

二十世紀中國書法研究匯觀

主編 張嘯東

書法本體
書法美學
書法理論
書法心理
內容與形式
書法批評
書法家
學書
創作
欣賞
流派與風格
書法與時代
書法史觀
二十世紀的中國書法
二十世紀的中國書法家

周俊杰書學受義

李篆林題

西泠印社

二十世紀中國書法研究匯觀

周俊杰书学要义

季羨林題



主編 張嘯東
副主編 孫憲勇

◎ 西泠印社

書名題字 季羨林
責任編輯 朱妙根
責任出版 張先富
策 劃 趙 雍
牛宗周
張 韜
陳文明
葛全明
封面設計 孫憲勇
版式設計 胡穎君
英文翻譯 黃為葳

周俊杰書學要義

西泠印社出版發行

杭州東坡路 90 號

全國新華書店經銷

河南省瑞光印務股份有限公司印刷

開本:850×1168 1/32 印張:17.75

插頁:6 字數:390 千字

1999 年 9 月第 1 版 1999 年 9 月第 1 次印刷

印數:00 001—5 000

ISBN 7-80517-401-6/J · 402

定價:貳拾玖圓(平) 伍拾陸圓(精)

直面現實

——《周俊杰書學要義》序

□ 沈 鵬

本世紀七十年代後期，在中國書法史上值得大書一筆。書法振興了，首先表現為創作的繁榮，幾乎與此同時呼喚理論的推動力和前導性，大體上說，先是與創作關係較為直接的問題，然後上溯史的研究，系統的理论與美學的研究，以及書法與其他各門藝術、文化關係的研究，再是中外藝術的比較、融化、吸收等問題。總的趨勢是由近及遠，由淺入深。在我們這個年月，理論活動不像創作那樣具有吸引力、誘惑力，而更需要（其實創作基本上一樣）耐得起寂寞，經得起折衝，以至受得起誤解。雖然如此，涉足理論領域的人總會有，二十多年來，涌現出一批理論人才和著作，便是明證。

“一切從‘零’開始”，如果指一種工作精神，為着鼓勵，未嘗不可。但是，當作一種科學的提法便不妥了。中國的書法有如此輝煌的過去，書法理論比之畫論絕不遜色，比之

詩論、文論也有自身特點，許多問題在古人那裡已經說得很深刻，只不過那時代沒有現代化詞語，可我們有什麼理由搬開巨人的肩膀呢？要搬也搬不掉，倒是站在巨人肩膀上繼續攀登才有可能開創新生面。老實說以我看，要能夠站到巨人肩膀上就已經很不容易，那畢竟是巨人，並且任何一個巨人也是在前代巨人的肩膀上成長起來的。我們對古代遺產不可能“吃透”無遺。所以，站在巨人肩膀上的提法也只能是相對的。

當然，理論還是要發展。當代理論畢竟有了時代特色。西方思潮的引進拓寬了我們的思維時空，現代意義上的科學性、邏輯性進入了歷史研究的領域，無異給中國書學注入了新的生物質，但是外來的思潮也要選擇，中國固有的也並非沒有科學性、邏輯性，與西方比較各有所長。我們不否認自身弱點，但我們的史論研究不能成為外國美學權威的注腳，我們要保持自己的民族性。當代書學理論的另一個重要之點，既稱“當代”，生活在世紀之交，就要貼近、關注、研究此時此刻書壇的種種問題：書法界出現了哪些新人新事？什麼樣的趨向值得肯定？什麼樣的趨向雖有不足卻儲藏着生命力？什麼樣的作品以新面貌出現卻適足見其淺薄？為什麼“快餐”多而經得起認真體味的精品少？為什麼社會上對炫耀現代化布景道具的燈光雜沓卻了無新意的晚會屢有微詞，而在書界的某些展覽與活動也有類似現象？為什麼我們（連同本人）一邊強調理論的獨立性，一邊卻有意無意地磨掉棱角降低理論的品位……真正的理論家不能也不願回避這些問題。真正的理論家直面現實，有包容性，也有獨立性、獨創性。包容性是把自我的個性溶化於廣大藝術受眾的共性之中，是排除了無知與狹隘的大度與寬容。這樣的包容性，不但不排斥獨立性，而且為獨立性確立了堅實的

