

Shunqing Cao

The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature

 Springer

The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature

Shunqing Cao

The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature

 Springer

Shunqing Cao
School of Chinese Language and Literature
Beijing Normal University

College of Literature and Journalism
Sichuan University
China

ISBN 978-3-642-34276-9 ISBN 978-3-642-34277-6 (eBook)
DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-34277-6
Springer Heidelberg New York Dordrecht London

Library of Congress Control Number: 2013956634

© Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg 2013

This work is subject to copyright. All rights are reserved by the Publisher, whether the whole or part of the material is concerned, specifically the rights of translation, reprinting, reuse of illustrations, recitation, broadcasting, reproduction on microfilms or in any other physical way, and transmission or information storage and retrieval, electronic adaptation, computer software, or by similar or dissimilar methodology now known or hereafter developed. Exempted from this legal reservation are brief excerpts in connection with reviews or scholarly analysis or material supplied specifically for the purpose of being entered and executed on a computer system, for exclusive use by the purchaser of the work. Duplication of this publication or parts thereof is permitted only under the provisions of the Copyright Law of the Publisher's location, in its current version, and permission for use must always be obtained from Springer. Permissions for use may be obtained through RightsLink at the Copyright Clearance Center. Violations are liable to prosecution under the respective Copyright Law.

The use of general descriptive names, registered names, trademarks, service marks, etc. in this publication does not imply, even in the absence of a specific statement, that such names are exempt from the relevant protective laws and regulations and therefore free for general use.

While the advice and information in this book are believed to be true and accurate at the date of publication, neither the authors nor the editors nor the publisher can accept any legal responsibility for any errors or omissions that may be made. The publisher makes no warranty, express or implied, with respect to the material contained herein.

Printed on acid-free paper

Springer is part of Springer Science+Business Media (www.springer.com)

Foreword

Without the Western world being aware of it, the comparative study of literature has been flourishing in China for several decades. In 1985 the first Congress of the Chinese Comparative Literature Association in Shenzhen was a major event in this development. As newly elected President of the International Comparative Literature Association, I attended the Congress and saw the energy and high expectations in the eyes of the young participants. However, even before that inaugural Congress, the international study of literature was practiced by outstanding scholars such as Qian Zhongshu and Yang Zhouhan, both notable for their impeccable knowledge of English and European traditions as well as the history of Chinese literature and philosophy. Another name to mention here is Yue Daiyun, of Beijing University, who has been a powerful organizer of congresses and symposia. A generation of highly gifted younger scholars has kept the flame of comparative studies burning with their journals, both in Chinese and English, and with conferences and local associations—among them Shunqing Cao, Xie Tianzhen, Wang Ning, Zhang Longxi, and many others.

As said, all these activities are virtually unknown outside China. Therefore, Professor Shunqing Cao's book on *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature*, appearing now in English, is a welcome attempt to break through the linguistic barrier that keeps most comparatists in China enclosed within their own cultural domain. Cao's book aims to open a dialogue with scholars abroad, in Europe and North and South America, India, Russia, South Africa, and the Arab world. (The world is already a multipolar system longer than most of us have realized.) It would be a gross mistake not to take up the challenge of Cao's erudite exposition. Shunqing Cao's argument contains many pertinent observations and, where we have reason to disagree, we must express our own views so as to continue the discussion.

The Variation Theory is an answer to the one-sided emphasis on influence studies by the former "French school" as well as to the American focus on aesthetic interpretation, inspired by New Criticism, which regrettably ignored literature in non-European languages. Our Chinese colleagues are right in seeing the restrictions of former comparative studies and are fully entitled to amend these deficiencies.

However, it is important to view the rise and interaction of the various schools which Cao describes in their historical context. Much of the misunderstanding between the French and the Americans was during the years of World War II, when intellectual communication across the Atlantic Ocean was virtually impossible. The fate of Russian formalism in the 1920s was determined by political persecution and suppression, and its valuable results were almost lost, also because few international scholars were able to read Russian in the original. Thanks to Roman Jakobson, who managed to flee from the Soviet Union to Czechoslovakia, where he met the structuralist Jan Mukarovsky and the comparatist René Wellek, and later escaped Nazi persecution by settling in the United States, the legacy of Russian formalism was saved from oblivion. At present it is German translations of the work of the Russian Formalists which most accurately, sometimes in bilingual editions, preserve the main ideas of Shklovsky, Eikhenbaum, Tynyanov, Jakobson, and others, without which a modern study of literature seems impossible. To judge the traveling of theories, knowledge of German, next to French and English, is indispensable, as Qian Zhongshu already asserted when I visited him in 1980. And now, at the suggestion of René Étiemble, European students of Comparative Literature are advised to study also at least one non-European language. The burden of comparatists has become heavy indeed...on the other hand, knowledge of various languages is an enormous enrichment as it opens the world of other cultures and is a major component of cultural consumption which, according to the French-Libaneser writer Amin Maalouf, must gradually replace the obsession with material consumption, if our world's resources are not to be exhausted within a foreseeable future and life on earth is to be preserved.

