

乐黛云 名誉主编  
曹顺庆 主 编  
邓时忠 晏 红 主编助理

---

# 迈向比较文学 新阶段

---

中国比较文学学会  
第六届年会暨  
国际学术研讨会论文选

---

四川人民出版社

# 目 录

- Preface I The Conference in Chengdu: A Major Success  
..... Douwe Fokkema(1)  
迈向新世纪:多元文化时代的比较文学(序二)  
..... 乐黛云(5)
- Preface III Cross-Culture:A New Change and Breakthrough  
of Comparative Literature  
..... Cao Shunqing(10)
- 比较文学:再次面临选择 ..... (美)亨利·雷马克(姜源译)(18)  
Rewriting:Forms of Rewriting in the Chinese and European  
Traditions ..... Douwe Fokkema(33)  
Le théâtre: choc des cultures, enjeu du multiculturalisme?  
..... Yves Chevrel(47)
- Snow White and the Social Construction of Purity  
..... Eugene Eoyang(67)
- 21 世纪与新人文精神 ..... 乐黛云(89)
- Unity in Diversity :On Cultivating the Common Ground  
..... Claes G. Ryn(95)
- The Siren and the Sage:Knowledge and Wisdom  
in Ancient Greece and China ..... Steven Shankman(124)
- Human Universals as a Global Challenge  
..... Mineke Schipper(131)
- 新理性精神文学论..... 钱中文(155)

Multi-Culture, Multi-Media, and the Future of

Chinese Culture .....	Pei-kai Cheng(158)
面对全球化:从文学批评走向文化批评 .....	王 宁(164)
文化多元主义二题 .....	林 岗(173)
文化转型、文论嬗变与多元文化 .....	杨玉华(181)
对话:理论精神与操作原则——巴赫金对比较诗学 研究的启示 .....	蒋述卓 李凤亮(189)
The Japanese Reception of Chinese Culture Reflected in Hearn's Retelling of Chinese Literature .....	Junko Umemoto(201)
汉语批评:从失语到重建 .....	曹顺庆等(213)
片面的历史与宿命的现实——评中国后殖民批评 的一种倾向 .....	陈厚诚(251)
后现代主义精神与魏晋玄学 .....	曾艳兵(264)
略论初期基督教文学的文化渊源 .....	梁 工(268)
夏目漱石与鲁迅的文明批评——低徊与抵抗 .....	森本隆子(276)
Genealogy of the French Translation of Chinese Poems, Mainly of the Poems Made in the Tang Dynasty .....	Machiko Kadota(286)
东亚汉诗代表性选本的比较 .....	严 明(293)
自然的恩典 .....	周 阅(300)
普列姆昌德:中国的接受 .....	黎跃进(307)
解释学理论与翻译研究 .....	谢天振(309)
本雅明译论发微 .....	刘象愚(323)
“牛虻”乎? “马蝇”乎? ——有关书名逐译一瞥 .....	刘以焕(340)
海德格尔翻译思想试论 .....	卫茂平(349)
中西文化早期交往的复义媒介者“扶南”的媒介	

特点与作用探——兼谈基督教文化最早入华 的上限问题·····	孙景尧 罗 璇(357)
“洋鬼子”词源初探·····	孟 华(371)
法国“如是派”对中国的理想化误读·····	车槿山(382)
中国文人笔下的一个“小西洋人”·····	罗 芑(389)
走进东方梦——美国作家视野中的中国面影·····	冒 键(399)
普希金的中国幻想·····	张铁夫(408)
卡夫卡的中国：一个寓言·····	昂智慧(416)
泰戈尔：在西方文化中的误读——以《吉檀迦利》 为文本个案的研究·····	刘 燕(419)
“根”的追寻——澳门土生文学中一个难解的情结 ·····	饶芑子(422)
香港短篇小说中的“疏离”主题·····	许子东(431)
澳大利亚“新华人文学”中的死亡·····	钱超英(436)
用东方佳酿，浇胸中块垒：法国文化圈中的华人文学 ·····	钱林森(446)
当代加拿大华裔英语文学述评·····	朱 徽(455)
传统文化在海外华人小说中的表现·····	毛克强(465)
李渔和西方戏剧理论的对话·····	李万钧(475)
学科合并是比较文学教学改革的契机·····	陈 博(484)
打通研究：一种属于比较文学的研究方法·····	徐扬尚(492)
总体文学理论的新构架——论曹顺庆的《中外比较 文论史》·····	刘介民(500)
汉语批评与比较文学中国学派·····	邓时忠 肖薇(511)
俄苏历史比较艺术学的特征及其对我国比较 文学学科建设的启示·····	吴泽霖(518)
对“妙悟说”的比较考察·····	张思齐(526)

