



见证

中国比较文学30年

1979—2009

1979-2009: Retrospect of the Development of
Comparative Literature Studies of China

—John J, Deeney(李达三)、刘介民往来书札

刘介民◎编译



广东高等教育出版社

Guangdong Higher Education Press



见证

中国比较文学30年 1979—2009

1979-2009: Retrospect of the Development of
Comparative Literature Studies of China



广东高等教育出版社

Guangdong Higher Education Press

广州

图书在版编目 (CIP) 数据

见证中国比较文学 30 年 (1979—2009): John J. Deeney (李达三)、刘介民往来书札/刘介民编译. —广州: 广东高等教育出版社, 2010. 9

ISBN 978 - 7 - 5361 - 3901 - 5

I. ①见… II. ①刘… III. ①比较文学 - 文学研究 - 中国 - 当代
IV. ①I206.7

中国版本图书馆 CIP 数据核字 (2010) 第 025330 号

出版发行	广东高等教育出版社
	社址: 广州市天河区林和西横路
	邮编: 510500 营销电话: (020) 87557232
	http://www.gdgjs.com.cn
印 刷	佛山市浩文彩色印刷有限公司
开 本	787 毫米 × 1 092 毫米 1/16
印 张	22.5 10 彩页
字 数	420 千字
版 次	2010 年 9 月第 1 版
印 次	2010 年 9 月第 1 次印刷
印 数	1 ~ 1 000 册
定 价	38.00 元

(版权所有, 翻印必究)

序

中美学者在“比较文学家之径”上

黄维樑

在 20 世纪,我与顺庆兄合编了一本《中国比较文学学科理论的垦拓——台港学者论文选》(北京大学出版社,1998)。在序中,我有这样一段文字:

香港中文大学是香港以至台湾、大陆比较文学的重要基地。德国的海德堡和日本的京都,都有“哲学家之径”。在我看来,中文大学的山村路、中央道、士林路可连成一线,谓之“比较文学家之径”。香港的、台湾的、内地的、其他地方的比较文学学者,在这条路上行走,或上学,或回家,或前往参加研讨会,或回宾馆休息,他们在山径上沉思冥想,柳暗花明,涉及的常常是比较文学的问题。李达三、袁鹤翔、周英雄、朱立民、钟玲、乐黛云、刘介民、曹顺庆、张隆溪、雷文(Harry Levin)、奥椎基(A. Owen Aldridge)等等,都在这里留下了他们比较文学的足迹和思维。

上述周英雄等“英雄榜”中人物,留下了足迹、思维,还留下了友谊。其中友谊最深厚、最绵长的,大概是刘介民和李达三两位了。他们从通讯到见面到学术上的合作,前后超过四分之一世纪。介民兄保存、整理、编译了他们互通的邮件、“易妙”(emails),汇成一册,就是这本《1979—2009 见证中国比较文学 30 年——John J. Deeney (李达三)、刘介民往来书札》(以下简称《见证》)。他们的信件共有 188 封。

刘介民在 1945 年出生,毕业于沈阳大学,为中国社会科学院研究生,长期在辽宁社会科学院任职。1995 年转任广州大学中文系教授,为该校比较文化研究所所长。著作、编著、编译有《比较文学方法论》、《中国比较诗学》等,极为丰富。1985 年开始,他多次在香港从事研究工作,前后共三年,主要是在香港中文大学(以下简称“中大”)。在中大时,他的“搭档”——更准确地说,他的导师——是李达三。李达三是汉名,原名是 John J. Deeney,美国人,1931 年出生,美国复旦穆大学博士,曾在台湾学习中文。1965 年起在台湾的师范大学等校教书,1977 年起在香港中文大学英文系教授比较文学等学科,并与同系的袁鹤翔等创办香港比较文学学会。李教授以无比的热情,从事比较文学的教学、研究、推广工作。我当年在中大中

