

中国文学在国外丛书



中国文学在英国

张弘 著

北京大学
南京大学

中国文学在国外丛书

中国文学在英国

张弘著

花城出版社出版

粤新登字 05 号

中国文学在英国

张 弘著

•

花城出版社出版发行

(广州市环市东路水荫路 11 号)

广东省新华书店经销

广州红旗印刷厂印刷

787×1092 毫米 32 开本 14.25 印张 3 插页 280,000 字

1992 年 12 月第 1 版 1992 年 12 月第 1 次印刷

印数 1 — 300 册

ISBN 7-5360-1279-9/I·1136

精装本定价: 10.00 元

内 容 提 要

本书叙述了近代随着中西交通的恢复发展及汉学的兴起，中国文学传入英国并得到翻译、评介与接受的情况。书中既勾勒了这一漫长、曲折、时有起伏的历史过程，说明了传播的各种媒介，介绍了贡献突出的著名学者，探讨了英国在译介中国文学方面不同于其他欧美国家的特点，而且分别评述了从古典诗歌、小说、剧本直至现当代文学在英国得到译介的各类成果，尤其注意分析文学接受过程中必然表现出来的阐释反差，进而探究在此背后的趣味与传统的不同。读者在对接受过程中各种意蕴丰富的现象产生兴趣的同时，不仅可以获得有关中国文学在英国传播情况的清晰全貌，并且也会对中西文化之同异留下更新鲜具体的印象。全书最后附录的“中国文学传入英国大事年表”，使得整个历史线索格外突出鲜明；而详尽的有中文对照的“英文参考书目”，则是从事进一步研究者必不可少的。

文化交流的双向反应

——《中国文学在国外》丛书总序

乐黛云

交流总是双向的。过去，我们对外国文化在中国的影响作过不少研究，但对于中国在外国的形象、中国对外国的影响，以及世界文化总体对话中的中国都研究得很不够。

其实，数百年来，中国文化已深深渗入西方文化之中，成为推动西方文化发展的重要契机之一。自1585年西班牙人撰写《大中华帝国史》以来，中国就以一个极其强大、发达、一体化大帝国的伟大形象出现于世界。这部书七年内就以七种语言出版过四十六次，可见西方对中国兴趣之一斑。十八世纪，中国艺术促进了欧洲艺术风格的转变，形成了欧洲建筑史上的“园林时代”。国家的陶瓷、装饰、丝绸及其他发明直接或间接推动了欧洲风习和制造业的革新。中国文学激发了伟大诗人歌德关于“世界文学”的宏伟构想，他呼唤德国人努力理解中国文化，因为中国文化是世界文化十分重要、十分宝贵的组成部分。二十世纪以来，中国成为西方文学中相当活跃的题材。诸如马洛的《人的命运》（法），和巴拉德的《太阳帝国》（英）描写了北伐革命和抗日战争；

庞德的《诗章》以中国为重要组成部分展开了人类历史的图景；卡夫卡的《万里长城》（捷），布莱希特的《四川好人》（德）、卡内蒂的《迷惘》（保加利亚）、博尔赫斯的《歧路园》（阿根廷）等都将中国纳入其象征体系而在其民族文学中享有盛誉。庞德甚至认为：“中国诗是一个宝库，今后一个世纪将从中寻找推动力，正如文艺复兴从希腊人那里找到推动力”。当然，在西方文学中也不乏负面的中国形象，如沃珀尔的《象形文学故事集》、笛福的《鲁滨逊思想家》。

关于中国的研究早就构成了世界学术思想发展史的一个组成部分，伟大思想家孟德斯鸠、莱布尼兹、伏尔泰、布朗杰、黑格尔、马克思、斯宾格勒、韦伯都曾对中国的成就和弱点，特别是它的长期停滞作过深邃的探究。他们的思考至今仍富于启迪。俄国瓦西里耶夫院士的《中国文学史纲要》（1880），阿里克谢夫院士的《一部论诗人的长诗——司空图的人诗品》（1906）都称得上是开创性的鸿篇巨制。其他日本、朝鲜各国对中国的研究著作就更是数不胜数了。第二次世界大战后，欧、美、苏、日涌现了一大批中国学研究者。他们对中国和中国文学的洞见常常开辟了新的研究层面。