中国传统诗学的“异质性”概说·····	曹顺庆 吴兴明(535)
用《文心雕龙》来析评文学——以余光中作品为例 ·····	黄维樑(554)
中印审美主体构成·····	郁龙余(566)
比较诗学:成规与突围·····	陈跃红(576)
比较诗学与中国现代文学理论批评·····	周晓风(581)
体系的差异与东西方诗学的对话·····	王晓路(584)
晚清文学经验的外向性转换:个案与背景·····	马睿(594)
失语症与嗜语癖——汉语批评的合法性·····	张小元(603)
近现代之交中西文化竞争的结果与中国传统 文论知识样式的解体·····	刘文勇(610)
全球文化语境与汉语批评·····	张荣翼(618)
从“失语症”、“重建中国文论话语”到“汉语批评”·····	支宇(628)
近百年文论回顾:西方文论在中国·····	代迅(637)
民族化与中国的现代性认同——兼论文化转型与 文化异质化·····	晏红 张优德(646)
Ethics in Writing:Poetic Language in the Theory of Foucault·····	Zhen Zhihui(656)
调和折衷:朱光潜诗学建构方法论·····	向天渊(663)
比较文学中国学派再辩·····	李凯(671)
林语堂诗学话语分析·····	刘庆璋(679)
中西比较诗学的接合点:超文化阐释·····	叶绪民(689)
“拯救”与“逍遥”:中国文论的话语权力——从“存在 论”意义对“失语症”的“思”的观照·····	赵海(696)
诗心的应和——中西象征主义诗论三题·····	杨思聪(704)
汉语思想界的百年困结·····	蒋荣昌(713)
全球化时代的发展、传播及文化策略·····	吴予敏(719)

- 传媒文化、商业广告与话语权力 ..... 李思屈 刘荣(721)  
 比较文学与大众传媒 ..... 黄琳(734)  
 “电影后文学”的尝试 ..... 方位津(744)  
 现代传媒与比较文学——《读书》与《出版广角》的话  
     语场分析 ..... 侯洪(753)  
 掘金蚁:藏犬:澳偷:金毛鼠——中西文化交流史  
     上的一宗公案 ..... 萧兵(760)  
 弗莱的文学人类学思想 ..... 叶舒宪(772)  
 “香草美人”与“双性同体”:神话原型及理论特征之  
     比较 ..... 刘怀荣(784)  
 千年故事百年追踪——一个难得的比较文学研究  
     实例 ..... 刘守华(793)  
 论嗅觉香气与听觉音响的空间叙事 ..... 张世君(803)  
 批评的界限:语文分野中的文化选择——关于“~~汉语~~语  
     批评”的思考 ..... 徐新建(812)  
 地域文化与边缘批评 ..... 冯宪光(823)  
 巴蜀文化的历史定位与精神形态 ..... 黎风(828)  
 穿行于异质文化之间 ..... 阿来(833)  
 中西古典小说自然描写模式之比较 ..... 张鹤(837)  
 象征主义与中国情结——沈宝基及其《哭城》  
     ..... 邓艳艳 何云波(844)  
 春秋战国文体源流考略 ..... 张岩(852)  
 Hua Mulan or Fa Mulan——My Understanding of the  
     Original Story and Maxine Hong Kingston's Interpretation  
     of the Heroine Fa Mulan in Her Novel *The Woman  
     Warrior* ..... Zhang Ziqing(855)  
 回应挑战:跨世纪的检阅与展望——中国比较文学  
     学会第六届年会暨国际学术研讨会综述

