馈：010-62772015，zhiliang@tup.tsinghua.edu.cn

印 装 者：北京雅昌艺术印刷有限公司

经 销：全国新华书店

开 本：155mm × 230mm 印 张：27 字 数：325千字

版 次：2015年5月第1版 印 次：2015年5月第1次印刷

印 数：1~1200

定 价：98.00元

产品编号：061369-01

Preface

The present collection of papers is the result of the 22nd Triennial Conference of the International Association of University Professors of English, held at Tsinghua University, Beijing, China on 16-20 July 2013. More than one hundred professors of English from seventy institutions representing twenty countries participated in the conference. It was the first time that the annual conference was held in Asia in the Association's 62-year history.

As conference organizer and editor, I am profoundly grateful to a number of people and organizations who deserve due acknowledgements in making the conference and this volume possible. First and foremost, thanks go to Heh-Hsiang Yuan and the then and now general secretaries of the association and chairs of its international committee, namely, Ian Kirby, Thomas Austenfeld, Jewel Spears Brooker, and Helen Ostovich for their continuous support and advice before, during and after the conference. Heartfelt thanks go to Li Jin and Jian Zhang of Beijing Foreign Studies University, Dan Shen of Peking University, Yan Zhang of Beijing Normal University, Keli Diao of Remin University of China, Yanping Tong, Ping Zhang, Yongguo Chen, Ning Wang and Shisheng Liu of Tsinghua University for their generous support and collaborative efforts in making the conference a remarkable success. Special thanks go to the 24 contributors and the section chairs who generously contributed their works and efforts to the present proceedings, to Christopher Ricks who considered his plenary speech more of a talk than a paper to fit into the present volume but allowed me to cite him in this preface, and to Ian Kirby, in particular, for reading through the proceedings with a meticulous eye. Last but not least, I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Jianhua Hao and Qirong Liu of the Tsinghua University Press for their generosity and assistance in bringing the volume to the present shape.

Two of the 24 papers presented here were plenary lectures by leading scholars of English studies. Heh-Hsiang Yuan who initiated

the idea of holding the IAUPE annual conference in China entitled his plenary speech as "From Both Ends of the Looking-Glass: English Literature in a Non-English Culture," which struck the appropriate keynote of such an international conference. Drawn on one of T. S. Eliot's letters to I. A. Richards written in the 1930s when Richards, then in Beijing teaching Chinese students English literature and theory, invited him to visit China, the title of Yuan's speech reflects the dilemma and difficulty in studying a foreign language and literature without erasing one's education in one's own mother tongue and culture. Judging from his own experience of studying Indian philosophy and Sanskrit some time before, Eliot had declined Richards's invitation with the conclusion "it seemed impossible to be on both sides of the looking-glass at once." Heh-Hsiang Yuan and the participants of different linguistic and cultural backgrounds, however, thought it might be otherwise with the conviction that intellectual as well as cultural bridges could be crossed through dialogues, translations and joint academic ventures of various kinds. This point was made equally clear by Dana Gioia in his plenary speech "The Enchantment of Poetry." By citing Kenneth Rexroth's translation of the famous Chinese Tang dynasty poet Tu Fu's "Winter Dawn" at the beginning of his speech, Gioia informed the audience, "Tu Fu sounds entirely at home in the Beat-era of San Francisco, not only because of the universality of his poetic genius, but also because classical Chinese poetry—through Ezra Pound and others—had already become one of the formative influences on modern American poetry." Such dialogues and communications of ideas and findings between the past and the present, the East and the West were expected and did happen frequently at the conference through academic presentations as well as cultural events. Despite the heat of summer and the unavoidable strangeness and inconvenience in a foreign culture, participants from all over the world enjoyed presenting and listening to one another's most recent researches in English studies, and shared an increasing awareness of the importance and necessity of cross-cultural communication and understanding through learning from one another things one knew of or heard of for the first time. As Jewel Spears Brooker,

then chair of the International Committee of IAUPE foretold in her opening address, by the time the participants had visited the Great Wall they would have dismantled some cultural walls and constructed some bridges.