文系任教，袁鹤翔、李达三为学会的正、副会长，我任秘书长。学会举办一些活动，在中大内外介绍比较文学，推广这门较新的学科。这门学科在20世纪由西方传入中国，颇有发展。到了50—70年代，它在中国内地沉寂之时，在台湾和香港却兴起且发展起来。台湾、香港的一些比较文学学者，对它在内地80年代的复兴，起了不小的作用，而李达三是一位关键人物。

20世纪80年代内地改革开放初期，百废待兴，各种学术资料异常匮乏。香港中文大学英文系有一个小组与香港中文大学中国文化研究所的比较文学与翻译研究中心合作，筹得经费，为内地文学学者和比较文学学者来中大访问、研究提供机会。老中青的学者，客似云来，当中有很多是青年学者。^①他们来访三两个月，接触、饕餮各种中外文书籍期刊，与中大的同行谈文论艺，从事相关的研究工作，往往大有收获。返回内地后，他们继续努力，不少人争取机会出国进修。凭着聪颖勤奋，加上运气，很多当年似云而来的青年学者，都在各地成为教授、博士生导师、系主任、学院院长、学会会长、“长江学者”、讲座教授。当年的萌芽学者（budding scholar），其茁壮、成长，多少都蒙受了香港中文大学的阳光和雨露。

李教授注释过艾略特的名诗《荒原》（*The Waste Land*），20世纪80年代从内地到香港的青年学者，都走过“文化大革命”所造成的“荒原”，几乎都要变成仙人掌了。他们南下到香港这块福地，受到阳光和雨露的润泽，其间有达学、达己、达人的李达三先生莫大的心血和力量。阳光和雨露是要花钱买的，不像苏东坡所说清风明月之免费。为了筹措来访学者的经费，达三先生“十年辛苦不寻常”。《见证》中的多封书信，都提到他的募捐之苦。90年代我担任过香港中文大学新亚书院辅导长一职，曾多次与书院院长外出筹款，真有新亚校歌所说的“艰险，我奋进；困乏，我多情”之慨。巧合的是，劝捐的对象中，有一位电器代理商，其高姓大名也是李达三，华人。不知道“美人”李达三可曾向华人李达三劝捐过。

捐款是副业，正业是教学、研究、著述。达三先生倾情倾力地务正业。学术研究贵在突破、推陈出新，研究者必须先把握时贤和前贤的研究成果，才可望在此基础上有发现、有创见。为此，李教授极为重视比较文学书目的编纂，以及相关论文的选辑、编译，多番和刘介民先生一起努力。他们合作的成果有《中外比较文学研究》和《中西比较文学理论》等书。这些书，

① 据《见证》所述，应邀到香港中文大学的内地学者有数十人，包括崔宝衡、方平、贾植芳、林秀清、刘以焕、刘介民、卢康华、罗钢、茅于美、孙景尧、蔡恒、巫宁坤、谢天振、杨周翰、易新农、应锦襄、远浩一、赵瑞琪、温儒敏、蒋述卓、廖鸿钧、胡经之、金宏达、曹顺庆、龙协涛等。还有季羨林、乐黛云、王瑶、贾益民、艾晓明、张文定、陈思和、陈秋峰、范岳、张锦、张智圆、谢媛、韩冀宁、张宁、朱志渝等。

套用一句习语，“嘉惠士林至鉅”。《见证》告诉我们，刘介民等学者在《中西比较文学理论》的编译过程中，李达三对书稿的修改、考证、补充、删节就有几千处，达三万字。近三十年来下面的事颇为常见：香港学者和内地学者合作编写书籍，前者出钱，后者出力。书出版后，由前者后者共同署名，甚至只署前者。名为合作，实者剥削或吞占学术劳动力。李和刘合作，各尽其力，并署其名。

二人都极为勤奋，《见证》多处提到介民兄孜孜不倦地为研究计划倾力工作。至于杰克，我与他同在一座办公大楼，有时在他的办公室晤谈，其室四壁一壁是窗，另外三壁，都是书刊文件，密密麻麻、密密实实。他喜欢用小纸片作备忘录，一切格物致知大大小小的事物通通记下来，提醒自己，一去努力完成任务。在《见证》中介民兄对小纸片有色彩缤纷的描述。连他的太太都认为，杰克是个工作狂（workaholic）。杰克就是 Jack，即 John，即 John Deeney，即李达三。学了美国作风，我们在校内都以名字相呼，而非相敬如宾地用某某博士、某某教授。

