

# 重讀經典

【上卷】

中國傳統小說與戲曲的多重透視

周建渝

張洪年

張雙慶

編

OXFORD

港台書

2207.41  
201130  
1

# 重 讀 經 典

中國傳統小說與戲曲的多重透視

上卷

周建渝 張洪年 張雙慶 編



OXFORD  
UNIVERSITY PRESS

# OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.  
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,  
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Auckland Cape Town Dar es Salaam Hong Kong Karachi  
Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Nairobi  
New Delhi Shanghai Taipei Toronto

With offices in

Argentina Austria Brazil Chile Czech Republic France Greece  
Guatemala Hungary Italy Japan South Korea Poland Portugal  
Singapore Switzerland Thailand Turkey Ukraine Vietnam

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press

© Oxford University Press 2009

First published 2009

This impression (lowest digit)

1 3 5 7 9 10 8 6 4 2

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,  
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,  
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,  
or as expressly permitted by Law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate  
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction  
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,  
Oxford University Press, at the address below

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover  
and you must impose the same condition on any acquirer

重讀經典

中國傳統小說與戲曲的多重透視·上卷

香港中文大學中國語言及文學系主編

周建渝 張洪年 張雙慶編

ISBN 978-0-19-800759-3 (上卷)

ISBN 978-0-19-800760-9 (下卷)

版權所有，本書任何部份若未經版權持  
有人允許，不得用任何方式抄襲或翻印

Printed in Hong Kong

Published by Oxford University Press (China) Ltd  
18th Floor, Warwick House East, Taikoo Place, 979 King's Road, Quarry Bay,  
Hong Kong

# 序

劉世德

重讀經典，必不可少的是細讀、精讀。

你如果是位業餘的愛好者，盡可以隨心所欲地讀，怎麼讀、讀什麼都無所謂。

但是，你如果抱着學習、研究的態度去讀，那就必須摒棄粗讀、略讀、跳讀。

細讀、精讀還有書內、書外之分。

尤其是古代長篇小說，卷帙浩繁，人物眾多，故事情節曲折複雜，更要前後反復地讀，方能對其中的奧妙、精彩之處，有逐步的深入的瞭解。

以《紅樓夢》為例，當你讀到第二回「冷子興演說寧國府」的時候，從冷子興口中透露了賈府的種種情況，特別是人物的性格，人物的出身，人物彼此之間的血緣關係，賈府的經濟情況等等，對你來說，等於是在進入某個風景點之前手中持有一張平面的導遊圖，或者說，等於是打開某個話劇劇本，頭一眼看到的是前面有一個詳盡的出場人物表。這無疑從一開始就提高了你的閱讀興趣，給了你莫大的幫助。我相信，當你讀至若干回以後，你還會再一次翻回到這第二回，來印證你對那個貴族大家庭的初步感覺和認識。

這時，你不免會產生一個疑問：為什麼冷子興竟對賈府內部有如此深刻和熟悉的掌握呢？當然，你也許會立刻作出自己的解釋：冷子興不過是曹雪芹手下的一顆棋子，它的定位、走向和作用，都取決於曹雪芹的腦與手。曹雪芹讓它朝東走，它就不會往西跑，曹雪芹讓它說什麼，它就只能說什麼。

可是，當你往下讀，讀到第七回周瑞家的送宮花，頂頭遇見她的女兒，曹雪芹方交代出冷子興的真實身份：他原來是周瑞的女婿，難怪他對賈府的情況是那樣的熟悉。而這一點，在第二回，卻是有意地對讀者進行封鎖的。於是，你不得不嘆服，這真是一著妙棋，曹雪芹不愧為下棋的高手。

這說的是書內。

再說書外。

讀小說，特別是讀幾部熱門的大作品，不能光讀作品本身。那樣寫出文章來，人云亦云、蜻蜓點水、淺薄、局限，是免不了的。某位外國學者看了一篇論述《聊齋誌異》的論文以後，譏評說：「我敢斷定，作者的書桌上只放着一部《聊齋誌異》。」

《三國志演義》是以陳壽的《三國志》等史籍為藍本改編的。你唯讀《三國志演義》，而對《三國志》不屑一顧，那你對某些細節就弄不懂了。第十九回曹操處死了陳宮。不知道你有沒有想過，曹操為什麼如此恨陳宮？陳宮不是曹操的恩人嗎？在中牟縣公堂上不是還救過曹操一命嗎？兩軍交戰，兵敗被擒，罪不至死，陳宮又非主帥，只不過是個謀士。這樣一思索，你也許就想不通了。