Returning to Variation Theory, precisely those scholars who acquired knowledge of languages outside their own cultural domain seem to have applied it, focusing on difference as well as similarity, on crossing cultural boundaries as well as the potential aesthetic experience. Shunqing Cao's characterizations of the "French school" and of American Comparative Literature studies may strike us as quick abstractions from a complex reality. In fact, there were also excellent cross-cultural studies, such as those by the American Japanologist Earl Miner or by the Chinese James J. Y. Liu teaching in the United States, by the Japanese Yoshikawa Kojiro on Song poetry, or by the American sinologist Stephen Owen on Tang poetry. They all discuss phenomena of both homogeneity and heterogeneity, of sameness and difference, and they had a keen eye for the Variation which Shunqing Cao provides with a theoretical framework.

Shunqing Cao and his team in Sichuan University do not claim to have solved the foundational problems of Comparative Literature. The Variation Theory recognizes sameness as well as differences, but how to identify sameness? Cao rightly assumes that the aesthetic experience is a constant factor in cross-cultural literary studies, but it may be necessary to be more specific about the aesthetic response to texts. Literariness—or *literaturnost*, a term first used by the Russian Formalists—is not an exclusively textual phenomenon but results from a transaction (Rosenblatt) between a given text and a rather unpredictable reader. The quality of the text is an important but not decisive factor in this process. We know on the basis of empirical research

that certain texts are more likely to trigger a literary or aesthetic response among particular readers than other texts, but the aesthetic response remains a fragile and volatile thing that differs from individual to individual and is even inconstant in the cognitive and emotional reaction of one particular individual: a text I find beautiful today may pale when I reread it tomorrow.

There are two scholars who in recent years have substantially contributed to the study of the aesthetic production and reception of literature. One is Yury Lotman, the Russian semiotician who introduced the distinction between the aesthetics of identity and the aesthetics of opposition. Thus he could include oral literature, which aims at recognition and identification, into his argument. Focusing on textual properties rather than readers' or listeners' reactions, Lotman did of course not solve all problems of aesthetics. Another step forward was made by the German scholar Siegfried J. Schmidt who introduced the notion of the aesthetic convention. With some minor amendments and specifications, I discussed the concept of the aesthetic convention in *Knowledge and Commitment: A Problem-Oriented Approach to Literary Studies* (2000, coauthored with Elrud Ibsch), and I will not repeat that argument here. Suffice it to say that a convention is a rather loose social agreement to solve a coordination problem. Individuals are free to join the aesthetic convention to interpret a particular text as literature: the aesthetic intention of a writer can be recognized and endorsed by the recipients, but it can also be ignored, as we know, for instance, from the case of political authorities who deliberately ignored the fictional nature of a text and interpreted the words spoken by a character as if they expressed the opinion of the author. Although I assume that all major cultures, at least those with a script, have some space for the aesthetic convention, many of them have known episodes during which the aesthetic reading of texts stood under pressure from a religion or other dominant worldview. The aesthetic response to texts has also remained beyond most people with little education or those taken up by the dire struggle for life, such as migrant workers or peasants living in extreme poverty.

The aesthetic response to particular texts is something that is taught and can be learned in school or from family and friends. Together with other readers, we may agree that certain texts are more worthwhile than others because they allow for an aesthetic reading; thus, we are in fact enacting the aesthetic convention. However, as mentioned, the potential aesthetic response can also be forfeited. In the latter case, a precious aspect of cultural communication is lost.

Rather optimistically, the Variation Theory argues that we may discover literariness in texts of a different culture. This appears a valid assumption, confirmed by our own reading experience. My advice is to try to understand Professor Cao's Variation Theory; try to apply it; and, if you believe that it does not work, publish your doubts or contact Professor Cao so that the cross-cultural dialogue he is hoping for will materialize.

Acknowledgments

This book is my first academic work written in English. It is one of the major milestones of my career. I would like to express my gratitude to all those who helped me during the writing of this book. My deepest gratitude goes first and foremost to Professor Douwe W. Fokkema, the ex-president of the International Comparative Literature Society and the distinguished professor of Utrecht University, for his continuous support to Chinese Comparative Literature and my study. He wrote the foreword of this book for me and introduced it to the international circles earnestly. I hope this book could comfort his soul and remind us of his great support for he has passed away before it is published.

I also own my sincere gratitude to my Ph.D. candidates in Sichuan University and Beijing Normal University in China who helped me a lot in my preparing for and writing the book. They are Jin Yizeng, Zhang Yu, Wang Lei, Xu Yadong, Qiu Lan, Wang Chao, Li Weirong, Yan Qing, Kong Xuyou, Qiu Mingfeng, Gong Xiaobing, Wang Qing, Cui Haiyan, Xu Yangshang, Wang Pengfei, Ren Xiaojuan, Chen Pi, Wu Lin, Fu Pinjing, Li Dan, Li Yan, Cai Jun, and Zhou Yunfang. I also own a special debt to Wang Lei, Zheng Che, Shi Song, Wan Yi, and Wu Liwen, together with Lin He, Li Quan, Zhang Zhanjun, Qin Ling, Du Ping, Zhuang Peina, and John Ronald Clark from University of Science and Technology Liaoning who have spent much time on translating and editing, and to Aaron Lee Moore of Sichuan University who helped edit the final draft of this book. I should finally like to express my gratitude to the National Social Science Foundation for its support all through these years.