杰克说得一口流利的普通话，在台湾继而在香港和大陆讲授、提倡比较文学。比较文学这门学科源于西方，其重镇、名家在西方，其理论、话语权在西方。在华人地区为比较文学传道、授业、解惑的西方人杰克，希望中国人在比较文学方面有自己的理论、自己的声音。比较文学研究有所谓法国学派（重心在影响研究）和美国学派（重心在平行研究），杰克呼吁中华学者建立“中国学派”。1977年10月发表于台北《中外文学》的《比较文学中国学派》一文，是杰克庄严的宣言，指出中国学说要与“定于一尊的西方思维模式分庭抗礼”，要抗拒西方思维的“全面垄断”。此宣言不无向西方中心主义者宣战的意味。杰克认为中国学派“要以自己的术语，按自己的条件，道出为人忽视的非西方诸文学之宝藏”。

杰克20世纪70年代起在台湾、香港、大陆学术界的努力，与尝试建立中国学派有密切关系。

中国学派要成立，要发出声音，就必须提出中国自己的理论，而理论离不开术语。在90年代初，杰克和台湾、香港几位志同道合者组织起来，在中国古代文学理论的用语中，挑选了一批重要的，大家分头解说、英译，最终目的是把中国古代文论术语的诠释汇成一册。参与小组的学者本来就不多，渐行渐少。1993年春天台湾、香港学者到北京大学，与内地同行讨论阶段性成果的，连杰克在内，好像只得五人左右。我是其中之一。中国文论术语确是要加以诠释、翻译的，这是文学论述的基本要求。当时我负责的术语是“风骨”，大概是杰克分配给我的，我勉为其难接受任务。杰克的研究方向，我认同；他以利玛窦以来耶稣会士在中国传教的热情，用于比较文学的

教研、推广，我佩服。无奈我当时的教研、学术行政、社会文教活动等工作非常繁重。光就香港文学而言，我除“著书立说”之外，还要筹办研讨会等活动，还要张罗经费，让内地学者到中大从事香港文学研究（工作的性质和杰克募捐经费、为内地学者作各种安排殊无二致），使我也成为一个工作狂，至少是半个。杰克和我这样的工作狂、半工作狂，识狂者重狂，我深深感觉到要对其术语释译项目加以支持，哪怕只是象征式的。从《见证》和杰克的著述可知，中国文论术语的释译，是他的萦心之念。对“风骨”的释译，以及其他几个术语，虽然后来在《淡江评论》（*Tamkang Review*）上刊登了，但术语这个项目后继乏力，或者说乏术，始终不能成书成册。乐黛云教授在北京大学登高一呼，襄助者众，一巨册的《世界诗学大辞典》就在1993年惶惶然面世，书名是钱钟书先生题写的。

说到中国学派，自从70年代李达三、陈慧桦、古添洪等人在台湾提出后，讨论颇多。内地学者曹顺庆更于90年代接其棒、扬其纛，且在学说上增益内容。要言之，中国学派旨在表彰中华特色，与西方中心分庭抗礼。近年中国国力强大，孔子学院在全球春笋般冒出两三百所，孟子的隽语，则为美国总统奥巴马所引述，比较文学的中国学派似乎也可适时而兴了。是的，可以正式建立中国学派——如果钱钟书健在，以其通晓七种语言的能力，以其渊博学识，以其宏富著述，加上肯“抛头露面”、“粉墨登场”，在国际学术会议上慷慨陈词，而且有语言能力、学问、著述都甚为优异的同辈或晚辈同行助威助阵，则中国学派可望在比较文学的国际舞台上成立。不过，中国学派这项“桂冠”，最好还是国际友人在赞叹声中，主动为中国比较文学学术界加上，而不是由中国人自编（编织）自导自演。在《见证》的往来信件中，刘介民坦率地引述反对中国学派提法的意见（见1987年3月25日刘函），他自己也表示不同意（见1987年9月10日刘函）。刘视李为师为友，他勇于做一个诤友。