..... 晏红 董天策(868)

附录 1	论文摘要 .....	(879)
附录 2	主、协、承办单位名单 .....	(899)
附录 3	组织委员会名单 .....	(900)
附录 4	会议议程目录 .....	(902)
附录 5	中国比较文学学会历届年会暨国际学术研讨会 简介 .....	(904)
附录 6	中国比较文学学会理事会成员名单 .....	(906)
附录 7	四川省比较文学学会理事会成员名单 .....	(907)
附录 8	鸣谢 .....	(908)
后 记	.....	(909)

# Preface I The Conference in Chengdu: A Major Success

Utrecht University *Douwe Fokkema*

The 6th conference of the Chinese Comparative Literature Association in Chengdu in August 1999 was a major success. In order to appreciate its significance we must go back into history.

For a long time comparative literature has been a field studied mainly in Europe and North America. Since I was trained as a sinologist I found this an unsatisfactory situation. Many scholars in the West were simply not aware of the great traditions of literature in Asia. The isolation of western comparative literature was mirrored by a similar isolation of literary studies in the East.

After having spent two years in Beijing in the late 1960s, I was definitely convinced of the negative effects of isolation. When I became active in the Executive Committee of the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA) in 1973—first as a secretary, then as a vice-president and president—I tried to persuade my colleagues to make the comparative study of literature really international. This meant that the Congresses of the ICLA should be convened not only in Europe or North America, but also in other parts of the world. The support of Earl Miner, a comparatist and Japanologist of Princeton University, in the United States, who was president of the ICLA between 1988 and 1991, was essential in this respect, as well as the hospitable response of Haga Toru, of Tokyo U-

niversity, and other Japanese colleagues.

Thus, in 1991 the 13th Congress of the ICLA was held in Tokyo, Japan. And next year, in 2000, the 16th Congress of the ICLA is convened in Pretoria, South Africa. In all probability, the congress to be held in 2003 will take place in Hong Kong.

In the meantime, also at grassroot level comparative literature was accepted as a truly international discipline. As a result of the sustained efforts of Qian Zhongshu, Yang Zhouhan and Yue Daiyun, in 1985 the Chinese Comparative Literature Association was founded in Shenzhen. Together with several colleagues from the West including Yves Chevrel (Paris), I had the honor to attend that first national meeting of comparatists in China, since that moment comparative literature has grown in China—in quantity, in diversity, and in quality.

The growth of comparative literature and its spread all over the world has also changed the contents of comparative literature. The positivist studies of literary influence as well as the New Critical analysis of texts have yielded to a focus on the cultural context in which literature is being produced and read. Literary studies have been conceived as part of cultural studies.

Chinese comparatists have quickly responded to this tendency. This appears from the theme of the 4th conference of the Chinese Comparative Literature Association in Zhangjiajie, which was: “Literature in the multicultural context,” and from the theme of the 5th conference in Changchun: “Cultural dialogue and cultural memory.” And it also appears from the theme of the meeting in Chengdu: “Comparative Literature in an age of multiculturalism.”

However, the focus on the cultural context has led to a problem

of definition. The question can be asked: to what extent is literary studies still different from cultural studies? If there is no longer any specific difference, the problem arises that scholars of literature must compete with historians, sociologists, anthropologists and psychologists. For they all deal with culture. What could the specific contribution of experts in literary studies be? In fact, literary researchers are less well equipped for studying culture than, for instance, cultural anthropologists.