Beijing, China
November 15, 2012

Shunqing Cao

A Brief Introduction of Shunqing Cao

Dr. Shunqing Cao, who was born in 1954 and graduated in Fudan University in 1980 and was awarded his Ph.D. degree in Sichuan University in 1987, is a visiting scholar of Harvard University and Cornell University in the United States (1992–1994); he was also invited to be guest professor at Nanhua University, Tamkang University, and Fo Guang University (1999, 2001) in Taiwan; now he is a professor and Ph.D. candidate supervisor at Beijing Normal University. He is also an eminence professor (enjoying the treatment of Research Fellow of Chinese Academy of Social Science) of Sichuan University and the dean of the college of literature and journalism at Sichuan University. In addition, he is the winner of Huo Yingdong Education Funds, the specially invited professor of Changjiang Scholar Awarding Program for Comparative Literature by the Ministry of Education of China, and a national distinguished teacher. Additionally, he has been distinguished as one of the remarkable scholars with a Ph.D. degree who has made a special contribution and therefore is the expert enjoying the special government allowance. Meanwhile, he is a counselor of the Academic Degree Commission under the State Council, the evaluation committee of The National Social Science Foundation. At the same time, he is also vice-president of the Chinese Comparative Literature Association, vice-president of the Chinese Ancient Literary Theory Association, and vice-president of the Chinese-Foreign Literary Theory Association.

He has published several books and articles including *The Comparison of Chinese and Western Poetics*, *Anthology of East Literary Theories*, *Discourse of Literary Theories of Ancient Chinese*, *A Comparative History of World Literature: An Evolution*, *Theories on Comparative Literature*, *The Course of Comparative Literature*, and *The History of Chinese-Foreign Literary Theories: A Comparative Study* and academic papers such as “The Discourse of Chinese Literary Theory and the Dialogue Between Western and Chinese Literary Theories” *Journal of Multicultural Discourse*, UK, 2008(3:1); “Reconstructing Chinese Literary Discourse” Wild Peony Press, Australia, 1997(6); and “Chinese School: 30 Years of Development 1978–2008” *Comparative Literature: East and West*, China, 2009(11).

Contents

1 Major Contributions of Influence Study and Its Weaknesses	1
1.1 The Origins of Comparative Literature in Europe and Its Dead Ends.....	1
1.1.1 The Beginning of Comparative Literature in Europe	1
1.1.2 Comparative Literature in Britain	3
1.1.3 Comparative Literature in Germany	4
1.1.4 Comparative Literature in Italy.....	5
1.1.5 Comparative Literature in Russia	6
1.1.6 Comparative Literature in France	7
1.2 The Major Contribution of the French School: Founding of the First Phase of the Disciplinary Theory of Comparative Literature.....	8
1.2.1 The Shaping of the French School.....	9
1.2.2 The Birth of Comparative Literature as an Independent Discipline and the Formation of Theories of Comparative Literature	10
1.2.3 Three Cornerstones of Theories of Comparative Literature	11
1.3 “History of Literary Relations”: The Merits of Positivism and Its Weakness.....	23
1.3.1 The Characteristics of Theories of the French School: Positivism of International Literary Relations.....	23
1.3.2 Criticism from the American School: Ambivalence of Positivism Versus Aesthetics	25
1.3.3 Internal Puzzles of the French School: Ambivalence of Positivism Versus Imagology	27
1.3.4 Challenges in Cross-Cultural Contexts: Variation Everywhere.....	30

1.4	Essence of Influence Studies: Coexistence of Positivism and Variation	32
1.4.1	Essence of Influence Studies: The Method of Positivism and the Phenomenon of Variation	32
1.4.2	Case Study on Coexistence of Positivism and Variation: Exploration of Variation in Literary Communication Between China and Japan	35
1.4.3	Chinese Orphan: The European Variation of “Orphan of the Zhao Family”	39
1.5	Important Breakthrough in Comparative Literature: The Shaping of Variation Theory.....	43
1.5.1	The Shaping of Variation Theory.....	43
1.5.2	The Scope of Influence Studies of Variation.....	47
1.6	Two Sustainable Points of International Literary Relations: That of Positivism and That of Variation.....	52
1.6.1	“International Literary Relations” from the Positivistic Perspective	52
1.6.2	Limitations of Positivistic Study of “International Literary Relations” and Its Challenges	53
1.6.3	The Other Pillar of “International Literary Relations”: Relations of Variation	55
	References.....	59
2	Major Contributions of Analogy Study and Its Deficiencies	63
2.1	Major Contribution of Analogy Study	63
2.1.1	Contribution of Analogy Study and Its Characteristics	64
2.1.2	Problems of Analogy Study in Practice	66
2.1.3	Contents of Analogy Study	68
2.1.4	Analogy Study in the Perspective of Variation Theory.....	69
2.2	Deficiencies of Analogy Study	73
2.2.1	Western-Centrism and Orientalism	73
2.2.2	Universal Truth and Heterogeneous Civilization.....	75
2.2.3	Deficiencies of Analogical Comparison: Ignorance of Heterogeneity.....	77
2.3	Elucidation and Variation in Analogy Study	81
2.3.1	Interpretation and Variation	81
2.3.2	Variation in Analogy Study.....	85
2.3.3	Evaluation of Variation in Analogy Study	88
2.4	Discourse Variation in Analogy Study.....	91
2.4.1	Spatial Variation: Origin of Discourse Variation in Analogy Study.....	91
2.4.2	Illustrative Approach and Spatial Variation	93
2.4.3	Aphasia and Variation Theory	94
	References.....	97