The other 22 papers were selected by the section chairs respectively from 15 sections that covered a wide range of topics from Old and Middle English language and literature to contemporary English, American literatures in English as well as the latest trends in linguistics, literary theory and teaching methodology. In order to spotlight the flavor of cross-cultural dialogue in English studies, "English Studies in China" was organized as a special session of local interest featuring not only the reception of English literature and theory in China before and after 1949, but also the teaching of western literature to Chinese students by non-Chinese professors of English in the last century and at present.

Since 1929 when I. A. Richards, followed by William Empson, came all the way from Cambridge, England to Beijing, China to teach English literature and practical criticism to students in Tsinghua and Beida (Peking University), English studies had become a major subject of intellectual inquiry in Chinese universities. Richards's teaching of English literature and theory was the very first contact between China and the 20th century literary theory in the West. Along with a boom of English learning across the country over the last few decades, came a flourishing of English literature and linguistics as major subjects of college education. It is estimated that China has over 300 million English learners at present, and "almost every Chinese university and college offers English as an academic program, and currently there are over 400,000 college students majoring in English," observed Li Jin in her welcoming address. English language and literature have indeed become one of the biggest and most important academic disciplines in Chinese higher education which plays an important role in the intellectual and cultural exchanges between China and the West. Like many other branches of western studies, the study of English literature and linguistics had been obviously interlocked with the evolution and transformation of Chinese modernity. If the earlier reception

of western language and literature resulted from the thirst for advanced ideas and concepts produced in the West, the recent study of literature in English has become a pursuit of both knowledge and critical conversation with the West in the hope of constructing true dialogues between China and the rest of the world on an equal footing.

July is a holiday as well as a conference season favored by contemporary “pilgrims” who care for literature and the meaning it expresses and conveys. The IAUPE members who came from near and afar to Beijing to share their researches and findings in the forefront of English studies felt both humble and proud. Humble, because the more one learnt, the more one realized his or her own ignorance; proud, because the more one shared his or her ideas with others, the more one became aware of the value of one’s dedication to the study of language and literature as a vocation of humanities. Ralph Waldo Emerson had said in “The American Scholar,” as I quoted in my welcoming remarks at the opening ceremony: “Thus far, our holiday has been simply a friendly sign of the survival of the love of letters amongst a people too busy to give to letters anymore.” Emerson’s lament, made on August 31, 1837, to the Phi Beta Kappa Society at Cambridge, Massachusetts, reflects not only 19th century America but also 21st century China, a country that is encountering all sorts of challenges and problems of growth and transformation including a declining interest in poetry and humanities. The papers presented at the conference showcased not only the frontiers of studies in English literature and language, but also testified to the importance of joining English with humanities in shaping, expanding, and refining human consciousness. If, as Emerson did, we care for letters or the enchantment of letters in the fast-changing contemporary world, the research and teaching of language and literature can indeed be taken as a vocation safeguarding humanistic values against the threats of a globally contagious utilitarianism.

Making dialogues between countries, institutions as well as individuals are a means of achieving new perceptions and knowledge as well as joining efforts in making literary studies a true dis-

cipline of thought and humanities in the mundane world. This was expected of literary studies and criticism by all who were bound by a common pursuit and therefore shared a common interest. As Christopher Ricks said in his plenary speech, citing Samuel Johnson, Samuel Taylor Coleridge, T. S. Eliot, John Keats, William Empson, etc., "It is, however, the task of criticism to establish principles." So said Samuel Johnson who believed, as Christopher Ricks himself did, that opinions may differ, but once improved, they are "improved into knowledge." Seen in this light, the new pilgrimages made by all participants to the 2013 Beijing IAUPE conference are therefore pilgrimages to new knowledge through questions, dialogues, excursions, and above all, a renewed understanding and practice of, to use Keats' phrase, "Negative Capability."