旗帜鲜明地在国际宣称中国学派，弊在时机未成熟，且有亏谦逊的美德。我们不应把中国学派的提法当作一篇对外政策声明，而可视它为一份对内工作指引。这份“内部参考消息”提醒中华学者努力的方向。从李达三到曹顺庆，他们也许都有把中国学派的提法当作“内参”的用意。若然，他们可把用意说得清楚一点。李达三是“鬼佬”（香港人习惯谐谑地称西方男性为“鬼佬”，即《见证》中某封李函中所说的 *gwailo*），鬼佬而倡议“唐人”（即中国人，欧美各国都有“唐人街”）成立中国学派，或可视为一种爱之深、期之切的表现。

李达三提出中国学派之后，对其引起的争论，对其发展，一直关心着。1993年他从香港中文大学退休后，至1998年，颇有复出之意，致函刘介民

时，还问他中国学派的近况如何（9月24日李函）。大概就在那一两年，西安举办过“中国古代文论的现代转换”研讨会，这个议题与中国学派颇有些间接的关系。数十年来众多中华学者一面倒，只用西方文学理论来研究中国古今文学。究竟中国古代文学理论能否“原装”或“转换”（转化）后用于文学研究呢？如果能够，即表示具有中国特色——或如李达三所说的具有中国民族性——的理论可发挥作用。

我个人赞同钱钟书“东海西海，心理攸同”之说，认为中西文论有其相通处，我们大可以《文心雕龙》等中国古代文论为基础，增益以西方文论，中西合璧地建立一个当代的文论体系，据此从事古今中外文学作品的实际分析、评价。近年我根据这个构想发表了一系列文章，并表示要让《文心雕龙》成为文论飞龙。今年6月杪我在北京大学的东方文学研究中心做了个报告，题目即为：《东方文论的龙头：〈文心雕龙〉与文学研究》。我在大学时期已感觉到《文心雕龙》的杰出，常常在评论中引用它的观点。之后写论文，引用西方理论之际，并没有忘记也援用《文心雕龙》的说法。夏志清先生1977年为我的第一本书《中国诗学纵横论》写序，有这样的一句：“维樑弟对《文心雕龙》推崇备至，真希望他写一本研讨《文心》的专著。”在潜意识里，我早已是比较文学中国学派的一个成员。我的心里早已有一条潜龙，近年要使它成为飞龙。

杰克从中大退休后回美国，以至他后来到台湾的东吴大学任教，我与他一直没有联系。在中大时，我们有过合作，但相交如水。他大概知道比较文学不是我文学事业的主要业务，因而把我视作比较文学的边缘人物。读《见证》中他每年圣诞节致刘介民和其他亲友的书信，我才知道他退休后在美国较为闲适的生活情况。他在匹兹堡与太太踏着沙沙的落叶，联想到英国诗人的佳句隽篇。他忆念亡母生前对他的爱，他聆听中西音乐，他跑遍城中大小图书馆，他偶尔作些公开演讲。他写起亲切有情味的散文来——就是这些圣诞节致亲友书，亲切有情味，而且不乏人生智慧。杰克在书信中引述一首小诗：

Yesterday is history.

Tomorrow is mystery.

Today is a gift.

That's why it is called the "Present".