基礎。評論者包容性、多元意識與獨立性、獨創性的統一，體現為可貴的學術品位與人格力量。對於書法界出現的各種現象，人們可以從組織領導、工作方法、社會因素等衆多角度進行分析，但是作為理論家，決定地需要的是立足於理論的立場。因為唯有理論才能揭示事情的本質，才能發揮導向作用。理論的論述可以也應當是多角度的，個性鮮明的，但是理論要求深刻，這是理論本性所決定的。理論的正確以其深刻為支點，否則缺乏說服力。

我贊賞周俊杰多次說過的一段話：“書法家應是敏銳的藝術直覺能力與深刻理性相結合的全面發展者，它本身就應包含學者具備的特徵。”這段話可以看作他從實踐中獲得的理性思考。他從七十年代書法重振之日起，就投入這門藝術，鍥而不捨，一支毛筆從事創作，一支鋼筆撰寫文章。相互促進，相互補益，但並不就是“一回事”。當我們用傅山的“四寧”、“四毋”套他的創作，往往得不到滿意的回答，說明理論與創作是兩種不同的思維方式，不同的“語言”，“理論”並不同“經驗”，尤其不等於個人體驗，盡管有着內在聯係。

很難設想，一個創作有成的人會輕視理論，不懂理論；也很難設想，一個理論水平較高的人會漠視創作，對創作不感興趣。我們不必排除理論家與創作家的分工，兼而有之的人也會有所側重。周俊杰在中年書法家的行列裡獲得自己的定位，我以為很重要的一個特點也即優點是，二十多年來他從投入書法開始，即自覺置身於書界漩渦之中，他立足中原，目光射向全國，他那以豪放、稚拙為主調的創作為人矚目。他從八十年代初開始就自覺地加入美學問題的討論，多年來發表的文章和著作，涉及書法學的衆多方面，他所說的“思想力”的“強度”透露出他勤於思考和善於思考的

能力，緊張的勞動和對事業的執着。他多次同我談到十九世紀俄羅斯別林斯基服務於《祖國紀事》的經歷，別林斯基自一八四一年到一八四七年逐年不斷地撰寫“俄國文學一瞥”的長文對同時代的一大批作家、詩人產生重大影響並借以發揮他的革命民主主義思想。這種深入時代漩渦之中而又站在時代制高點的風範，俊杰由青年時代起就接受了影響，從中汲取典型的力量。這裡順便提一下，別林斯基在《一八四七年俄國文學一瞥》這篇文章裡談到某些停留在“精神冬蟄狀態中”不思改變的人，“我們將僅僅說，他們是中國人……”回想那是一個怎樣的時代！被帝國主義用大炮挾帶鴉片轟擊的中國人還處在“精神冬蟄狀態”。一百五十餘年後處在全面改革開放的今天，回想起來，不也很值得警策嗎？我們怎樣防止“冬蟄”的墮性，在意識形態領域裡不也是時刻遇到的問題嗎？

現在擺在我們面前的一部三十五萬字《周俊杰書學要義》，共分十五部分，從“本體”開始，繼而“美學”、“理論”、“心理”等屬於書法理論核心的部分，接着是“內容與形式”、“批評”、“書法家”，作者認為屬於內圓部分；“學書”、“創作”、“欣賞”屬於與書法本質相連的藝術體系；作者通過“流派與風格”、“書法與時代”、“書法史觀”勾畫出我們這個時代書法的脈絡，最後兩部分論述了二十世紀書法與書法家。從總體來說，俊杰仍是以“要義”為他的著作的特點。《易解》在“剛柔之際，義無咎也”下注：“義，猶理也”；韓愈《進學解》說“記事者必提其要”，俊杰說他愛好以簡明文字直入闡拔，這也可以看作是他理解的“要義”所在，由此影響到研究問題的方法。《藝概》的作者劉熙載說“余平昔言藝，好言其概”，表明了劉熙載的一種治學方法。當然言什麼、如何言，是更為根本的問題，由此確定著作的價值。俊杰的寫作方

法，吸收了我國古代文藝理論主要以經驗性的思維為主的論述方法，從他包容的十五個部分和引用外國美學觀點來看，也力圖具備現代意義上的系統性與邏輯性。讀者期望他的，是進一步把思路的開闊與準確、嚴謹相統一，把西方學說與民族傳統相結合，這是理論工作者成熟的重要標誌。俊杰在學術問題上的坦誠，體現他的自信與虛心的一致性。