的确，国外的中国形象有美有丑，中国对外国的影响时强时弱，在世界文化对话中，中国的声音或抑或扬……研究这一切，探索其规律，是一个很有吸引力、很富于挑战性的极待开垦的领域。首先，这对于客观、清醒地认识“自我”有无法替代的意义。英格兰诗人彭斯早就祈望有一天“能以别人的眼光来审查自我”，当代理论家哈伯珀斯强调“互为主观”是突破封闭体系、更新重构的前提，因为在自己的体系中观察自己，很难发现问题。其次，这种研究又是很好了

解对方的途径。两种文化的汇合是一个非常复杂的过程，这里首先发生的是一种“文化过滤”现象。任何文化接纳外来文化，都会摒除自己难于接受的部分而只作有选择的认同。这种选择往往出自本土文化的需要。人们由于无法解决现实生活中的问题和不满，就会构造一个“非我”来与“自我”相对立，把一切理想的、圆满的，在“我方”无法实现的品质都投射于对方，构成一种“他性”而使矛盾得到缓解。这里起主导作用的不一定是对方的现实，而是我方的需求。欧洲“三十年战争”前夜的混乱时期和第一次世界大战后的绝望年代都形成了对中国美化和理想化的高潮就是一个明证。当然，有时“他性”也被投影为最黑暗、最可憎的负面形象而大遭挞伐。目的是增强“自我”的信心。因此，不断变化的西方的中国形象总是理性分析与虚构想象参半，赞美与指责也都不全合乎实际。然而，正是这种“不合实际”为我们提供了理解对方的钥匙。最后，还应看到两种文化的“认同”决不是靠一方的完全失去原有特色国实现，决不是一方对另一方的“同化”和淹没，如果两方完全相同，就会失去“交流”意义，无法产生新的因素。“认同”，应是歧义在同一层面的“共存”，这种“共存”形成张力和对抗，正是这种张力和对抗推动事物前进。同时，这种“共存”中的外来文化又与过去不同，这里必然存在着大量“误解”、改造（或曰歪曲）和变形。一种文化受益于另一种文化，正是通过这种“误解”、改造和变形，亦即本民族文化的折射来完成的，自觉研究这种“误解中的共存”对于理解文化汇合的规律及世界文化发展趋势显然都有重要意义。特别在目前所谓文化转型或文化重组时期更其如此。

我们奉献于读者之前的这套《中国文学在国外》丛书只是以上种种构想的一个方面，也只是一种初步尝试。丛书拟出十本，除今年作为国庆四十周年献礼的中国文学在法、俄、日、朝四本外，尚有明年出版的中国文学在美、英、德、越、东南亚、东欧六本。虽只是初步尝试，这部丛书已得到多方面的关注。特别是年已八旬的世界比较文学大师法国艾田蒲教授千里迢迢专门为丛书写了总序。花城出版社更不顾亏损，慨然允诺承担全部出版任务。这一切都使我们深受鼓舞和感动。丛书由北京大学、南京大学共同编写，也期望能收南北呼应、通力合作之功。正是南京大学副校长董健，北大季羨林、杨周翰教授的大力支持，这一合作才得以圆满实现。一并在此深志谢意。

序

〔法〕艾田蒲

我在巴黎大学讲授法国十九世纪某一大文学运动（如果我没有记错的话，那是浪漫主义，也可能是象征主义）时，经过仔细地反复阅读文学作品和有关的学术著作，我对人们给我提出的课题，进行了认真的研究。当然，这里并未涉及到什么专门术语，而是讲述了一些基础性的文学通史及其与上层建筑的辩证关系。我也扼要介绍了文学巨厦中的各种倾向和流派，甚或小的文学团体。学生们专心地作了笔记。

报告以后，我声明：“我所参考与引证的文章都借之于你们称之为纪元前的中国文学。”这番话令四座皆惊。我觉得以这样的方式无可辩驳地指明了那些带着高傲的口吻谈论“黄种人”的人是多么愚蠢而卑鄙；此外还肯定了我的一项研究成果，这项成果使我耗去了六十个年头，我尽可能多地研究了各国文学，以便从中证实我所称之为“不变的原则”：我们人类基本一致的无可辩驳的佐证。