我读后画线加批语，认为值得推荐。也许可以这样意译为中文：

昨天已成老皇历，
明天的事很神秘，
上苍赐我的大礼，
今天要珍惜。

老生常谈的道理，因为机智的修辞而显得有智慧。

我们不但要珍惜今天，更要惜福惜缘。早在1997年介民兄已致函杰克，表示要把他珍惜的二人的书信编译结集成书。杰克曾泼冷水，介民热心不熄。到了2008年，介民兄把杰克的英文书信都翻译完毕，书也编出来了，接下来是寻觅出版社。《见证》中二人屡述五大卷的《中外比较文学研究》出版的艰辛，我希望《见证》的出路少曲折。介民兄早已独当一面成为专家学者，著作等身。他费了大力气编译信件，接洽出版社，除了《见证》确实具备书名所显示的价值外，我认为还显示了他一份浓郁的情意。介民从杰克那里得到帮助和教益，感谢师恩。介民曾在致杰克的信中说：“我将永远是先生的一名追随者。”（1990年2月10日刘函）如此深情长情，杰克一定感动。有一次杰克做梦就梦到了介民（1998年9月24日李函）。我睽违杰克已十多年，离开香港中文大学也近九年了。据说近年比较文学在中大不受重视，已式微了。读《见证》，我们知道三十年中比较文学在海峡两岸发展的相关人事实况，包括学者交往、研究工作、大学研究所的课程设计、国际研讨会的议题变化等，我还仿佛见到上一个世纪中大“比较文学家之径”上，杰克与介民在浓密的相思树荫下，边走边谈，话题是美国学派呢还是中国学派。什么学派已不重要，将流传下来的是美国和中国两位学人连绵三十年亦师亦友的佳话。

2009年7月杪

Chinese and American Scholars on the “Path of Comparative Litterateur”

Huang Weiliang

In the last century, my beloved partner Cao Shunqing and I co-edited a book *The Chinese Theory of Comparative Literature Billiton—Taiwan scholars Papers* (Peking University Press, 1998). In the preface, I wrote:

The Chinese University of Hong Kong is an important base for comparative literature study of Hong Kong, as are the base of Taiwan and Mainland. Its significance is so great, as Heidelberg to Germany and Tokyo to Japan, and both of them are noted as the “home of philosophy”. In my personal view, the Village Path, Central Avenue, and Shilin Path in Chinese University of Hong Kong can be named “Path of Comparative Litterateur”, because we can trace a lot of footprints of scholars of comparative literature in these sites. In particular, John J. Deeney, Yuan Heh Hsiang, Zhou Yingxiong, Zhu Limin, Chung Ling, Yue Daiyun, Liu Jiemin, Cao Shunqing, Zhang Longxi, Harry Levin, and A. Owen Aldridge have left their insightful ideas and thinking on the comparative literature studies here.

Of those scholars that I have just mentioned, two of them, Liu Jiemin and John J. Deeney, built the most precious friendship. Their academic cooperation and communication in the field of comparative literature has lasted more than a quarter of century. Through compiling and editing all the correspondences between them, Liu Jiemin completed the book *1979—2009: Retrospect of the Development of Comparative Literature Studies of China (the “1979—2009”)*.

Liu Jiemin was born in 1945. He graduated from Shenyang University and later furthered his study in Chinese Academy of Social Sciences as a graduate student. After a long-term work in Liaoning Academy of Social Sciences, he transferred to Chinese Department, Guangzhou University in 1995 and was appointed as the director of Institute of Comparative Culture there. During this period, he compiled and edited some books of great influences in the academic circle such as *Methodology of Comparative Literature*, and *China's Comparative Poetics*. Liu's friendship with John J. Deeney began in 1985 when he engaged in a continuously three-year research in Hong Kong. In Chinese University of Hong

Kong, Liu had some cooperation with his partner, more precisely, his tutor John J. Deeney who now is noted as an excellent scholar in the field of comparative literature study with a famous Chinese name Li Dasan. John J. Deeney was born in 1931 in U. S. A. Having obtained PhD from Fordham University, he learned Chinese in Taiwan and since 1965 worked as a teacher in Taiwan Normal University and other schools. In 1977, he moved to Hong Kong and taught the course Comparative Literature in English Department, Chinese University of Hong Kong. At the same time, he established Hong Kong Committee of Comparative Literature with his colleague Yuan Heh Hsiang. As the vice-president of the committee, John J. Deeney was devoted to the promotion of Comparative Literature with immense enthusiasm. Comparative Literature was a relatively new discipline before the 1950s as it was until 20th century introduced from the west into east Asia. Due to the great endeavor of the scholars both in Hong Kong and Taiwan, Comparative Literature studies progressed remarkably in decades between the 1950s and 1970s in this area, which then brought the boom of mainland China in this field during the 1980s. So it is no exaggeration to say that John J. Deeney has contributed greatly to promoting comparative literature studies in the Mainland.