I agree that literary production and reception should be studied in its cultural and historical context, but in the process of this contextualization the specific characteristics of the aesthetic experience should not be overlooked. In spite of the attempts of some critics, notably in the United States, to politicize the debate on culture and to neglect the research on literature, aesthetic perception remains an important faculty of the mind. In his *Zhongwai bijiao wenlun shi* (1998, *Comparative History of Chinese and Foreign Literary Theories*) Cao Shunqing argued: although the various literary traditions have different origins, they all have been looking for the aesthetic qualities of literature. Indeed, for many readers the aesthetic experience is a fact that enriches life. However, the aesthetic experience is more than a luxury. It is not an isolated phenomenon that has no relation with other faculties of the mind, such as ethical judgment, or the search for truth. Aesthetic perception is perception from a certain distance; it is perception without immediate commitment to action. Nevertheless, it often precedes — and maybe even prepares — a reorientation in action or judgment. As such it can be part of an individual reconsideration of an idea or plan.

The ethical and social effects of literature result from such re-

considerations. Different from plain political discourse, literature may break through cultural barriers that separate readers living in different parts of the world. Different from propaganda, literature has an indirect effect.

The particular rhetoric of literature is something literary scholars know something about. We should not forsake our own expertise. For if we do not pay attention to the particularity of literary writing, no one in the university will care for literature anymore. I would deplore that development. For, as Lu Xun argued in his turbulent and highly politicized time, literature is needed. Literature should be defended, also by means of fundamental research and rational argument.

The conference in Chengdu was a great success precisely because the participants were interested in the specific role of literature in the cultural debate. Many papers focused on the aesthetic effect of reading literature. Other papers related the aesthetic experience to the cultural context. Moreover, there was a lively international exchange of opinions. The intellectual atmosphere of the conference was excellent. However, without a perfect organization and without Professor Cao Shunqing and his staff, the great success of the conference would not have been possible.

On behalf of all foreign scholars who attended the conference, allow me to express our most sincere thanks to our hosts in Chengdu.

# 迈向新世纪： 多元文化时代的比较文学(序二)

北京大学 乐黛云

我们来到真正即将告别 20 世纪的时候了。20 世纪最后一年所发生的一切并不令人特别高兴，倒是使人更清楚地认清了现实。看来人们曾经期待的经济和平发展、政治多极共存、文化多元并进的局面远非唾手可得；强权、暴力也不会自然退出历史舞台。然而，暴力和强权越是猖獗，世界各族人民之间的沟通 and 理解就越是重要。能够制止暴力和强权的，唯有不同民族的人们之间的相互沟通、理解和宽容。跨文化研究，特别是跨文化研究中的文学研究，即比较文学，作为不同文化之间互相沟通和理解的重要桥梁，一定会在未来的新世纪发挥更大的作用。

自从 1886 年英国学者波斯奈特(H. M. Posnett)第一次用“比较文学”命名他的专著开始，比较文学这一学科几乎是以泯灭亚、非、拉各民族文化特色为己任的。在比较文学极为兴盛的本世纪 20 年代末，著名的法国比较文学家洛里哀(Frederic Loliee)就曾在他那部著名的《比较文学史》中公开作出结论：“西方之智识上、道德上及实业上的势力业已遍及全世界。……从此民族间的差别将渐被铲除，文化将继续它的进程，而地方的特色将归消灭……一切文学上的民族的特质也都将成为历史上的东西了。……总之，各民族将不复维持他们的传统，而从前一切种姓上的差别必将消灭在一个大混合体之内——这就是今后文学的趋势。”<sup>①</sup>