Li Cao
New House, Tsinghua University
August 2014

Contents

Preface

Li Cao	v
--------------	---

From Both Ends of the Looking-Glass: The Study of
English Literature in a Non-English Culture

Heh-Hsiang Yuan.....	1
----------------------	---

Poetry as Enchantment

Dana Gioia	22
------------------	----

The Bedan Legacy: The Ways Bede's Works Have Been
Used

George Hardin Brown	47
---------------------------	----

Who Reads of Lamwel? The Pardoner's Tale and the
Politics of Textual Access

Andrew Taylor.....	60
--------------------	----

Spenser's "Home": *Colin Clouts Come Home Againe*
and the Methodology of Literary Biography

Jean R. Brink	77
---------------------	----

Hamlet and Violence

Robert Appelbaum.....	97
-----------------------	----

Milton as Poet-Citizen

Barbara K. Lewalski.....	115
--------------------------	-----

Miltonic Perspectives on Dryden's Oldham Elegy

Sanford Budick	132
----------------------	-----

Public Lectures on Literature and the Birth of "English"	
William Christie	147
Thomas Hardy's "Poems of 1912-13": A Jungian View	
Byunghwa Joh	165
The Transformation of American Orientalism: The Chinese Novels of Pearl S. Buck	
Victoria Lipina	193
Past Forgetting: The Ghost of Ethnic Identity in Philip Roth's <i>The Ghost Writer</i> and Maxine Hong Kingston's <i>The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts</i>	
Emily Budick	204
The Quest for Sacred Time in T. S. Eliot's "Journey of the Magi"	
Temur Kobakhidze	216
Elizabeth Bishop's Encoded Love Poetry and Sexual Identity	
Yangsoon Kim	227
The Drama of Shaping a Lyrical Moment: An Approach to the Poetry of Dana Gioia	
Thomas Austenfeld	244
Eliot and Heraclitus	
Jewel Spears Brooker	259
Reviewing the Text-Context Relation	
Herbert Grabes	270

The Gender-Split and Roaming “I”: The Impact of Transgender Theory on Autobiography and the Travel Narrative Chantal Zabus	284
Variation and Change in English Newspapers in Mid-18th Century London Udo Fries	302
Lexical Semantics with and without Sense Relations: Pig Terms in EFL Dictionaries Przemysław Łozowski	321
The Queen and the Knight: Consciousness and Image in the Campbell-Sitwell Correspondence Peter F. Alexander	337
Allen Ginsberg and His Chinese Dreams Shiyi Yu	354
“Improvisation in Beijing,” the Orient and Counterculture: A Reading of Allen Ginsberg’s China Works Jian Zhang	375
The Reception of William Wordsworth in the Period of Late Qing and Republic of China Yan Zhang	392
Notes on Contributors	409

From Both Ends of the Looking-Glass: The Study of English Literature in a Non-English Culture

Heh-Hsiang Yuan
Soochow University

I open my discussion with an apology. Every apologia functions with a twofold purpose: one explicit and the other implicit, with the former expressing a sense of regret for not being able to adequately exhaust what is intended, and the latter an implication of an attempt to explicate some meaningful if not profound ideas. My title, "From Both Ends of the Looking-Glass: The Study of English in a Non-English Culture," suggests exactly that. The main title, without further elaboration, betrays some sense of ambiguity, beneath which, however, the sense of apology is detectable; the sub-title itself is clear enough to convey what I am trying to say. In deliberating whether I should accept the invitation to speak, I have had some serious doubts. My hesitation results from the position of a cultural alien in English literature. By "alien," I mean an "outsider," one whose native tongue is not English and whose cultural orientation is also not English. Thus whatever I say may just be views from the other end of the looking glass, and such views, to the best, are reflexive and, to the worst, distorting. But, as literature is expression of ideas culminating in artistic construct of words, there must be a way through which understanding can be reached disregarding the variance of culture and language. Bearing this in mind, I chose the topic, "From Both Ends of the Looking-Glass," with this consideration in mind, thus a note of explanation is in order. This is the first time, I believe, that IAUPE is holding its triennial conference in a country where the cultural tradition is so different from that of the English speaking nations.

But, in spite of the cultural differences, the common concern is “the study of English,” and I might add, English studies in all countries regardless of their different cultural traditions. This reminds me of a UK symposium on “Cambridge English and China” held at Clare College, Cambridge in July 2011, whereat broad-scoped discussion of English studies in China was avidly and stimulatingly discussed. My present topic continues the subject. I made my point of argument then on the issue of “the outsider looking in,” meaning a non-native speaker of English attempts to grasp the significance of English literature through the study of the “muse’s language.” Two incidents should lead to a start.