During the early 1980s, the scarcity of academic materials and reference books were big problems to the scholars in mainland when undertaking research in Comparative Literature. A research group of English department, Chinese University of Hong Kong thus cooperated with Comparative Literature and Translation Studies Center to raise funds, assisting the Mainland scholars to visit Chinese University of Hong Kong and helping them carry on relevant studies. Most of the visiting scholars from mainland were young. After they returned to mainland, they shared the academic experience and communicated with their peers and played key roles in the subsequent boom of Comparative Literature in mainland. Their individual efforts plus generous assistance of Chinese University of Hong Kong made most of them become experts in this engaging field nowadays.

Those young scholars of mainland, who have suffered the "bareness" of the Cultural Revolution of 1970s, came to Hong Kong, a blessed land, and hoped to obtain the opportunities to further their study. Most of them ever got the selfless assistance of John J. Deeney. Just as his Chinese name implied ("Dasan" signifying generosity), John J. Deeney, with his magic force of personality, did his best to accelerate the development of Comparative Literature studies in

mainland. To raise the research funds for the visiting scholars from mainland, Dr. Li had to put up with the “unusual decade of hardship”. In Liu Jiemin’s new book *1979—2009*, many letters mentioned the difficulties and embarrassments John J. Deeney encountered when raising the funds. During that period, I was a counselor of New Asia College, Chinese University of Hong Kong. My job was accompanying the dean of the College to raise funds then. Therefore, I can quite understand the “painstaking” what John J. Deeney has mentioned in his letters to Liu Jiemin. And what I felt in the process of fund-raising was like the words of my university song— “Though dangerous, I forge ahead. Exhausted as I am, I never give up.”

Raising funds was for the better development of Comparative Literature in the Mainland, Taiwan and Hong Kong. Based on the achievements some scholars have made in this field, John J. Deeney and Liu Jiemin did some creative job and co-edited two important books *Research on Foreign and Chinese Comparative Literature and Chinese and Western Comparative Literature Theory*. All these books, apply an idiom, “Benefiting scholars, it’s perpetual and immortal”. According to the book *1979—2009*, John J. Deeney painstakingly revised the book *Chinese and Western Comparative Literature Theory* through closely textual research, supplementing, and deleting in the editing process. And the amount of the revision was up to around 30,000 words. And Liu Jiemin also made great contribution to the accomplishment of the books by collecting data and modifying the manuscripts.

John J. Deeney is noted for his diligence in his university. I ever worked in the same building with him, and sometimes I went to his office, noticing piles and piles of books, papers and periodicals there. His office was full of colorful notes which are used for reminding him of all schedules. All in his office impressed me and told me that he must be a workaholic.

John J. Deeney is a typical American, rather easy-going in personality. The colleagues liked to call him Jack, namely John, in daily life. He can speak fluent Mandarin and have rich experience in teaching the course Comparative Literature. Although he admits the fact that the discipline Comparative Literature is originated from the west, and it is characterized by western approach and theories, he hopes Chinese scholars can let the west hear the voice from China in this field. Conventionally there are two schools in the field: French School and American School; the former is notable for its empiricist and positivist approach, while the

latter concentrates on "Parallel Research". However, John J. Deeney calls on Chinese scholars to establish "Chinese School". In an article titled *Chinese School of Comparative Literature*, published in *Chung-Wai Literary Monthly* in October 1977, John J. Deeney pointed out that Chinese scholars should "establish their own theory of Comparative Literature based on eastern culture and thus resist the western monopoly in this field". He also noted that Chinese scholars should "create their own terms in the present academic circumstances of China, digging out the 'treasures' belonging to the traditional legacy of the east".

