

# 香格里拉围城

——张宽自选集

张宽  
著




江西教育出版社

# 香格里拉围城

——张宽自选集

张宽 著

江西出版集团

 江西教育出版社

## 图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

香格里拉围城——张宽自选集/张宽著. —南昌: 江西教育出版社, 2008. 6

ISBN 978 -7 -5392 -4921 -6

I. 香... II. 张... III. 社会科学—文集 IV. C53

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2008) 第 042917 号

书 名: 香格里拉围城——张宽自选集

著 者: 张 宽

责任编辑: 洪晓梅

特约编辑: 程忆南

装帧设计: 朱 镔

设计制作: 汪 阁

出 版: 江西教育出版社

社址 南昌市抚河北路 291 号

邮政编码 330008

发 行: 广东联合图书有限公司

印 刷: 北京佳信达艺术印刷有限公司

版 次: 2008 年 6 月第 1 版

印 次: 2008 年 6 月第 1 次印刷

规 格: 32 开 (880mm × 1230mm)

11.25 印张 200 千字

定 价: 30.00 元

## 精英的局限（代序）

在此序言中我试图说明，为什么国别文学的专门知识是比较文学重要的组成部分，然而所有严肃的比较文学研究者，就他们的研究方法而言，本质上都成了居高临下的精英主义者。我的论点是，国际比较文学协会五十余年来的活动，引领我们进入了精英主义新局面。也就是说，特定的国族文学，无论其规模大小，无论其性质简单或是复杂，无论国别文学的专家们怎样试图设立围栏防护，公元2000年以后，国际比较文学研究为了满足自身精英主义元叙述（metanarrative）的需要，已经或正在将所有文化纳入其考察的对象之中。假使我们把自己定位为文化哲学家，就应该思考这样的问题：比较文学研究者侵蚀和收编国族文学的实践，究竟会加强或是最终损毁特定文化的表达？然而在精英主义的话语里，这个问题的重要性被放到了次要的位置。国际比较文

学研究的这一新动向已经引起了反弹，比如说，一些学者提出一系列十分专精的议题，并且不无理由地声称，只有他们才有资格为特定的文化场域和话语代言。而这只是众多的对我们的精英主义不满的表征之一。

1990年以后，国际比较文学协会卸任主席，协会下属的跨文化研究委员会创始人蓀尔·弥讷（Earl Miner）的一本书永久性地关闭了那种空泛的比较研究的乐园。弥讷的专著《比较诗学：跨文化文学理论研究》令人信服地证明，近两百年来，全世界非西方学者对欧洲文艺术语的愈来愈多的借用，背离了如中国和印度那样纯然东方的久远深厚的文化传承。在近代的文化融合发生之前，伟大的非欧洲的文学世界早已创造出了自己的文学体例、审美标准、论题和见解，千百年来大量的优秀作品就在这样的场域和氛围中产生，其影响一直持续到当下。西方的文学范畴通常在非西方的主要文学体系中找不到对应的概念，不仅如此，实际上任何一个大传统内部也存在差异。因此，不了解特定文化的价值观念，也就不可能恰当地评论那些传统中产生的文学作品。这一原则，不仅适用于那些主要的非西方的文化传统，对那些欧美影响抵达较晚的狭小的文化世界也应该如此。

比较文学史和比较文学理论的撰写教训是一目了然的：一方面，精英主义的研究必须舍弃自身熟悉的术语范畴的舒适，承认其局限性，然而欧美比较文学研究者一旦表明他们认可自身语境之外的任何价值，立即就会冒犯和疏远那些坚持西方传统价值观

念的同行。于是，在随大流的社会压力下，我们的研究免不了模式化。由于坚持否认自身的局限性，许多伪比较研究应运而生。我的立论涉及到许多方面，比如，一个接受了“美国研究”训练的亚洲背景学者，对欧洲文学史的价值没有深入的理解，也缺乏亚非国族文学的专业知识，如果只是凭借当下西方的时髦理论，他就不可能中肯地讨论任何亚非文学作品。

假使我们的某些同事过于崇拜“理论”的功效，视“理论”为神谕，拒绝哪怕是一时半会儿地放下理论家的身段，去关注特定国族文化的实实在在的表达，我们除了耐心等待和谨慎应对以外，也别无他法。是的，我们撰写文学史，把理论视为文化体系的一部分，本身就是一种理论性的表述。因此，我们的研究，也就益发助长了那种精英主义的元叙述。所谓元叙述，就是以居高临下的姿态，去审视特定文学体系，并以全局的眼光，将其作品的产生、消费、接受和理论一并囊括。当今的比较文学研究者背负着恼人的历史意识：众多的文化系统，无论大小，都有其独立存在的权利和价值。他们因此被迫别出心裁地编织出了一套更高级的元叙述，这套叙述超出了任何比较文学研究者的个人能力，也让以前那种较低级的欧洲中心、中国中心、印度中心或任何中心的叙述无从企及。