I. A. Richards, in 1930, wrote to T. S. Eliot inviting the latter to come to China to teach. He was hoping that Eliot, with his unique understanding of English literature and the European tradition, could shed light on English literature for the Chinese students, who were then under the oppression of both domestic feudalism and foreign imperialism, and who needed new insights through the introduction of scientific knowledge in all areas; the English language as a necessary tool must be learned. Richards and C. K. Ogden started the BASIC system in China, both hoping that they could get as many intelligent minds to join them in this great endeavor. Richards thought of Eliot. He, knowing Eliot’s interest in philosophy, dangled the bait of “exposure to Confucian ideas,” hoping as Indian philosophy had caught Eliot’s intellectual curiosity that another equally great oriental moral philosophy would also prove attractive to him. Eliot turned down the invitation. His refusal was somewhat light-hearted and humorous at first; he wrote. “I do not care to visit any land which has no native cheese.”¹ But, later on August 9, 1930, Eliot wrote to Richards again giving a more serious reason. He, drawing from his experience in studies of Indian philosophy and Sanskrit, said that “it seemed impossible to be on both ends of the looking-glass at once” and “how much more dependent one was than one had suspected, upon a particular tradition of thought”; here, he meant the Western tradition of

1 Note by Eliot quoted in R. Koenek, *Empires of the Mind: I. A. Richards and Basic English in China, 1929-1979*.

thought from the Greeks down. His conclusion was that he did not believe “to translate one terminology with a long tradition into another” was possible. The best result one can achieve, he concluded, was “an ingenious deformation.” I do not know if, at that point, he had in mind Edward FitzGerald’s translation of Rubaiyat of Omar Khayyam. Those who are familiar with Lin Ch’in-nan’s Chinese translation of Camille can fully understand the humor of this, I believe. The refusal Eliot gave, to some, seems to suggest: “The east is the east, and the west is the west / And the twain shall never meet.” But this Nineteenth Century argument was proven invalid. The German philosopher-linguist, Max Muller, through his comparative studies of European language and Sanskrit and Indian religions, found the common root between India and the West. Eliot himself, in his early poetic works, *The Waste Land and Other Poems*, demonstrated that accommodating comprehension is possible. In section V of the poem, “What the Thunder Said,” Eliot referred his readers to both Dante’s “Inferno” and “the Brihadaranyaka Upanishad,” using Eastern wisdom to explicate the Christian idea of “charity, sympathy, and control.” Each one of these virtues is aimed at a particular type of human character—the misery, the unloving and the cruel. If we consult the “Upanishad” text, we will find that it was on an occasion where Buddha was speaking to three groups of listeners—gods, demons, and men. The syllable pronounced was “Da,” on all three occasions. The first “Da” was spoken to men, meaning “datta” (to give); the second “Da” to the demons, meaning “dayadhhvam” (to have sympathy); the third “Da” to the celestials, meaning “damyata” (to have control). Here, I believe, reflexive thinking is given a reflective expression. Eliot studied Sanskrit at Harvard; he must know the philosophical implications of these terms. Thus his adoption of the Sanskrit terms to further his conclusion is clear. This instance leads me to believe that a non-English person may be able to comprehend English literature properly if (s)he reads English literature with a quite thorough understanding of the English language and a full comprehension of the cultural history of the nation. My concern is thus first on language.

Speaking of language, in this case, the English language, I cannot help reminiscing an incident few years ago. I was once invited to a conference in Asia on the theme of "English in the Twenty-First Century," something close to saying "the millennium for English." Nowadays, it seems very popular for conference organizers to name their gatherings prophetically, and conference participants all love that. It seems that anything, which excites, must be futuristic. And to them English studies is no exception. English in the twenty-first century poignantly aims at a visionary view of the future of the discipline. The phrase also seems to provide an answer to the question "What will become of English studies?" The future is always an imaginary state of existence; hopeful and promising in the best sense we can conceive of it, uncertain and allusive in the worst sense we can speculate on it. In literature, and speaking in modern terms, however, the expression is somewhat different; it is either a utopian vision about the future world as a social, political and economical entity, or it is a fanciful imagination of the distant "ahead" in science fiction. In a discussion, as we are engaged doing now, of academic subjects, we try to avoid such unassuming descriptions. Instead, we try to approach the subject from facts, past and present, and search into them for a possible and tentative conclusion that can serve as a guiding principle for our endeavors. In my mind, English studies in the future should fall into that category of academic pursuit which meets its present and immediate needs of practical demand without forfeiting its visionary ideal. This seems to fall somewhere in between the two exigencies, the practical and the literary.