當代書壇的多元趨向，為開創流派提供了前提。流派的形式需要有代表性的領袖人物，相對穩定的區域，最後歸結到特殊的藝術風格。從我國目前書壇來看，形成新的流派似乎還需要時日，而某些書家個人風格的總結、研究，倒值得給予更多的注意，也許可以說是為開創流派做一些先導的工作。俊杰對當代書壇的流派大致區分為“純傳統派”、“現代派”和“新古典主義派”三大類別，以人數之多、影響之廣當以“新古典主義派”為最。“新古典主義”本是一個外來名詞。十八世紀中下葉，隨着龐貝等古遺址的發現，追求莊重宏偉或優美典雅風格以反叛羅可可的纖細、繁瑣風格流行起來，開始在羅馬，以後以法國為中心向歐洲擴散，在繪畫方面，大衛及其繼承者安格爾等按照古希臘羅馬雕像所樹立的標準，以崇高、理想、典雅為最高尚的追求。

周俊杰和他的伙伴把“新古典主義”運用到當代書法，逐漸被大多數人接受。其間經過一番闡釋、界定。重要的不在於將外國藝術名詞用於中國書法，重要的是賦予怎樣的內涵。以我的初步了解，俊杰的“書法新古典主義”是一個廣泛的概念，幾乎除“純傳統”與“現代派”之外都囊括在內。同時，俊杰也吸收了這個名詞的本原的含義，他宣稱：“當代書法的發展絕不是渾渾噩噩地任其自流，當代書法創作應當以復興古典藝術精神為主綫，這種精神包括豪放博大的民族氣魄與充滿童稚的童心。在清人崇碑之後，我們

應向‘民間書法’這一廣闊的未被開墾的藝術土地吸取自由的創造精神，同時，又要以強烈的民族自信力去吸取國外藝術精華，將文人書法、民間書法、國外優秀的藝術創造精神與手法融為一體，從而開闢出只屬於我們這個時代的藝術之路。”

俊杰的研究成果，立足於對藝術事業的忠誠，由此激發出追求真理的勇氣和探求新知識的勤奮。他好讀書，卻有別於書齋式的學人；他也好交友、游覽，卻非匆匆過客。他正處在一生中最富創造力與開拓性的時期，他的活躍的思維源於當前書法熱潮所出現的紛繁的現象和提出的各種問題，他的每一項研究成果既是前一階段的結束，又是新的探索的起點。給書壇帶來信息，注入活力。

祝願俊杰等一批中青年探索者保持與他們年齡相應的我們時代特有的蓬勃生氣。

ALWAYS LOOKING THE REALITY IN THE FACE

—Foreword to ESSENTIALS OF CHINESE CALLIGRAPHIC ART

by Zhou Junjie—

□ Shen Peng

The closing years of 1970s witnessed a very noteworthy turning point in the history of Chinese calligraphy. The turning point manifested itself in an extensive rejuvenation of the art of calligraphy in China. As a result of the rejuvenation, calligraphic creations began in those years to appear across China in an astonishingly large number. That was certainly an auspicious start to lead in its wake a calligraphic boom. With the advent of the boom, the calligraphic public was naturally impelled to seek solutions to a series of technical problems that directly concerned calligraphic creation. Then the calligraphic community's attention was directed to the history of Chinese calligraphy. After having explored the history of Chinese calligraphy deep enough, the community was gradually awakened to the needs of improving the

system of traditional Chinese calligraphic canon, of imbibing ideas related to aesthetic norm from philosophical thinkings of the West, and of finding out the relations between calligraphy and any of the whole spectrum of arts and between calligraphy and traditional Chinese culture. By drawing comparisons between an art form that is unique to China and one that is unique to the West, the community began penetrating below the mystery enshrouding such cultural phenomena as “assimilation”, “infiltration”, into the mechanism that had motivated the evolution of traditional Chinese calligraphy. To sum up, all the developments, unfolding in the domain of Chinese calligraphy since the late 70s when a calligraphic creation boom began to loom above China’s cultural horizon, have been materializing in the prevalently fixed pattern featuring gradual expansion and progressive accumulation. In present-day China, an effort at developing some new theories or improving some existing system of theories in a certain domain of art is in most cases much less rewarding than an effort at creating an artistic piece of some sort. In other words, nowadays theoreticians have to learn to be patient, to be able to tolerate the agony caused by seclusion, loneliness or obscurity they are to be subjected to, and even to be able to afford misunderstandings or incriminations slung in their direction. Although calligraphic artists have fared just a little better than calligraphic theoreticians, yet the former also have to learn to be resigned to some discomfiting or disappointing situations they have to face when their creations are exhibited to the critical eyes of the general public. But however adverse the fate of calligraphic theoreticians may be, all of them are not