3 The Variation Theory in Cross-Language Context 101

3.1 Literary Translation: From Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance to Creative Treason 101

3.1.1 Original Intention: The Seeking of Equivalence in Patterns of Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance 101

3.1.2 Bewildering: Phenomena of “Intention Beyond Language” and Utopia of Equivalence 104

3.1.3 The Way Out: Harmony Without Being Identical and Emphasis of Heterogeneity 106

3.2 Non-translatability and the Inevitability of Variations in Literary Translation 109

3.2.1 Literature Review: Debate and Research on Non-translatability 110

3.2.2 Non-translatability in Two Philosophical Paradigms 111

3.2.3 Non-translatability and the Inevitability of Variations in Literary Translation 117

3.3 The Cross-Language Variation Between Western Languages and Chinese 119

3.3.1 Heterogeneity Between Western Languages and Chinese and Their Equal Status 119

3.3.2 Shift Between Western Languages and Chinese in Translation 125

3.4 The Variation Theory in Translation: Medio-translatology 130

3.4.1 Translation Study and Variation in Cross-Language Context 130

3.4.2 Birth of Medio-translatology 132

3.4.3 Difference Between Medio-translatological Study and the Traditional Study of Translation 133

3.4.4 The Core of Medio-translatological Study: Creative Treason 134

3.4.5 Transmission of Cultural Images and Mistranslation 136

3.4.6 Medio-translatology and Literary Variation Theory 137

3.5 Case Study on Cross-Language Variation Among European Languages 138

3.5.1 “Translation Is Interpretation” 140

3.5.2 Significance of Cross-Language Variation 143

3.6 Case Study on Cross-Language Variation Between European Languages and Chinese 145

3.6.1 Domestication 145

3.6.2 The Variation of the Second Time 149

3.6.3 Variation in Images 151

3.6.4 Variation in Translation of Idioms 153

References 155

4 Cross-Cultural Variation Theory..... 159

4.1 Cultural Filtering and Literary Variation 160

4.1.1 Social Context..... 162

4.1.2 Linguistic Translation 164

4.1.3 Traditional Culture..... 167

4.1.4 Recipient’s Individual Acceptance Screen..... 170

4.2 Literary Misreading and Literary Variation 173

4.2.1 Conceptual Generation and Research Diversion
of Literary Misreading and Literary Variation..... 173

4.2.2 The Reason for Literary Misreading
and Literary Variation 176

4.2.3 The Value and Dynamic Formation of Studies
on Literary Misreading and Literary Variation 177

4.3 The First Establishment of Cross-Cultural Variation
Theory: The Theory of Imagology of Comparative Literature..... 179

4.3.1 Definition and Characteristics..... 180

4.3.2 Past and Present 183

4.3.3 Theories and Methods..... 188

4.3.4 Issues and Reflections 192

References..... 193

5 Cross-Civilization Variation Theory..... 195

5.1 The Emergence of the Clash of Civilizations
and Cross-Civilization Variation..... 195

5.1.1 Samuel Huntington: The Clash of Civilization
and Cross-Civilization Studies..... 197

5.1.2 Edward Said: The West and East in the Field
of Postcolonial Literary Theory 199

5.1.3 Tu Weiming: The Discourse Between
Neo-Confucianism and Civilizations 201

5.2 Cross-Civilization: From Blind Spot to Focal Point..... 206

5.2.1 The Neglect and Contempt of the Early
Western Civilization to the Oriental Civilization..... 206

5.2.2 Ulrich Weisstein’s Hesitation of Exceeding
the Limits of Civilization 209

5.2.3 From Bias to Dialogue Between Civilizations..... 213

5.3 The Rise of Cross-Civilization Studies
in Comparative Literature 214

5.3.1 The Product of the Clash of Civilizations:
Early Comparative Literature of China..... 214

5.3.2 The Variation and Distortion
of the Clash of Civilizations..... 216

5.3.3 From “Illustrative Study” to “X+Y”: The Difficult
Development of Chinese Comparative Literature..... 220

5.3.4 The Emergence of “Aphasia” and the Rise
of Cross-Civilization Studies 223

5.4 The Heterogeneity of Civilization and the Variability of Comparative Literature 225

5.4.1 The Universality and the Uniqueness of Civilization (Commensurability and Incommensurability) 225

5.4.2 The Theoretical Transformation of Comparative Literature: The Transformation from the Sameness (of Homogeneity, of the Same Kind) to Variability (the Heterogeneity and Complementarity of Civilization) 229

5.4.3 Mutual Elucidations and Variations Among the Literatures of Heterogeneous Civilizations..... 233

5.5 The Heterogeneity of Cross-Civilization Literary Theories and the Studies of Variation 238

5.5.1 The Principles of Foreignization of Literary Theories 239

5.5.2 The Study of Chinization of Western Literary Theories..... 242

5.5.3 The Dialogue and Activation Among Heterogeneous Literary Theories..... 246

References..... 250

Introduction

Variation Theory: An Important Breakthrough in Comparative Literature

Comparative Literature, as an independent academic discipline of literary scholarship, has undergone three major stages of development so far¹: The first is the French school with its insistence on influence studies; the second is the American school with its emphasis on studies of analogy (parallel studies) and interdisciplinary research; and the third is the practice of Chinese scholars who put forward cross-civilization studies and the Variation Theory. The introduction mainly discusses the major theoretical significance and academic value of Variation Theory in the course of development of Comparative Literature in the world [2].