---

① 洛里哀：《比较文学史》，傅东华译，上海书店 1989 年版，第 352 页。

但历史并没有按照他所规定的方向发展。60年代,一些比较文学家提出:“比较文学就是从一种以上的民族文学的眼光或结合一种或另一种甚至几种知识学科,对任何文学现象所作的研究”。<sup>①</sup>欧文·奥尔德里奇教授明确地提出了“一种以上的民族文学”和“几种知识学科”,可惜这里所说的民族文学,指的主要也还是西方文化体系内部的各民族文学;直到70年代,著名的《比较文学与文学理论》一书的作者乌利希·韦斯坦因(Ulrich Weisstein)教授仍然认为东西异质文化间的比较文学是不可行的,比较文学只能在同一文化体系内进行。

20世纪下半叶,随着后殖民时代的到来和后结构主义理论的广泛影响,比较文学这一学科正在呈现出空前未有的蓬勃生机。西方中心论的隐退带来了多元文化的繁荣,殖民体系的瓦解促使各民族的文化特点得到复苏和展现;与此同时,世界进入信息时代,快速的跨文化传通成为现实。这一切使比较文学可以不再局限于同质的西方文化体系内部,而在欧美、非洲、亚洲、拉丁美洲等异质文化的对比和共存中获得了空前未有的广阔空间。

作为欧洲文艺复兴发源地的意大利的比较文学家——罗马知识大学的阿尔蒙多·尼兹(Armando Gnisci)教授在他的《作为非殖民化学科的比较文学》一文中首先提出了有关比较文学的全新的理解。他指出:“如果对于摆脱了西方殖民的国家来说,比较文学学科代表一种理解、研究和实现非殖民化的方式;那么,对于我们所有欧洲学者来说,它却代表着一种思考、一种自我批评及学习的形式,或者说是从我们自身的殖民中解脱的方式。”<sup>②</sup>

尼兹教授还进一步指出,要做到这一点“不能仅靠我们的力

---

① 欧文·奥尔德里奇:《比较文学:问题与方法》,伊利诺斯大学出版社1969年版,第1页。

② 阿尔蒙多·尼兹:《作为非殖民化学科的比较文学》,罗恬译,见《中国比较文学通讯》1996年第1期,第5页。

量,以我们的哲学传统下的心理状况为基础;相反,这只有通过比较、倾听他人,以他人的视角看自己之后,才可能实现。通过这些手段,我们最终才会向他人,也向我们自己学习那些我们永远不能通过别的方法发展的东西。如今,这一切无需离家就可以实现,因为其他人已前来与我们相会。他们的目的不是武力征服,或以文化优越性压人一头,而是希望平等尊严地生活在我们当中”。<sup>①</sup>

尼兹教授的文章使我十分感动,而且深深地受到启发。他首先肯定了曾经是殖民地和被殖民地的不同民族之间的异质文化是可以相互理解和沟通的。他提出比较文学可以帮助我们真正走出过去的殖民和被殖民体制,成为以平等心态去理解别人和沟通异质文化的重要途径。他还认为要认识自己,就不能局限于自己固有的“哲学传统下的心理状况”,而要走出自己,“通过比较、倾听他人,以他人的视角看自己之后”才能实现。他期待着既不是“武力征服”,又不是“以文化优越性压人一头”的“平等尊严”的对话。他对比较文学的理解与前一个世纪末洛里哀教授的理解正相反,不是文化的征服和混一,而是异质文化的多元共存。

然而,今天,在经济和科技不可避免的全球化的大趋势下,文化的多元共存显然面临着危机。首先是科学的挑战。正在高速发展的电脑电讯、多媒体、互联网极其深刻地改变着人类的思维方式、生活方式,以至生存方式。目前,网络上通行的是英文,这种以某种语言为主导的跨国信息流是否会压抑他种语言文字从而限制人类文化的多样性发展呢?更严重的是信息的流向远非对等,而是多由美国流向其它国家。随着经济信息、科技信息的流入,同时也会发生意识形态、价值观念和宗教信仰等文化的“整体移入”,以致使其他国家民族原有的文化受到压抑,失去“活性”,最