Since the 1970s, John J. Deeney started to cooperate with scholars of the Mainland, Taiwan and Hong Kong to make an attempt on establishing "Chinese School". For such a school, the establishment of a new theory was necessary. And a theory should have its own terminologies. Therefore, from early 1990s, John J. Deeney and several scholars of Taiwan and Hong Kong dedicated to edit a book which was about the translation and interpretation of some important terminologies in terms of ancient Chinese literary theories. But it was a pity that the participants in this program later became fewer and fewer out of some reasons. Until the spring of 1993, there was a meeting for the scholars of Taiwan and Hong Kong to communicate the periodical progress with the Mainland peers in Peking University. But only five people were available, including John J. Deeney. I was one of them and then responsible for the interpretation of the Chinese literary term "vigor of style", a basic concept of ancient Chinese literary theory. I remember that I accepted the task with a little reluctance, because at that time I was too busy with my teaching, administrative work and different social activities in Chinese University of Hong Kong. But I admired his zeal in promoting comparative literature studies and agreed with the methodologies he applied in the research of this field. During that period, both he and I became workaholics, overloaded with academic studies and all kinds of social work such as raising funds and accommodating the Mainland scholars and the like. I deeply knew the significance of his job and the importance of interpreting the terminologies to promoting its own Comparative Literature of China. From the book 1979—2009 and some works by Dr. Li, we can see that it has been his cherished dream to translate and interpret the terminologies of ancient Chinese literary theories. But it was finally proved a failure as the book of the terminologies did not come out. Only one article dealing with the interpretation of several terms including "vigor of style" was later

published in *Tamkang Review*. The unexpected outcome of this project is the publication of *Dictionary of World Poetics* in 1993, which was proposed in Peking University by professor Yue Daiyun. And the great scholar Qian Zhongshu inscribed the title of the book cover.

Since the scholars John J. Deeney, Chen Huihua and Gu Tianhong first advanced “Chinese School” in Taiwan during the 1970s, there has been a great deal of discussion and debate about it. In the 1990s, the Mainland scholar Cao Shunqing further enriched this concept with more theoretical support. In short, the aim of “Chinese School” is to highlight Comparative Literature with Chinese theories, which means forming a research center parallel with the western center. In recent years, with the revival of the economy of China, Chinese culture also gains its popularity in the globe. More than two hundreds of Confucius Institutes have been established in different countries. Even Obama, President of the United States would quote Mencius’s sayings to add power to his address. So the time of promoting Comparative Literature of China to other countries has come. It is a pity that the great scholar Qian zhongshu has passed away. If he was alive, if he could address in the international forums or academic session on this issue with his proficiency in seven languages and broad vision, it would be definitely a success of introducing “Chinese School” to the world. But Liu Jiemin opposed the concept “Chinese School”, which was showed in his letters to John J. Deeney. In one letter written on March 25, 1987, Liu Jiemin quoted some dissenting opinion of other scholars. Also in another letter of October. 10, 1987, he frankly expressed his objection.

The time to advance Chinese School, I admit, has not been ripe. But we can set it as a goal and encourage Chinese scholars to meet it. Although John J. Deeney is an American, he can regard it as his cause for life. I think it is his deep love for Comparative Literature of China that brings him so much enthusiasm in this field.

After John J. Deeney proposed the concept “Chinese School”, there has been a great deal of debate about it. And he is always concerned with the development of it. In 1998, when he had retired from Chinese University of Hong Kong for five years, he wrote to Liu Jiemin, hoping to know something about the recent development about it. During that period, there were some seminars related to Comparative Literature such as Modern Transformation of Ancient China Seminar

held in Xián. The topics of them were indirectly involved in Chinese School. For the past decade, most Chinese scholars have been accustomed to studying ancient and modern Chinese literature with Western literary theory. It poses a question to all of us—If the theories of ancient Chinese literature, directly or indirectly, could be applied to the present research of literature? If it could be, it means the theory that John J. Deeney has advanced, namely the theory with Chinese nationality, should be workable.