The Defects of Contemporary Theories of Comparative Literature

As the first stage of Comparative Literature, the basic feature of the French school is to insist on the empirical and positivistic approach. They believe that in the study of comparative literature, importance should be attached to empiricism and positivism and all studies should center on the history of international literary relations. Many theoreticians of this school express similar opinions towards this assertion. In the programmatic article introducing the first number of the “Revue de littérature compare” (1921), Baldensperger, the recognized founder of the school, makes comments: “No explicatory clarity results from comparisons restricting themselves to a glance cast simultaneously at two different objects, to that recollection, conditioned

¹The three stages and the rippling pattern of the development of Comparative Literature was first proposed by Shunqing Cao [1].

by the play of memories and impressions, of similarities which may well be erratic points furtively linked by the mind's caprice" [3]. Paul Van Tieghem, another founder of the school, thinks "the characteristic of comparative literature, as the nature of the historical science, is to embrace a great number of possible facts of different origins, then explain each of them, then enlarge the basis of knowledge as to discover the causes of most effects. In brief, the word 'comparative' should avoid its aesthetic value to get a scientific one" [4]. Marius-Francois Guyard, the prominent French comparatist, claims that comparative literature is not a comparison of literatures. It is in fact a scientific method misunderstood. The right definition for it should be the history of international literary relations [5]. Jean-Marie Carré, in his foreword to Guyard's *La Littérature Comparée*, regards Comparative Literature as "a branch of literary history; it is the study of spiritual international relations, of factual contacts which took place between Byron and Pushkin, Goethe and Carlyle, Walter Scott and Vigny, between the works, the inspirations and even the lives of writers belonging to several literatures" [6]. René Étiemble also points out that there is a tendency to insist that this discipline should be essentially along the same lines with historical study. It can only be and must be a branch of literary history in the sense of being "événementiel" [7].

The French school's standpoint is to use positivistic method to study the history of international literary relations, including Doxologie, Mesologie, and Crenologie, which are all based on the study of homogeneity. Doxologie studies the travel and influence of a literary phenomenon to foreign literature. Mesologie studies the function of intermediaries and transmitters, such as translators, reviewers, critics, scholars, travelers, or vehicles like books and journals. Crenologie regards writers as recipients and then explores the source of the influences they received. It is a kind of research whose starting point is not clear. Simply, "The French are inclined to favor questions which can be solved on basis of factual evidence" [8]. Therefore the focus of the French school is "scientism" [9] rather than "analogies" [8] of the American school.

The American school with its advocacy of parallel studies and interdisciplinary approach is the second phase of the theoretical development of the discipline. Different from "historical relativism" and "factualism" [9] advocated by the French school, the American school advocates "artistic interpretation and evaluation" [8], which is "beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between literature on the one hand, and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts, philosophy, history, the social sciences, the sciences, religion, etc., on the other" [10]. It is a type of transnational and interdisciplinary comparison. Therefore the American school promotes studies of analogy; it is in fact more concerned about the internal study of literature, namely, the study of the literariness.

Up till now, most scholars of Comparative Literature believe that the French school with its influence studies and the American school with its studies of analogy (parallel studies) provide a solid theoretical foundation for Comparative Literature.

This is not true. Our practice shows that even with these theories of these two schools, there are still serious theoretical defects as well as problems to be solved in the theoretical aspects of this discipline.

The major theoretical defect of the contemporary theories of Comparative Literature lies in the following fact: the issue of the heterogeneity of the comparison is completely ignored. It is quite common for a person without theoretical training of Comparative Literature to believe that both homogeneity and heterogeneity of different literatures are to be sought in the study of Comparative Literature; the comparison is to discover the differences out of similarities and the similarities out of the differences of various literatures. This intuition is actually correct. However, the truth is that homogeneity instead of heterogeneity is sought under the provision of the theories of Comparative Literature both in Europe and America. No matter influence studies or analogy (parallel studies) studies, their purpose is to “seek commonness.” Homogeneity, the identity of the same origin, and analogy, the similarities among literatures of different countries, or between literatures and other subjects, are the respective focus of influence studies and analogy studies.

The heterogeneity in literature of different countries did not and could not escape the attention of European and American scholars, for it only requires common sense and intuition to be conscious of the issue. But from the viewpoint of the theory of Comparative Literature, they believe that differences are not comparable, and it is not meaningful to compare differences. Baldensperger once wrote “no use for comparisons which do not involve ‘a real encounter’ that has ‘created a dependence’” [11]. Weisstein also hesitates to extend the study of parallels to phenomena pertaining to two different civilizations. For it seems to him that “only within a single civilization can one find those common elements of a consciously or unconsciously upheld tradition in thought, feeling, and imagination” [12]. In other words, only within the same civilization, literature in different countries can be compared. Nevertheless, the theoretical model of “seeking commonness” is defective, because in the study of influences by French school and the study of analogy by the American school, there are many heterogeneous factors, which are often more influential than the factors of “homogeneity” and “analogy.”