---

① 阿尔蒙多·尼兹:《作为非殖民化学科的比较文学》,罗恬译,见《中国比较文学通讯》1996年第1期,第5页。

后重新成为文化霸权的牺牲品！

由于以上的文化压制，一部分人感到自身民族文化被淹没以至消亡的可能，奋起突出彰显本民族文化，这对于保护和发展世界文化的多样性无疑具有重要意义。遗憾的是在这一潮流中，封闭、孤立、倒退的文化孤立主义也随机而生。他们无视各民族文化交往、相互影响的历史，只要求“原汁原味”的本土文化。这就有可能导致一种文化上的封闭性和排他性：只强调本文化的优越而忽略本文化可能存在的缺失；只强调本文化的“纯洁”而反对和其他文化交往和沟通，惟恐受到“污染”；只强调本文化的“统一”而畏惧新的发展，以至对外采取文化上的隔绝和孤立政策，对内压制本文化内部求新、求变的积极因素，结果是导致新的文化对抗和冲突。

加之以 20 世纪后半叶，后结构主义各种思潮将人们习惯的深度模式解构了：现象后面不一定有本质；偶然性后面不一定有一个必然性，“能指”后面也不一定有一个固定的“所指”；中心被解构了：原先处于边缘的、零碎的、隐在的、被中心所掩盖的一切释放出新的能量；在文化研究的范围内，这些思潮起了消解中心，解放思想，逃离权威，发挥创造力等巨大作用，但它也导致了某种离散和互不相关，使人类社会失去了必要的凝聚力。

总之，人类文化发展实面临两方面的危机：一方面是文化的多元发展受到威胁，文化的多样性日益削弱，这势必导致世界文化资源无可挽回的流失；另一方面是文化本土主义所造成的文化孤立和隔绝不断引向文化对抗和冲突，而思维模式的变化又大大加深了社会意识的分崩离析。

这样的形势为比较文学提出了空前未有的挑战和机遇。比较文学由于其性质所规定，它首先尊重不同文化的差异，提倡在差异中反观自己，加深对自己的认识，使一种文化或文学在与不同文化或文学的差异和反观中得到发展和更新。与此同时，比较文学也十分重视发掘不同文化或文学中人类共同的基因，正是这些共同

的基因使人类有相互理解和沟通的可能。这就是孔子所提倡的“和而不同”原则。这一原则认为事物虽各有不同,但决不可能脱离相互的关系而孤立存在。“和”的主要精神就是要协调“不同”,达到新的和谐统一,使各个不同事物都能在与其它事物的相互促进中得到新的发展,形成新的事物。中国传统文化的最高理想是“万物并育而不相害,道并行而不相悖”。“万物并育”和“道并行”是“不同”;“不相害”,“不相悖”则是“和”。在即将到来的新世纪,中国这一古老的智慧很可能成为人类反对霸权(“同而不和”)的重要文化资源,而比较文学也将在这一智慧的浸润下,进一步成为沟通异质文化中人类思想感情的重要桥梁。

# Preface III Cross-Culture: A New Change and Breakthrough of Comparative Literature

Sichuan University      *Cao Shunqing*

At the end of this century, it seems that comparative literature is facing a new “crisis” again, which stands for, at the same time, a new change and breakthrough.

We are already on the turning point for such a new option and important strategy. The history is challenging us and the opportunity is at hand. But how to meet this challenge and grasp the chance is necessarily the important task for the scholars in the field of comparative literature, both in China and even the whole world.

In the early 50's, the study of comparative literature was in a serious “crisis”. It was, however, that crisis that caused the field to make a remarkable breakthrough, in which the Parallel Approach, the American School, was born. Since then this field has been on a new phase.

In 1958, Rene Wellek pointed out at the second conference of the International Comparative Literature Association held at Cathedral Hill that the discipline was in crisis with the sign that both the object and the methodology had not been defined. . . Comparative literature thus had almost become dead in terms of its methodology. And right now this field in China is in the similar situation. Meanwhile the discipline theory of the field outside China seems more and