其實，你讀一讀《三國志·魏書》的武帝紀、裴松之注和呂布傳，就不難瞭解到以下幾點事實：第一，陳宮沒有做過中牟縣令，釋放曹操的是位無名氏。這樣一來，陳宮救命之恩就根本不存在了。第二，陳宮原是曹操的部下，後來叛變，佔據了曹操的重要根據地，許多人紛起回應，給予曹操極大的打擊和嚴重的威脅，使得曹操一度處於極為尷尬和難堪的境地。所以陳宮最終逃不掉做曹操刀下之鬼的命運。

同時，你也知曉了羅貫中讓陳宮擔任中牟縣令的用意。陳宮伴隨曹操出逃，一路上見到了曹操的所作所為，所思所想。在羅貫中筆下，他扮演的角色不僅是曹操的同行者，更是曹操心理、行動、思想、性格的知情人、見證人。特別是對那句名言，「寧教我負天下人，休教天下人負我」，陳宮更是起到了揭露者的作

用。試想，如果不是陳宮，而換為史籍中的那位曇花一現的無名的縣令，能在讀者面前順利地、有說服力地完成此項任務嗎？

自然，這一切是你在《三國志演義》和《三國志》對讀以後才能得到的收穫。

所以，重讀經典必須細讀、精讀。

# 目 錄

序 (劉世德)	ix
---------	----

## 【甲】重讀傳統小說：綜論

1. A Return to the <i>chuanqi</i> Question Glen Dudbridge	3
2. 擬話本概念的理論缺失 傳承洲	12
3. 論笑話與小說的關係 黃慶聲	25
4. 建陽刊「全像」小說與建陽刻書背景 涂秀虹	66
5. 近代教育小說初探 李延年 耿淑傑	81
6. 民族思想文化「新經典」的創立與創立的經典 許并生	109
7. 「世代累積型集體創作」說商兌 沈伯俊	128
8. 中國古代小說版本數位化和電腦自動比對 周文業	141

## 【乙】重讀傳統小說：中、短篇小說專論

9. 論《燕丹子》對後世文學作品之影響 潘銘基	187
10. 唐傳奇《鶯鶯傳》新解 關四平	207
11. 「夢」的筆法 ——〈南柯太守傳〉與《南柯記》的文本對讀 黃偉豪	230

12. 天理與人欲：三言故事中的因果觀 251  
張洪年
13. Canonizing Pornography. A (Foolish?) Woman's in Sexual Education *Chipozi zhuan* 270  
Paola Zamperini
14. 凝視與窺視：李漁〈夏宜樓〉與明清視覺文化 299  
陳建華
15. 《聊齋誌異》中的人才問題小說 329  
周先慎
16. 淫神、弔詭心理與「抗神」 355  
——論《聊齋誌異》〈五通〉及〈五通·又〉  
劉燕萍
17. 蒲松齡《聊齋誌異·念秧》的《史記》筆法 393  
陳寧
18. 兄弟小說家：詹熙、詹塏和晚清小說的形成 408  
魏愛蓮 (Ellen Widmer)
19. 論王韜涉海外素材之小說 433  
徐璋
20. 白蛇故事的轉化 455  
——劉以鬯與李碧華筆下的經典重讀  
余婉兒

### 【丙】重讀傳統小說：長篇小說專論

21. 後現代批評與《三國志通俗演義》 487  
周建渝
22. 《三國演義》的性別觀念及男性中心意識 500  
魏崇新
23. 論《三國演義》中的自殺人物 515  
程中山
24. 文類中的文類 538  
——《三國演義》詩詞析論  
孫賽珠



25. Re-reading Myth in *Water Margin* Roland Altenburger 554
26. 女人/老虎  
——《水滸》英雄造像隅探  
康韻梅 578
27. 從李逵戰鬥小隊的陣容看《水滸傳》後半部故事的關係  
黃海星 604
28. 試解《金瓶梅》崇禎本評改者之謎  
王汝梅 633
29. 《儒林外史》評點研究與實踐的回顧與思考  
陳美林 651
30. 《紅樓夢》眉齋藏本：一部新發現的殘抄本  
劉世德 665
31. 美人黃土的哀思  
——《紅樓夢》的情感意蘊與文化傳統  
劉勇強 688
32. 《紅樓夢》中元春形象的詩意空間  
曹立波 711