下面我试图勾勒“总体文学”当下的处境。乍听起来，这似乎不是一个紧要的任务，因为许多教学和研究机构，目前并不使用“总体文学”这个术语，甚至“比较文学”的学科命名也逐渐

被放弃，或者加上了“文化研究”的后缀。可是“比较文学”和“总体文学”的术语仍然被不少大学的系、杂志和地区性的组织所采用。我们应该追问，为什么曾经与总体文学相关的概念又重新变得重要起来，而这些概念又是怎样和精英主义的全球比较文学特征纠缠在一起？弄清这些问题，将有助于我们把握今后的方向。我们可以探讨的范畴很广，可是一个简短的列单上至少应该包含以下内容。20世纪中叶的一个基本共识，就是总体文学要研究那些我们不熟悉的历史时期、我们所陌生的地域产生的作品，因为这些作品已经汇入了特定国族语言生活文化的主流。只要探讨以下的问题，总体文学就是“跨学科的”：古代哲学在现代写作中的回归，法国革命在法语文学、希腊文学、瑞典文学或其他文学中的展现，《圣经》在西班牙语区、英语区、斯瓦希里等语区的接受等等。同样，那些显然更包含文学意味的题目，比如古希腊或罗马诗歌格律在北欧语言中的落户，莎士比亚在非英语地区的接受等，也被认为与总体文学相关。总体文学还考察古希腊罗马神话母题在欧洲现代白话文中的翻新，或者从国外引来新旧心理学、哲学理论，将其应用到本国文学的研究当中，如此等等。

总体文学吸取了“世界文学”的内涵，也就是说，翻译过来的众多外国文学作品可以和母语作品一并讨论。到了20世纪初，19世纪兴起的所谓“国族文学”系科巧妙地收编了总体文学。1901年索邦大学建立的“总体文学与比较文学系”可说是一个幸

运的例外。通常情况下，国族文学总以为自己承命于天，因为他们的学术活动与本国公共领域的社会批评实践活动相互依存（比如与报刊的评论、文学的运动和社团的互动等等）。到了20世纪，随着比较文学新生代领域的拓展，他们开始声称，自己比狭义的国族文学能够更有内涵、更深刻地理解总体文学。今天，几个世纪过去了，比较文学无处不在，取得了巨大的成就，许多国族文学系和研究机构开始向比较文学研究者示好，试图收编他们。许多团体利用国际比较学的材料和方法的同时，越来越频繁地声称，比较文学作为一门相邻的、独立平行的学科已无必要，居然没有人在意这样的说法是否有足够的学理支持。国族文学系通过跨系科的任命，常常成功地完成了对比较文学学科的殖民和控制。

回溯比较文学领域的拓展和被收编的历史细节超出了本序言的范围（请读者参阅我发表在 *Neohelicon* 杂志上的文章和我的专著《比较的途径》）。今天，由于竞争重叠的实践结果，在大部分的机构里，比较文学的核心部分已经逐渐被接纳进了总体文学的框架。这种变化既发生在占主流的各国的本民族语文学系，也发生在绝大多数国家的外国语文学系中。在一些小国家里，由于存在两种甚至更多的母语文学，图景也许略有不同，然而这些小语种通常仍然倾向去总体文学中寻找藏身之所。英语作为世界性的语言在全球的扩张，并没有改变这种基本格局，尽管在特殊的背景下也引起了戏剧化的后果。比如，印度原本是多语言的区域，



可是英文输入以后建立起来的超强势英文系挤压、窒息了对其他非印度语言的研究，进而收编了拓展中的比较文学，甚至侵入到罗曼斯语、日尔曼语、斯拉夫语、闪米语、土库曼语、日语和其他文学的领域。我提醒大家，我并非要对这些现象进行道德评论，我只是在勾勒必要的历史背景和现实状况，而比较文学要面向未来，要从这里再次出发。

依我看，在可预见的将来，比较文学不可能也不会取代总体文学。从更正面的意义上，我们完全可以把全球范围内总体文学的丰富实践，看做是在为比较文学提供资源和素材，也就是说，团队中从事研究的精英主义比较文学工作者，可以从总体文学广泛的兴趣和实践景观中，领略到种种文化的风貌。比较文学国际性的角色，可以从总体文学结构性的术语中解放生长出来，这些术语，给比较文学的成长提供了养分。现实历史中总体文学与比较文学的序列，基于我们集体经验自然生长的年轮，不是全球范围内基于本土性、特殊性的文化使命或者职业性的傲慢。