“The sense of justice and rationality is the same with everybody,” I personally agree with the way Qian Zhongshu put. Too few people will gainsay that there are some common things shared by Western literary theory and Chinese ancient literary theory. We can take *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons*, an important ancient Chinese literary treatise, as the basis, and combine the western theories to establish a system of contemporary literary theory. And then we can rely on this system to carry out some concrete analysis and evaluation. Based on this concept, I have published a series of articles in relation to it in recent years. In late June of this year, I delivered a lecture on *The source of Eastern literature theory: The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons and literature study* in Research Centre of Eastern Literature, Peking University. When I was a college student, I have realized the distinguishing characteristic of *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons*, and often quoted its standpoints in my writing. Even in my later academic paper, I from time to time cited the viewpoints of it, combining with western theory, to support my idea. Therefore, when in 1977 I asked Mr. Xia Zhiqing to write a preface for my book *Approach to Chinese Poetics*, he wrote a sentence: Weiliang praises *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons* so highly, and I really hope he can write a treatise on it. Maybe at the bottom of my heart, I have long thought myself as a member of Chinese School of Comparative Literature.

Since he retired from Chinese University of Hong Kong and back to the United States, and later taught at Soochow University in Taiwan, I have not contacted with John J. Deeney for years. When we both worked in Chinese University of Hong Kong, we had some cooperation in academic research, but we were not intimate friends. He probably knew Comparative Literature was not my keen interest, so he always regarded me as the “marginal man” of Comparative Literature. When I read the book *1979—2009*, I learned that he led a leisure life

in U. S. A. after his retirement and every Christmas he would greet Liu Jiemin and other friends by letters. According to the book, I also know that he and his wife have spent much happy hours in Pittsburgh, walking on the falling leave, reading the eternal lines of English poets; he missed the love his dead mother hold to him; he listened to eastern and western music; he went around all libraries of the city; he occasionally made some public speeches; he wrote some lovely essays and then mailed to his friends and relatives in Christmas days. The following is a short poet he ever quoted in his letter:

Yesterday is history.

Tomorrow is mystery.

Today is a gift.

That's why it is called the "Present".

I think this poem is good and deserves recommendation to readers. And I have tried my best to translate it. The following is my Chinese version:

昨天已成老皇历，
明天的事很神秘，
上苍赐我的大礼，
今天要珍惜。

Some rules of thumb become outstandingly unique because of their witted rhetoric, which reminds us to cherish "today" and friendship.

Early in 1997, Liu Jiemin told John J. Deeney in one of his letters that he would compile all the correspondence of them into a book. But Dr. Li showed his lack of confidence in marked contrast to the enthusiasm of Liu Jiemin. By 2008, Liu Jiemin has translated all the letters into Chinese and completed the edition of them and now is seeking a publishing house. The book 1979—2009 detailed the hardship of publishing the five volumes of the book *Chinese and Western Comparative Literature Studies*. I hope the publication of 1979—2009 will be smoothly. Liu Jiemin has been an expert of Comparative Literature studies in Mainland for a long time. He ever wrote to John J. Deeney in his letter dated on Feb. 10, 1990, "I will always be your follower." And John J. Deeney told Liu Jiemin in his letter on Sept. 24, 1998 that he missed him and has met him in dream. From these letters, we see their valuable friendship. I have not seen John J. Deeney more than ten years, and left Chinese University of Hong Kong almost nine years. It is said that Comparative Literature studies at the University has been

ignored. Reading the book *1979—2009*, we know that the development of Comparative Literature in Mainland, Taiwan and Hong Kong, including exchanges among scholars, contest, research situation, related curriculum design of University, and the changes in the international seminars on the topic and so on. Now it seems that I see both John J. Deeney and Liu Jiemin; they are walking under the shadow of “Path of Comparative Litterateur” tree, talking about American School and Chinese School. The book *1979—2009* is not only the demonstration of the development of Comparative Literature of China in the past three decades, but also the record of both scholars’ friendship.