### 【丁】重讀傳統戲曲

33. 戲曲研究的一些關鍵性問題  
曾永義 731
34. 戲曲中的神秘現實主義和神秘浪漫主義描寫略論  
——中國戲曲的首創性貢獻研究之一  
周錫山 750
35. 董解元《西廂記》的「現代性」思想初探  
張兵 774
36. 愛情、功名與社會規範  
——從性別研究角度重讀元雜劇《倩女離魂》  
杜家祁 788
37. 《漢宮秋》之後昭君戲的寫作與觀演  
王小岩 806

38.	重塑經典 ——試論永樂大典戲文三種之崑劇改編演出 蔡欣欣	827
39.	《四聲猿》與戲曲批評中的以氣論戲 蘇涵	850
40.	杜麗娘的經典閱讀與明清女性情感教育 謝擁軍	867
41.	重讀《牡丹亭》的幾個門徑 ——以訓詁、音律、民俗、表演學切入 蔡孟珍	890
42.	孟稱舜《貞文記》的創作時間、版本及祁彪佳序的真偽 黃仕忠	910
43.	道教文化與《長生殿》 鍾東	924
44.	何須扇底看桃花 ——《桃花扇》之解讀與孔尚任罷官原由新探 胡梓穎	939
45.	慾望與華夷的嬉戲 ——清代戲曲家吳震生的另類喜劇 華瑋	979
46.	今世只教學釵玉，人間何處不瀟湘 ——清代女作家吳蘭徵與《紅樓夢》 鄧丹	1007
47.	從《喬影》到《小船幻想詩》 ——論清代劇作家吳藻的性別意識與當代詮釋 沈惠如	1023
	編後記	1057
	作者簡介	1059

【甲】重讀傳統小說：綜論





## A Return to the *chuanqi* Question

Glen Dudbridge

For some years now, in various papers on Tang literature, I have been saying farewell to the term '*chuanqi*' 傳奇.<sup>1</sup> And why? In brief, there are two basic reasons. One: this generic term lacks any historical status or authority from the time when the literature was composed. And two: the term brings with it no real analytical value. It is time for us to reconsider the way we think about the rich and varied narrative literature bequeathed by Tang writers and their successors.

To reject like this a term which has been established in literary historical discourse for nearly a hundred years is certainly provocative, if only because it has become so central in the perception of Chinese narrative tradition. It is taught in the schools and familiar to every educated Chinese. I had not expected a quick and positive response to this new suggestion. Indeed for a while there was no response. But I was saved from disappointment by a scholar in China, Yin Dexiang 尹德翔, who two years ago published a spirited defence of the modern usage of *chuanqi*, in reply to one of my own papers.<sup>2</sup> The opportunity for dialogue on a fundamental question in Chinese literary experience is always valuable and welcome, and I raise the question again here because it might stimulate a more extensive and thorough rethinking of how, in the twenty-first century, we should read the narratives of a thousand and more years ago.

This exchange of views on Tang stories started with a focus on a particular item, 'Ding Yue achieves sword release' 丁約劍解, appearing in the ninth-century collection *Que shi* 闕史, but also in the Song collections *Taiping guang ji* 太平廣記 and *San dong qun xian lu* 三洞群仙錄. It used a historical setting in the late Tang as background for a story of

- 1 Two of the papers are reprinted in Glen Dudbridge, *Books, tales and vernacular culture: selected papers on China*, Leiden: Brill, 2005: 'A question of classification in Tang narrative: the story of Ding Yue' (pp. 192–213); 'A thousand years of printed narrative in China' (pp. 2–14). A third appears in Glen Dudbridge, *Lost books of medieval China: the Panizzi Lectures 1999*, London: The British Library, 2000, as Lecture III: 'Classification: the case of *The Four Gentlemen of Liang*'.
- 2 Yin Dexiang, '“Ding Yue jian jie” yu chuanqi wenti wenti' 《丁約劍解》與傳奇文體問題, *Qiu shi xuekan* 求是學刊 32.5, 2005, 92–97. This was a response to 'A question of classification in Tang narrative: the case of Ding Yue'.

Daoist transcendence and immortality. I argued that, while showing some interesting narrative features, this story resisted simple classification: it had not been included in any recognized canon of *chuanqi*, and to me this seemed in any case beside the point, since *chuanqi* itself lacked any precise definition. With this view Yin Dexiang firmly disagreed: he found the story of Ding Yue stylistically too weak to qualify as a *chuanqi*, and maintained that *chuanqi* had indeed been decisively characterized by Lu Xun in his writings of the 1920s.