My present task is one, however, which considers how the subject can be best "argued" without perverting its integrity. By this I mean not to betray the cultural tradition of a literature in a non-English culture reader's comprehension and interpretation of her/his reading. I speak of this with a particular "story" in mind. When in 1929 in I. A. Richards' first visit to China, he was both exhilarated and puzzled by his experiences in teaching English literature to Chinese students. He found that the Chinese students, as Bertrand Russell described, "have many times the European

powers of memory and a tireless application” and a “deftness at retaining long passages of text, an ability highly prized in Confucian scholarship”; that to him was “a continuous wonder” during his stay in China.² But Richards was also “mystified” by their reaction to some of his lectures:

For instance, they all applauded when he read out the final scene of Hardy’s *Tess of the D’Urbervilles*. ‘He soon discovered the students had read the novel as a moral tale rather than a tragedy (resulting from certain social conditions), interpreting Tess’s death as just retribution for disobedience to her father at the beginning of the story’, and that their critical evaluation of or approach to a literary work was ‘hampered’ by their ‘aptness’ to attribute to it a moral interpretation, taking the text at its face value. The cause for this misreading, according to Richards, was the result of not truly understanding the English language or ‘poor’ training in reading techniques and the mental operation that communication requires.’ He believed that many difficulties his students faced in reading English could be ‘avoided simply by improved teaching methods’; the students needed to be ‘more cognizant of their capacities’ in acquiring ‘a clear grasp of’ the ‘underlying concepts and assumptions’ of language in order to make easier ‘the process of cultural transmission.’³

The quoted leads back to my earlier discussion of *The Waste Land*. It is, I think, possible to reach a better understanding of a culturally variant literature through a carefully constructed comparative approach. By “comparative approach,” I mean the reflexive reading and thinking of a reflective literary work. To be able to do that, one must go back to history, because history is the linking together, orderly and continuously, of ideas; and ideas are words in structure. F. W. Bateson, in his *English Poetry and*

2 Quoted in John Haffenden, *William Empson*, p. 15.

3 Heh-Hsiang Yuan, “From Outside Looking In: English, the Muse’s Language in a Non-English Culture,” p. 90.

the English Language,⁴ argued for this succinctly and clearly, with a critical and appreciative deliberation. I do not have Bateson's capacity to present such a thorough and comprehensive purview to initiate novices into competent craftsmanship. But, being a person who is truly outside, I can perhaps justify my argument for looking into the subject from both ends of the looking-glass. For an outsider in an attempt to get inside, in the present case, to get inside the subject of English Literature, the first priority is to have a clear historical view of the development of English literature. For those of us who are not native speakers of the English language but who have had teaching or academically related experiences in the West, meaning England, America or Canada or any English speaking countries, the initial contact with English literature starts from language, then literary works following the literary tradition, that is a historical viewing of such works. I believe most of my colleagues would agree with me that in teaching English literature to students in this part of the world, a comprehensive yet succinctly critical approach to the subject is vital to the success of the endeavor. And such an approach often relies on a careful selection of texts, which reflect not only the temporal order but also certain prevalent cultural traditions in the works under scrutiny. Years ago, such a pedagogical measure relied heavily on the instructor's own appreciation of the significance of the work(s) he selected. But such choices can sometimes be random, and, on rare occasions, preferential. Even in modern times we witness such inadequacies as in selection of reading material in, say, a course on literary criticism. All we need to do is to look at the anthologies for the course of literary criticism. In my graduate student days, I vaguely remembered using the text including selections from Plato down to Arnold, supplemented with a slim volume of some then considered modern European critics like Taine, Marx, Croce, and Freud. Later when I was teaching, the texts were Hazard Adams' *Critical Theory since Plato*, which ends with Murray Krieger. Adams' book, I understand, is now republished in Beijing, with revisions and additions, combining both volumes—*Critical Theory*

4 New York: Russell & Russell, 1961.