cowed into completely giving up their attempts at enlarging and enriching the domain of calligraphic theories. That in the past two decades have been arising in China calligraphic theoretical publications and calligraphic theorists galore can serve as very convincing evidence testifying to the fact that all the calligraphic theorists are not discouraged from doing their regular stint of theorization.

Some scholars have given Chinese calligraphic theorists the advice of "starting your effort at new calligraphic theorization just *from scratch*". Is such an advice worthy of being literally followed? Not really. When warning a theorist against going overly proud of his past accomplishments in theorization, you may of course advise him to always remember to start *from scratch* every time he launches into a new project of calligraphic theorization. But it is simply absurd to exhort all Chinese calligraphic theorists to try to build a system of Chinese calligraphic theories *from scratch* in view of the facts that the system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories served as a brilliant guideline attentively followed by all successful calligraphers in our history and that the said system is not at all intellectually or artistically inferior than—say—the system of traditional Chinese painting theories, or that of classical Chinese literary theories. A great number of calligraphic rules established by noted calligraphers in our history in compliance with the system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories are extremely truthful and practical indeed, though the whole body of literature, or treatises, on calligraphic theories as composed by our ancient gifted calligraphers is invariably couched in difficult classical Chinese mandarin, instead of Chinese

vernacular. We need not to scrape off or discard entirely the extant calligraphic theoretic setup and replace it with a completely 'new' system. What present-day calligraphic theorists have to do consists—apart from the job of rendering the system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories written in difficult classical Chinese mandarin into statements written in modern Chinese vernacular—in, so I think, adding our new experience and new theoretical acquisitions to the edifice of Chinese calligraphic theories. As a matter of fact, the lore of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories constitutes too rich a lode of calligraphic conceptualizations to be exhausted or consumed by our generation or forthcoming generations of Chinese calligraphers. Every generation of calligraphers adds, as a rule, something new to such a lode. So far not a generation of calligraphers has ever dreamed of scraping off the system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories; rather it invariably seeks to build its professional splendor merely on the basis of the old splendor created by its forerunners.

No system of theories in an art domain in any epoch can remain completely unchanged for all the social changes taking place in that epoch. The system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories is no exception. The theoretical addition produced by a generation of calligraphers to accrue to the edifice of Chinese calligraphic theories usually bears marks of the epoch in which the generation flourishes. New calligraphic theories developed by the current Chinese calligraphers are indubitably imprinted with epochal marks of their own. It is evident that when the current Western philosophical thinkings, modern notions arising from the

latest developments of sciences, and innovative logic schemes fresh from creatively formulating minds of the West are applied to interpreting the system of traditional Chinese calligraphic theories, that would necessarily amplify the logical dimension of the said system. What needs to be pointed out in this connection is this: Intellectual products originated with the Occident—however enlightening and freshening it can be—can and should never be gorged on uncritically. All sorts of ideology, logic, or philosophy originated in China are not rational or scientific. Values of the East are, like those of the West, superior in their own peculiar way. These two systems of values are simply incomparable; either system has its unique merits and demerits. Any nation needs to preserve its peculiar national traits. China's system of traditional calligraphic theories should never be reduced to the status of a set of trivial arguments fit only for playing the role of "evidence in support of some aesthetic propositions put forward by some 'authoritative' Western philosopher". As pointed out above, the theoretical addition produced by a generation of calligraphers to accrue to the edifice of Chinese calligraphic theories usually bears marks of the epoch in which the generation flourishes. The theoretical addition made by the contemporary generation of calligraphers to accrue to the edifice of Chinese calligraphic theories ought, as a matter of course, to bear the marks of the epoch characterized by its happening to be overlapping the 20th century and the 21st century. In other words, in the present calligraphic generation's theoretical contribution to the edifice of Chinese calligraphic theories should be integrated (1) the solutions it sets forth to the major, or pressing, issues most