从以上我勾勒的比较文学的现状中我们可以解读张宽博士的研究工作。我们看见一个学者成长的标准化历程：求知欲把他带到了中国以外的两个大陆学习多种文化，然而他始终与自己伟大的民族文学传统紧密相连，与故土文化的脉搏一起跳动。一方面，作为比较文学研究者，他发掘外国文学优秀作品和外国文化的重要特征，思考怎样与中国的文学生活产生联系；另一方面，作为一个学养深厚的中国学者，他国学知识完备，因此能感悟母

语媒介的创造性，从而把中国语境下的规则和价值传达给外界。

作为一个学者，仅仅把比较文学和总体文学加在一起仍然是不够的。张宽博士对自身民族文化的审美标准了然于心，以文学评论者的身份面向中文读者言说。从更广阔的公共领域来看，作为文化的中介者，他让读者了解到中国和欧美的文化遗产产生的背景，从而使跨文化的双向交流成为可能。张宽博士同时还从事文学翻译，他提交给斯坦福大学的博士论文也曾探讨文学翻译对中国现代诗歌中的现代主义形成的重要作用。正因为许多比较文学工作者掌握了多门语言，他们自然而然地成为文化的中介者，这些学者型的翻译工作者对国际文化的交流起到了不可磨灭的贡献。张宽博士此文集以其广度和深度，成为中国多向度地参与国际文化对话成果之一。

吉拉尔德·纪乐思比（Gerald Gillespie）

美国斯坦福大学荣休教授

前国际比较文学协会主席

# Why Elitists Humbly Acknowledge Limits

By Gerald Gillespie

In these prefatory remarks I hope to indicate why local expertise is an essential component of Comparative Literature (henceforth CL), yet all serious comparatists are by the very nature of their approach elitists. My thesis is that the activity of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) over the past five decades has conducted us into a new situation of ineluctable elitism. Whatever the size and complexity of any local culture, and whatever the specialists devoted to it may assert about it, all cultures have become by the year 2000 of the Common Era either implicitly or de facto subject matters which international comparative scholarship appropriates or aspires to appropriate for its own elitist metanarrative. The question whether such scrutiny, on the part of comparatists, eventually may enhance or, on the contrary, may

harm or even contribute to killing certain kinds of cultural expression is a separate matter appropriate to ponder if we want to act as philosophers of culture, but that is to play a second role and practice a second form of elitist discourse. Backlashes against international comparative studies -- for example, through the proliferation of particularist agendas in a host of cultures and by scholars who claim, often correctly claim, to "represent" specific cultural lobbies and sociolects -- are just one of many signs of resentment against our elitism.

As of 1990, a book by the late Earl Miner, a past president of ICLA and founder of its Committee on Intercultural Studies, has forever shut the gate to any unitary paradise of comparison. His *Comparative Poetics: An Intercultural Essay on Theories of Literature* argues persuasively that the increased borrowing of European notions by non-European people worldwide in recent centuries must be disentangled from the literary heritages of such deeply rooted non-European cultural worlds as the Chinese and the Indic. Prior to these more recent cultural convergences, great non-European literary worlds generated their own habits, preferences, controversies, and views that over many centuries conditioned the formation of distinct literary conglomerates, with important effects lasting down to the present. Not only do Western categories often not match up with or apply to other major literary systems, but there are big gaps in every grand tradition,

so that we cannot properly evaluate works born in specific territories without studying their distinct values. The same insight holds in regard to smaller cultural worlds that exist in a special environment which only more recently may have been impacted by the intrusion of European or Euro-American ways.

The lesson for the writing of comparative literary history or criticism is plain: only an elitist scholarship can cope with abandoning the comfort of familiar homegrown categories and admitting their inadequacy. As soon as European or Euro-American comparatists reveal that they recognize values outside of the norms of their local territories, they irritate and alienate fellow scholars beholden principally to local values; the social pressure to conform causes conformity, thus a great deal of pseudo-compartism results from the compulsion to deny limits. This proposition cuts in all directions. For example, without good knowledge of European literary values, an Asian scholar trained as an Americanist cannot deal adequately with most Asian and African works simply by applying fashionable Western theory in the absence of deep knowledge of each of the home cultures in question.