我在《七星文库》所翻译出版的两卷盒装的三部伟大的

中国小说和其它作品都证明了这一点，这三部小说是《水浒》、《红楼梦》和《金瓶梅》。我主持编译的《东方知识丛书》汇集了阿拉伯、孟加拉、古埃及、菲律宾、越南、日本、中国等国家的作品，在现有六十五种出版物中，中国作品就占十七种。我即将要翻译出版的是苏曼殊的作品，1988年底要翻译出版陶渊明诗全集，还有一厚卷有关中国文明的书籍。即使这些作品还在印刷尚未出版之前我已离开人世，但出版协约已经签定。就目前我的计划的进展情况而言，一切合同至1990年底会全部实现。

况且，我的这套丛书以后也要出惹人喜欢、价格便宜的袖珍本，一切爱好中国文学的人，只要花几条烟卷——毒品——的钱就能买到这些书。以美攻毒，可见中国文学是多么了不起的戒毒之佳品！

一九八八年十一月二十七日

巴黎

Chinese Literature in England

(résumé).

This essay deals ~~with~~ the translation and introduction of Chinese literature in England, ~~which~~, in another point of view i.e. the point of view of the British, should be termed as the reception of Chinese literature in England. Here we at once have to meet a trouble, because the British could accept Chinese literature through many various mediums and ways. For instance, a British citizen may reasonably have chance to read a pertinent book (translations or reviews) published in the United States or other English countries, which interests him in Chinese literature well. Should we take all concerned English publications, even of India or Singapore, into account? Obviously it will go beyond the content of this essay. So, for certain purpose, I would like to limit myself to description and remarking of only the published issues in England, and sometimes simultaneously in other English countries. I don't

think that it is the best dealing; but, I believe, it might be the most convenient one.

To the author, another difficulty is of sources. The insufficiency of domestic materials is not unimaginable. Though some chief libraries such as Feking Library and Shanghai Library have been boasting their rich reserves, the bibliographic shortage, especially of the current press, is inevitable. If I were able to have a research in British libraries and museums, this essay will cover more completely. But now, what I can do is to plough through amongst the home stacks. To my happiness, the famous Sinologists David Hawkes and Cyril Birch, and Dr. Tony Hyder of the Oriental Institute Library, Oxford, have given me a good deal of aid in the bibliography sphere. Some Chinese colleagues also have made their contribution. All of them I am great indebted to.

With regard to method, my description is on principles of both chronicle and morphology. First of all outlined is the historical course that Chinese literature and relative things spread in England, even ascending to the beginning of both correlation, i. e. the year 1238 when Henry III heard from the Ismailians (Assassins) about the Chinese (Tartars). Meanwhile I analyze the morphologic changes of Chinese literature in dissemination and reception, which means, in my opinion, a tra-

nsplanting of visions from one hermeneutical horizon to another. Here there is not only the linguistic or textual rewriting but also, more significantly, the imaginary and judgmental modification. Such revision or variation comes from the inherited cultural tradition of foreign readers, who interpret the literary works in distinct tastes or conventions.

This essay is divided into nine chapters, plus a theoretic paper on the morphologic approach, and some appendixes.

The first Chapter describes how the British turned away from indirect hearsays to firsthand data to learn China and its literature. Before the nineteenth century, the main sources about China were the various reports of the missionary Jesuits and Dominicans, whose members included Matteo Ricci, Gonzalez de Mendoza, Alvarez de Semedo, Louis Lecomte, etc. Although F. Bacon, Shakespeare, Ben Jonson and Milton mentioned of China, the visions in their works look like fantasy. The seventeenth-century discussions on questions as to the making method of porcelain, the advantage of the imperial examination system, and the quality of the language of China, i. e. whether it belongs to the primitive language before the confusion of tongues at Babel, contained unreal factors as well. Just as S. Johnson concluded, "there are few nations in the world,

more talked of, or less known, than the "Chinese." * But one can find a sophisticated distinction between the seventeenth-century and the eighteenth-century writers applying Chinese topics. Usually the latter e.g. Defoe, Goldsmith, S. Buckley, D. Hume took sceptical or critical attitude to the Empire of China, while the former e.g. Sir Walter Raleigh, A. Cowley, Sir William Temple were in high adoration. More notably, in the eighteenth century Chinese poems and stories were first translated by Sir William Jones and T. Percy, though most of the texts did not come from the original but from the Latin or the French. At the same time in London was performed a tragedy *The Orphan of China* adapted from Voltaire.