We must clearly recognize that the basic standpoint of comparability is “homogeneity” and “analogy,” but they are not the only bases of comparability; “Variation” and “heterogeneity” can be compared as well, the comparability of which is the basic standpoint of Variation Theory. Variation is a common fact in the process of communication between different literatures and cultures. What’s more, it is also the basic law for the interaction, integration, and development of culture and civilization. The French school’s greatest defect should be the neglect of the research on Variation in the study of influence. In fact, “seeking Variation” is ignored not only by the French school but by the American school as well, and therefore it is impossible for it to be summarized by either school from the disciplinary perspective. Thus the proposal and emphasis on Variation is the innovation and the point where Variation Theory surpasses its predecessors.

Characteristics of the Study of Influence and Its Dead Ends

The French school advocates using a positivistic approach to study the history of international literary relations, but when a literature travels from one country to another, Variation inevitably arises, which shows there are variations in positivistic relations among international literatures too.

We hold the view that the method of the French school should include two pillars: positivism and Variation. That is to say, the study of influences should include the international literary relations studied from two perspectives: positivisms as well as Variation. For the former, the objects of study include poetry, novels, dramas, as well as other literary forms of different nations. For the latter, the objects of study include translation, linguistic and cultural filtering, and so on. However, the French school paid too much attention to the positivistic research. What is ignored by the French school is not only the possible existence of Variation but also the aesthetic value of literature. Those are the two defects of it. The American school has made up for the absence of literary aesthetics; however, the neglect of Variation has not yet been resolved.

In fact, the issue of “other country’s image” has already been included by the French school, whose essence is the study of the Variation of images. Therefore, the French school has touched upon the study of Variation without being aware of it, not to speak of making theoretical summary.

We can say that early studies of images have already exceeded the scope of positivistic research. The most typical examples are the studies made by Jean-Marie Carré and Marius-Francois Guyard. Carré published *Les écrivains français et le mirage allemand, 1800–1940* in 1947. Guyard’s *La littérature comparée* was the first theoretical study of images. In the book he included a chapter “other countries in our eyes” to discuss the issues of images. Actually, Guyard and Carré started a new direction for research—Imagology. Although the non-positivism of Imagology is not admitted by them, it is obvious that it cannot be carried out with positivistic methods only. In fact, the French school is engaged in non-positivistic studies with the so-called scientific methods. So Imagology studies should not be classified into influence studies of the French school.

In fact, Imagology should be classified within the scope of the study of variations. Its object is another country’s image in one national literature, since another country’s image is a kind of “national illusion” [13], which can only be a thing of Variation instead of being positivistic. For example, Chinese people used to refer to foreigners as “Yang Ren” (people from overseas) and refer to the Japanese as “Guizi” (japs), which constitute nationwide illusions of Chinese people towards foreigners and the Japanese. As Imagology is related to factors of illusions, it is bound to generate variations. From the perspective of Variation, the illusions of the image have also undergone a fundamental change, that is, from the “reproductive imagination” up to “creative imagination,” which is a blend of reproduction both subjective and objective, both emotional and rational. The image of “otherness,” which has undergone a series of reproduction and recreation, is certain to be

changed. It is impossible to apply the scientific and positivistic methods to the research on the complex process of Variation.

Obviously, due to historical, cultural, psychological, and many other factors, literature in the process of communication and exchange is bound to change. The pursuit of influence studies is for “homogeneity,” while the pursuit of Variation studies is “heterogeneity,” which determines the academic significance and historical value of the Variation studies in Comparative Literature.

Characteristics of the Study of Analogy and Its Dead Ends

Many scholars of Comparative Literature thought that the study of analogy was initiated by the American school, but actually it was restored by the American school. We are going to discuss it from the following three aspects:

The first is the negation of the French school to analogy studies. The French school thought that only the research involving “relationship” can be regarded as Comparative Literature; therefore, the study of analogy is excluded from the domain of the discipline. As Marius-Francois Guyard said, “My teacher Jean-Marie Carré, following P. Hazard, and F. Baldensperger, finds where the link disappeared—someone with an article, a work with an environment, a country with a tourist and so on, then the comparison ceased to exist and was replaced by either rhetoric or criticism” [14]. Obviously, the French school excluded analogy studies, which was later restored by the American school.

The second is the reason why the American school advocated the study of analogy. The American school thought that the aesthetic value should be the focus of the study of literature, while the French school failed to do so. Instead, it put too much emphasis on positivism. The study of analogy just rectifies the neglect of the French school towards literary aesthetics. It emphasizes the transnational and interdisciplinary nature of Comparative Literature: comparing the products of different national literatures, comparing between literatures and other subjects, and sorting out the common aesthetic values and the universal laws in literature and literary development.

Finally, the focus of the American school is the study of thematology, typology, stylistics, and so on. Among them, thematology is the study of writers of different countries and their different treatment on the same subject, which includes the research on motif, situation, and image. Moreover, the study of theme is not only included in parallel studies but also in influence studies. Then, which does thematology belong to? Parallel studies or influence studies? In fact, influence studies focuses on external relations of the texts, while analogy studies focuses on the aesthetic nature of the texts. Thematology actually covers the study of these two aspects and is therefore the subject of analogy studies as well as influence studies.