The strange thing about our debate is this: although strong differences of opinion are expressed, I find that the argument in Dr Yin's paper confirms virtually all the perceptions I have myself expressed on the use of this term in modern times. And that is what I hope we can examine together here.

We can begin with the historical status of the term *chuanqi*. It has often been noted that it was not in use as a generic term in Tang times, and Li Jianguo has added that it also failed to appear during the Northern Song.<sup>3</sup> Starting from the Southern Song period a small group of references have been gathered and debated over the years, but their generic value and relevance to the modern use of this term have not been clearly established.<sup>4</sup> The first real point of recognition comes up much later, in the sixteenth century, with Hu Yinglin's 胡應麟 much quoted analysis of *xiaoshuo* 小說 in his *Shaoshi shan fang bi cong* 少室山房筆叢. This is familiar to us all: he develops a six-fold classification, citing named stories to illustrate each category, and among them *chuanqi* and *zhiguai* 志怪 form only two of the categories. We recognize his chosen examples, which are echoed in our modern categories, and accept his attempt at a comprehensive system as a strong and intelligent contribution.<sup>5</sup> He also sensitively acknowledges the weak definition of his categories, their tendency to blur into one another, and particularly the lack of clear separation between *chuanqi* and *zhiguai*.<sup>6</sup> The impact of all this classification on the catalogues and collections that followed in later centuries receives less attention from modern scholarship.

3 Li Jianguo 李劍國, *Tang Wudai chuanqi zhiguai xulu* 唐五代傳奇志怪敘錄, Tianjin: Nankai Daxue chubanshe, 1993/1998, pp. 6–7.

4 Li Jianguo, for instance, finds the earliest reference to hold a generic value in the thirteenth century: pp. 7–9. See also the references listed by Cheng Yizhong 程毅中 in *Song Yuan xiaoshuo yanjiu* 宋元小說研究, [Nanjing], 1998, pp. 7–8.

5 This is well covered in the article by Laura Hua Wu, 'From *xiaoshuo* to fiction: Hu Yinglin's genre study of *xiaoshuo*', *Harvard Journal of Asiatic Studies* 55, 1995, 339–371.

6 On this see Laura Hua Wu, pp. 353–355; Dudbridge, 'A thousand years of printed fiction in China', pp. 13–14.

Yet it creates certain ironies: the seventeenth-century *Wu chao xiaoshuo* 五朝小說 for instance accepted '*chuanqi*' as a category, but applied it freely to items within the Wei/Jin as well as Tang and Song sections.<sup>7</sup> That scarcely fits well with twentieth-century perceptions, which bring the category into play only with the Tang and later.

All this was the background to my own considered view that the twentieth century embraced the *chuanqi* into its vision of Tang literature only at the initiative of Lu Xun. It was his discussions in *Zhongguo xiaoshuo shi lue* 中國小說史略 and elsewhere that laid the foundations for modern views, and his anthology *Tang Song chuanqi ji* 唐宋傳奇集 that created a canon for modern readers. A conscious agenda was at work: Lu Xun and the like-minded intellectuals of his period were modernizers and reformers:

They had embraced fiction (a term which in Chinese now matched itself with the ancient bibliographical term *xiaoshuo*), as the chief medium of their new culture. It came now with resonances from the progressive Western world whose achievements they hoped to emulate ... There was now a sense of onward progress: these men were interested in the future, they saw fiction as an agent in social and cultural change, and they needed a scale of values by which fiction itself could be seen as an evolving, progressive medium.<sup>8</sup>

These views seem to be fully shared by Yin Dexiang. He draws a close parallel between Lu Xun's characterization of *chuanqi* and the Western 'short story' tradition which the same author had laboured to introduce to China in his early years. Yin also quotes from the younger contemporary Zheng Zhenduo 鄭振鐸, who acknowledged the guidance and support of Lu Xun in compiling his own anthology of Chinese short stories. This included some of the famous Tang pieces, which represented for him the first stage in the conscious use of the form by Chinese writers.<sup>9</sup>

So both Yin Dexiang and I share in common the view that the *chuanqi* concept was a tool of modernizing, Western-influenced writers and critics of the early twentieth century. But is that really how Chinese readers and critics of today want to shape their understanding of Tang literature? Some forty years ago C. T. Hsia 夏志清 wrote these words in a well-known book,

7 See Li Ruiqing 李銳清, 'Wu chao xiao shuo kanben wenti chu tan' 五朝小說刊本問題初探, *Guoli zhongyang tushuguan guankan* 國立中央圖書館館刊 28.2, 1992, 115–131, esp. 115.