There is little we can do, except exercise patience and reply carefully, if some fellow scholars who worship "Theory" in general as some quasi-divine agency, deny that it is possible for us to abandon our role as theoreticians even temporarily in order to pay heed to the

particulars of actual cultural expression. True: our act of treating theories (in the singular!) as parts of cultural systems when we write literary history is a kind of theoretical statement in itself, because thereby our scholarly work contributes even more demonstrably to an elitist metanarrative. This metanarrative, in effect, is posited over the totality of the literary system under examination, over both its literary production and consumption, including that special kind of reception or discursive chiming-in called "theorizing". Because today's international comparatist is burdened by a troubled historical consciousness that multiple grander and smaller cultural systems exist in their own right, he or she is virtually compelled to fashion a higher-order metanarrative, a metanarrative beyond the competence of any single comparatist or the reach of any older lower-order Eurocentric, or Sinocentric, or Indocentric, or whatever-centric narrative.

Now I would like to sketch some aspects of the role of General Literature (henceforth GL) in our contemporary situation. This may not seem an urgent task at a time when many teaching and research entities do not use the term GL and some have even been opting to drop the label CL altogether in their official name or to add Culture Studies to it. Yet the terms CL and GL still do appear, often twinned, in the names of many university departments, journals, or regional associations. I believe it helps clarify our goals today if we ask why some of the older

concepts associated with GL are again important and how they relate to the elitist character of global CL. There is a diverse range of categories we could examine, but an abbreviated list should contain at least the following. A common understanding around the middle of the twentieth century was that GL involved working with texts which, having originated elsewhere or in a remoter period of history, had been imported into and/or were carried in the cultural stream of a particular living language. Thus GL was “interdisciplinary” insofar as it dealt with such matters as these: the perennial return of ancient philosophy in modern writing; the role of the French Revolution as exhibited in French, Greek, Swedish, or other literatures; the reception of the (originally Hebrew, Syriac, and Greek) Bible in Spanish-speaking territories, in English-speaking territories, in Swahili-speaking territories; and so forth. Likewise, subjects thought of as more obviously literary — for example, the inroads of classical and Romance versification in northern European languages, the impact of Shakespeare in various non-British homelands — were understood to pertain to GL. Thus GL would account for the persistence of Greco-Roman mythological motifs in various local vernaculars, or would consider the possibility of applying a particular older or newer psychological or philosophical doctrine derived from a foreign source, and the like.

GL comprehended the teaching of "world literature", that is, a variety of texts insofar as these were available in translations and could be conveyed as significant alongside literature written in the local language. Thus, willy-nilly, so-called "national literature" departments emerging from the nineteenth century were put in charge of GL in the early twentieth century, often tacitly. Among the happy exceptions was the establishment of a new department of General and Comparative Literature at the Sorbonne in 1901. Otherwise, in general, the national literature groups assumed that they had a special mandate because their academic activity coexisted immediately with local social practices of criticism in the public sphere (for instance, in relation to newspaper and magazine reviews, cultural movements and programs, and the like). It was only gradually that the newer breed of comparatists began intruding in the twentieth century and claimed they could offer a more informed, enhanced brand of GL than did the locally entrenched national literature departments. Now, many decades later, the success of CL has been so extensive that not just the local national literature departments but many other local teaching and research entities have, in effect, turned the tables on the comparatists. A wide variety of groups have coopted and internalized CL materials and approaches, so that with increasing frequency they claim not to need CL as an academic neighbor. It does not matter whether this claim cannot be substantiated intellectually. By



means of cross-appointments the local departments have often succeeded in colonizing and even gaining control of CL.

To rehearse the many details of the story of the proliferation and subsequent cooptation of CL exceeds the scope of this Preface. (I point readers to my articles in the journal *Neohelicon* and my book *By Way of Comparison* for a more thorough treatment.) Today the practical result of the competitive overlap is that “hard-core” CL has gradually been reabsorbed in a GL framework in most institutions. This shift has been happening both within the respective, locally dominant national literature departments and within the foreign literature departments in a plethora of host countries. The picture may vary slightly in some smaller countries where two or more indigenous national literatures exist side by side, but the regional tendency of each language stream usually is to insulate itself protectively within a GL framework. The spread of English as an international lingua franca does not alter these basic relationships, although there are dramatic consequences in specific contexts. For example, the predominance of English as an adopted national language in the huge polyglot world of India has led to the creation of powerful English departments which tend to crowd out and choke off the study of other non-Indic languages, hence to inhibit the expansion of CL in other obvious areas involving the Romance, Germanic, Slavic, Semitic, Turkomanic, Japanese, and other