In fact, the American school doesn't exclude influence studies completely, arguing that positivistic studies should be combined with the aesthetic studies, rather than only emphasizing the former as the French school, because the two kinds of

research at some point are not completely separate. This is why the two schools' representatives are involved in each other's studies. For example, both Ulrich Weisstein and Henry H. H. Remak included influence studies in their writings, while French scholar René Etiemble claimed a preference for the combination of influence and analogy studies.

Although analogy studies have made up for some defects of influence studies, there are still some confusions to be clarified. Whether there is a boundary or not in the scope of Comparative Literature is an issue of great importance. René Wellek believed "Comparative Literature can and will flourish only if it shakes off artificial limitations and becomes simply the study of literature" [15]. It is clear that Wellek is inclined to the theory that there is no boundary in Comparative Literature. Remak also proposed a definition that deliberately transgressed boundaries: "Following Remak and the American school, anything could be compared with anything else, regardless even of whether it was literature or not" [16]. On the contrary other scholars have different understandings, such as Ulrich Weisstein. He did not think we should expand the boundaries of discipline, because this will undoubtedly make our object of study too complicated and will not help us develop the comparison of the analogy. His own explanation is such, "carrying colonization that far means, in my opinion, dissipating the very forces that require consolidation; for as comparatists we are not a people lacking space but rather one having too much of it" [17]. Although the scholars of the American school have different opinions, the basic point of their study is to "seek commonness," which is the fundamental foothold of analogy studies. At the same time we must also clearly realize that they failed to recognize the Variation of Comparative Literature. Scholars with conflicting views show that the source of the constant crisis of the discipline is their failure to recognize the fact that heterogeneous civilizations are also comparable.

The differences among American scholars reflect two issues: one is that they can't get out of their usual mode of thinking, that is, "seeking commonness"; the other is that some theoretical problems have aroused the attention of the European and American academia, such as Said's concept of "Orientalism," which involves the perspectives of Variation. Said proposed a greatly sensational notion in the West, which stated that "the Orient was a word which later accrued to it a wide field of meanings, associations and connotations, and that these did not necessarily refer to the real Orient but to the field surrounding the word" [18]. Obviously, Said thought the hegemony of the West has led the West to stand on its own point of view to see the East, but he did not understand that the root of this practice is caused by the heterogeneity of Eastern and Western civilizations. This shows that when American scholars conduct analogy studies, they also ignore the issue of Variation, which is another reason for the absence of Variation Theory in Comparative Literature.

Usually scholars of Comparative Literature think that Variation only exists in influence studies but not in analogy studies. The issue of Variation in analogy studies refers to the variable factors created in the researchers' explication towards the two completely different research objects. Therefore, we believe that in the collision of different civilizations, the heterogeneity of different civilizations will inevitably lead to Variation, which lies in the intersections of the two parties. This is the most

fundamental characteristic of analogy studies. The Variation of discourses is the most typical example in analogy studies, for there is its unique set of discourse respectively in Eastern and Western civilizations. Take Romanticism, for example; the poems of the Lake Poets in the romantic period focus on the spontaneous overflow of emotion, as William Wordsworth put it, "Poetry is the spontaneous overflow of powerful feelings: it takes its origin from emotion recollected in tranquility" [19]. Coleridge, in his "Hymn before Sun-Rise, in the Vale of Chamouni" praises: O sovran Blanc!/The Arve and Arveiron at thy base/Rave ceaselessly;/but thou, most awful form!/Risest from forth thy silent sea of pines,/How silently! Around thee and above [20]. This poem expresses Coleridge's joy and admiration for nature. We can see that expressing personal emotions freely is the focus of Western Romanticism. If it is used as the standard to measure ancient Chinese poetry which also "focuses on emotions," then all ancient Chinese poetry fall into the category of Romanticism. There is a similar definition of poetry given by Bai Juyi: the thing to move one's heart begins with emotion; forms with language; develops with sound; deepens with meaning [21]. In fact, we cannot really apply the theories of Romanticism to the analysis of all Chinese poetry. The reason is explained clearly by Qian Zhongshu: "In contrast to Western poetry, Chinese classical poetry in general is characterized by emotional restraint. When judged by Western principles, Chinese poetry considered to be 'most romantic' is still 'classic.' This is similar to the exchange rates of international currency that different countries' monetary currency does not have the same value. One dollar in A country can only be equal to half a dollar in B country. Westerners are not very familiar with Chinese classical poems, so when making comments they are outsiders only capable of viewing approximation, the similarity but not the difference" [22]. Therefore, we cannot use the Western concept of "Romanticism" to make generalizations about Chinese classical poetry. When we are using the Western theories to explain Chinese literature, though the tools we adopt belong to Western discourse, once it is used to illustrate Chinese literature, it is no longer entirely Western and will certainly generate new things. This is a kind of Variation. This is most exemplified in the method of "illustration" proposed by scholars of Taiwan (discussed more in detailed later).