With the development of commerce and diplomacy correlation of both countries, the dissemination of Chinese literature in England entered a new stage in the nineteenth century. Important mediums, many British missionaries and diplomats reaching China directly learnt Chinese literature and made various introductions. Sir George Staunton, Robert Morrison and Aurel Stein early or late brought Chinese books to London, Sir John Davis made his *Observations on the Language and*

* *The Works of Samuel Johnson*, ed. by Sir John Hawkins, 15 vols. London, 1787-1789, Vol. XIV, P. 554.

Literature of China (1822), J. Legge, with the assistance of a Chinese scholar, translated *The Chinese Classics* (1861-1886), A. Wylie wrote *Notes on Chinese Literature* (1867), etc. Meanwhile English periodicals of Hongkong, Canton, Shanghai provided room for the research results of the missionaries and diplomats, and the chairs of Chinese appeared in Oxford, Cambridge and London. Sinology finally separated from Oriental studies and became an independent subject. As summary of this rather wide tide, H. Giles' *A History of Chinese Literature* (1901) represented the academic level of the first British Sinologists, which also marked a more systematic understanding than of the native traditional scholars who were used to fragmentary, empirical and impromptu criticism.

However, the personality of the British nation is emphasizing practical interests and affairs such as of commerce. After the short bloom, Chinese literature studies in England slid into its valleybottom. As evidence we need but mention of the fact that there were only three students during H. Giles' holding the chair of Chinese in Cambridge 1897-1928. In this bleak circumstance Arthur Waley came to the fore. As early as the 1910s he already devoted himself to Chinese poetry studies, and his achievement at last was awarded of the Queen's Medal for Poetry in 1953, for he was

so successful in applying the "sprung rhythm" to interpreting Chinese poetry. Chiefly with Waley's abiding efforts, more and more Western poetry lovers have found the fascination of Chinese poems. Waley also introduced Chinese novels and other works. In general, the depressing state of Chinese literature studies remained till the postwar period, when the British mind, in order to reconstruct moral ideals after the two world wars, realized the necessity to understand deeper other peoples and their spiritual achievements.

The above-mentioned tracks since the nineteenth century consists of the content of the second chapter. Then from the third chapter on, attention is paid to every genre of Chinese literature introduced to England. As Prof. James Liu has pointed out, before 1960s Western interest in Chinese literature had been mainly confined to classical works, so considerable space is distributed to them. The third chapter refers to classical poems, especially *Shih-ching* (*The Book of Songs*), *Ch'u-tz'u* (song of the South China), *fu* (rhapsody, or rhymeprose), *T'ang-shih* (poetry of the Tang Dynasty), *tz'u* (lyrics, or lyric metres) etc. Besides Waley's series of translations, other earlier or later selections translated or edited by H. Giles, R. Fayne and J. Frodsham are equally held in account. Among the somewhat fresh books, D. Knechtges' *The Han Rhapsody* (1976),

W. Jr Graham's *The Lament for the South* (1980) and A. Birrell's *New Songs from a Jade Terrace* (1982) are notable. With his rather rhetoric than historical views, Knechtges rediscovered the charm of *fu*. Jr Graham, insisting on more traditional method, gave *dilinguistic* texts with scholarly commentaries. A. Birrell caught correctly the erotic savor of the Southern-Dynasties (420-589 A.D.) poetry and made a new evaluation, expressing a female perspicacity. An anthropological approach that Waley used to analyze Shamanism of *Ch'u-tz'u* and then D. Hawkes used to study the genre evolving from *Ch'u-tz'u* to *fu* is also remarked.

The fourth chapter depicts the Chinese poets appearing in the British scope, who formed an exotic gallery. Accompanying with Waley's works after the second world war, the *Series of Cambridge Studies in Chinese History, Literature and Institutions* devoted its share to many ancient Chinese poets, while Oxford published translations of verses for some of them. In the British scope, of course, the Chinese poets cannot but be more or less dyed in mystic colors. For instance, the solitude poet T'ao Yüan-ming (365-427 A.D.) seems like a modern contemplator:

In T'ao, the individuality is much greater than the eccentricity... I see him as a man who, with a vital sense of moral values but despairing utterly