8 Dudbridge, 'A question of classification in Tang narrative', p. 196; and compare 'A thousand years of printed narrative in China', p. 11.

9 Yin Dexiang, p. 93.

*The classic Chinese novel: a critical introduction:*

It seems to me self-evident that we cannot accord the Chinese novel full critical justice unless, with all our due awareness of its special characteristics that can only be fully understood in historical terms, we are prepared to examine it against the Western novel.<sup>10</sup>

Is that view still held now? Here at this conference I shall be interested to learn whether the present generation of scholars in today's China still regards Western fiction as the yardstick by which not just their vernacular classics, but even their ancient narratives in the literary language are to be judged. Later in this paper I shall offer my own view that we need to move on from the May Fourth period and its values, and respond more sensitively to medieval narrative literature as a whole. We do not need to look for Western-style short stories in the pages of *Taiping guang ji*.

Yin Dexiang responds at some length to my question, 'What indeed is a *chuanqi*?'<sup>11</sup> And from his response it is clear that there are two different aspects to this problem, both of which emerge from Lu Xun's pronouncements on the subject. It is one thing to point out the characteristics of this literature, to state the formal criteria which have now become familiar in so much later writing about the subject. (Lu Xun's phrases still echo today: 敘述宛轉，篇幅曼長，記敘委曲，文辭華艷，施之藻繪，有意為小說。) It is another to create a canon of acknowledged works in the genre, into which certain items are admitted, and from which others are excluded. Do those formal criteria actually establish a standard by which such inclusion and exclusion can be achieved? For Yin Dexiang the answer is actually both 'yes' and 'no'. And the solution to this paradox lies again in the May Fourth terminology. It all depends whether we are talking about *chuanqi wen* 傳奇文 – the classic, stand-alone pieces which display those well-known stylistic charms and which Lu Xun enshrined in his anthology, or about *chuanqi ji* 傳奇集 – a looser, less rigorous body of story collections which he systematically excluded from his anthology but still dignified with the name *chuanqi*. This distinction enables Yin Dexiang both to exclude 'Ding Yue' from the *chuanqi* category (for not achieving the May Fourth stylistic standards), and to acknowledge that Lu Xun accepted the *Que shi* (in which 'Ding Yue' is the first, longest and most

10 C. T. Hsia, *The classic Chinese novel: a critical introduction*, New York and London: Columbia University Press, 1968, p. 6.

11 It was posed in 'A question of classification in Tang narrative', p. 207.



elaborate story) as a *chuanqi* collection.<sup>12</sup> So 'Ding Yue' is not a *chuanqi* if we judge it as a self-standing piece; but it is a *chuanqi* if we see it as part of a collection. You will judge for yourselves whether you find that distinction clear or confusing, useful or irrelevant. My own feeling is that Yin Dexiang has done well to draw attention to this ambivalence in Lu Xun's writings on the subject.

We can test the coherence of Lu Xun's double-standard *chuanqi* system by studying the editorial policy he used in *Tang Song chuanqi ji*. He introduces it in these terms:

本集所取，專在單篇。若一書中之一篇，則雖事極煊赫，或本書已亡，亦不收采。如袁郊甘澤謠之紅線，李復言續玄怪錄之杜子春，裴鉞傳奇之昆侖奴聶隱娘等是也。

What does this policy say about the canon? Some of the most famous and well-loved stories in Tang literature are excluded from this anthology because they form, or once formed, part of a Tang collection. A multitude of questions now arises. Does it mean that these named stories are degraded to the second rank? If so, why bother to name them? Or if not, does it mean that the remains of those ancient collections still offer numbers of fine stories of full *chuanqi* status? How many more such stories might there be, deserving a place on the high altar but left in the shadows because of their bibliographical context? Would it not have been better to include the finest of them in the new anthology?

The notion of a stand-alone or self-contained (單篇) story is actually difficult and confusing. Lu Xun himself gives this example:

皇甫枚飛煙傳，雖亦是三水小牘逸文，然太平廣記引則不云出於何書，似曾單行，故仍入錄。

The mere absence of a source reference in *Taiping guang ji* 491 has enabled this story to transcend the '*chuanqi* collection' category and enter Lu Xun's anthology, because of the implication that the story might have circulated independently. That contrasts with 'Li Wa zhuan' 李娃傳 and 'Liu Yi' 柳毅, both actually transmitted as items in the ninth-century collection

12 Yin Dexiang, pp. 95 and 96.