calligraphers in China are now facing, (2) the proper criterion to be adopted by the calligraphic public for evaluating contemporary calligraphic creations, (3) the moral or professional standard, by which a newly emerging calligraphic style or trend in China can be duly assessed so as to determine whether it has some intrinsic worth or whether it has been endowed with more than sufficient vitality to survive competitions in calligraphic circles. It must be admitted that only a small proportion of all the contemporarily produced calligraphic pieces can be rated as truly immortal creations. Why? What are the causes that have engineered the outcropping of so overwhelming a majority of artistically shallow calligraphic creations? Some calligraphic works have been extravagantly advertised as admirably avantgarde masterpieces, but in fact they are creations of very poor taste. In such cases disregard for fundamental aesthetic principles is so glorified as to be understood as a devilish knack of concocting absurdities at will. In recent years a great number of calligraphic exhibitions have been housed in shockingly exquisite and costly art galleries, but most of the calligraphic pieces on display there are just ugly childish affairs. Although most of our calligraphic theorists (including myself) are in the habit of professing that we would firmly adhere to the system of calligraphic theories we have been popularizing, more often than not we would shrink from involving ourselves in any argument with an opponent who expressly wants to unreasonably blast our system of calligraphic theories. Sometimes we even connived at some outrageous distortion of our professional faith, though, we know, such connivance was tantamount to depreciating our professional faith. A true theorist

should never allow himself to stoop so low. He should be courageous in the face of grim actualities. Though he can tolerate within reasonable confines the disparities between his calligraphic canons and his opponent's, he should never stand what has already gone beyond those confines. In creating his calligraphic works he is independent and original. But he should always be watchful so as to rid himself of narrowmindedness and free himself from sectarian mentality in the face of an onset from an adverse system of calligraphic theories. We believe his tolerance of different systems of calligraphic theories within reasonable confines can do no harm to his independence and originality in artistic creation. Rather, such tolerance tends to even more actively arouse his calligraphic or theoretical imagination. In a calligrapher, a unity of tolerance, independence, originality, pluralism is a token attesting to his attainment of sublime professionalism and generous personality. The general public may assess the calligraphic community from manifold perspectives such as competency on the part of the community's leadership, the policy by which activities of the community have been guided, prevalent social circumstances and influence. However, for a professional calligraphic theorist, his assessment of performance of the calligraphic community as a whole can be based only on his outlook and ethic that are crystallized from the system of calligraphic theories he has professed to uphold. Why? Because it is the theories he has sincere faith in that can unfailingly penetrate into the core of a complication and serve as a guideline for unraveling that complication. On the other hand, a system of theories would be inane or even misleading, if it is logically

untenable. Moreover, it must be not only correct but also deepgoing; otherwise it would sound just hollow.

Zhou Junjie, author of this book, once said, "In a competent calligrapher, ought to reside the unity of profound reason and intuition coupled with sharp insight in matters of arts. Such a unity presupposes his acquisition of all traits peculiar to a true scholar." This is a statement or proposition I highly value. It must be an outcome of his long cogitation maturing in the course of his calligraphic practice spanning decades. He began his calligrapher's career at the end of the 70s. While practicing calligraphy, he applied himself consistently to composing calligraphic treatises. His calligraphic practice and his exertion dedicated to composing treatises, though they are reciprocally beneficial to each other's improvement, are in essence two different types of endeavor. That accounts for the fact that we can get ourselves practically nowhere with our attempt at evaluating his calligraphic creations from the perspective of the dual norm of "4 rather's plus 4 no's" propounded by Fu Shan. And that also accounts for the fact that the cogitational pattern going into formulating a theory is different from that going into creating a calligraphic piece. Indeed either employs a "language" of its own. Theory cannot be regarded simply as nothing more than a piece of experience clothed in words; nor can theory be equated with a piece of an individual's unique experience, though there do exist some hidden ties between theory and experience.

It is inconceivable that a successful artist would belittle the influential role played by theories in the course of his creation of artistic works or can remain ignorant of the theories important for