Cultural Context for Variation Theory

In recent years, increasing attention has been paid to differences, which has become the cutting-edge issue of contemporary scholarship. Therefore the presentation of the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature coincides with this academic trend in the world. At present, Western academia is concerned with the study of differences, and deconstruction is the most typical representative of it. Many scholars believe that deconstruction is a continuation and development of structuralism, but they do not know there is an essential distinction between them. Structuralism is to "seek the common ground," and deconstruction is to "seek the differences." The overall purpose of construction is to pursue common laws, while deconstruction

holds the view that the structure is not what is common and central; it comes from the differences and is determined by the differences. From Derrida's own term of "Difference" (différance), we can see that deconstruction demands for differences. Besides deconstruction, feminism, postcolonialism, post-modernism, and other contemporary Western literary theories are all characterized by deconstruction of the center, highlighting the differences and embracing diversity. In this postmodern context, many Western theoreticians are using deconstruction to interpret contemporary culture. For example, Kristeva, Spivak, Homi Bhabha, and other feminist scholars often conduct the research of Comparative Literature from the perspective of deconstruction. The elucidation on power, discourse, and interpretation of history of poststructuralist Foucault reflects his emphasis on deconstruction too.

All in all, the aim of the cultural theory of post-modernism is no longer the ultimate pursuit of eternal truths, but great importance is attached to a kind of hermeneutics in order to explore the road towards the theory of difference through the collapse of integrity. And the concern about difference has been reflected in Comparative Literature. The shift is mainly reflected in two aspects. One is the Variation on translation issues. Spivak and Susan Bassnett have noted the variations that exist in translation. The second is the Variation in Imagology. Therefore our proposal of Variation Theory is not only in keeping with the tendency of today's academic development, but also constitutes a major breakthrough in theoretical research of Comparative Literature.

In addition, in recent years there has arisen an interest in cross-civilization studies. Samuel Huntington, the director of the Harvard Institute for Political Studies, put forward the theory of "clash of civilizations" and thought it as the decisive force of the post-Cold War world. As Huntington said, "the principal conflicts of global politics will occur between nations and groups of different civilizations. The clash of civilizations will dominate global politics" "The next world war, if there is one, will be a war between civilizations" [23]. His ideas led to a lot of controversy: some scholars believe that only economic interests and national interests are decisive factors to determine the pattern of the world; some other scholars believe that Huntington's view only puts China and the Islamic world in the opposing position to the Western world, seeking certain political interests and economic interests for the United States. Later, the "9/11" incident confirmed to people the correctness of the theory of "clash of civilizations," thus making people begin to attach importance to Huntington's theory.

From the above discussion, we can see today's cutting-edge issues of the academic world are the difference and conflicts between civilizations. In response to the Huntington's theory of "clash of civilizations," Tu Weiming, a scholar of Harvard University wrote *Clash of Civilizations and Dialogue*, which advocates dialogues between different civilizations and proposes that "Confucian ethics can provide resources for global dialogues between civilizations" [24]. Said's postcolonial theory also touched upon the differences among civilizations. He believed that the Orient in the eyes of the Westerners is not really the East, but the distortion and misunderstanding of the East from their own standpoint, which is a result of Western cultural hegemony. The theoretical research of Huntington, Tu Weiming, Said, or

other Western literary theoreticians all touch upon the heterogeneity and the clash of civilizations: “One of the most challenging opportunities for the practice of Comparative Literature lies in the joint consideration and contrast of the several Oriental and Western traditions” [25]. To face today’s cultural trend which is gradually more pluralistic and integrated, the study of Comparative Literature in China should face the conflict between heterogeneous civilizations and conduct the comparison between the West and China, India and China, and the Middle East and China.

We can see that differences have become a core issue in today’s academic research. There are multiplied understandings towards this concept according to different theories, such as structuralism, deconstruction, hermeneutics, translation studies, etc. This can be illustrated by the transition appearing in translation study. The traditional theories of translation stress the process of translation as faithful to the original as possible even if there exist variations of mistranslation and misreading in this process. Nevertheless, the “creative treason” emphasized by Medio-translatology refers to the generation of the new meaning during the process of translation. In fact the development from the traditional theories of translation to Medio-translatology reflects the change of the thinking from “seeking the same” to “seeking the difference,” which is also a new tendency of today’s academia.

Driven by the two trends of deconstruction and cross-civilization studies, theories of Comparative Literature have been developing, and the new theoretical meaning is created at the intersection of the these two trends. It can be said that a focus on difference will be the new trend for future academic interest, which is also the academic background that we put forward in the new theory of Comparative Literature—the Variation Theory.

The Reason for the Shaping of Variation Theory

Our proposal of Variation Theory as a new approach to further study is based on the comprehensive consideration of history, the status quo, and the future of Comparative Literature. First, the proposal of Variation Theory is to solve the problem that there is no definite scope and objectives of Comparative Literature. There is chaos and confusion not only in the Western theories of this discipline but also consequently in some Chinese monographs and textbooks. For example, Mesologie is sometimes completely removed from some Chinese textbooks on Comparative Literature and replaced by Medio-translatology; thematology is grouped either into the scope of influence studies or analogy studies. Moreover, under close scrutiny, there are also variations in the positivistic influence studies, which further highlight the lack of definite scope and objectives of this discipline.

The French school proposes influence studies and promotes the positivistic study of the history of international literary relations, because it is believed that a scientific spirit should be embodied in this discipline. Out of questioning of the positivistic research of the French school, the American school advocates aesthetic elements in analogy studies and believes that Comparative Literature should “face up

to the problem of literariness” [26]. Literariness is the central issue of literary study and aesthetics should be introduced to the construction of the theory of this discipline.

But once literariness and aesthetics integrate into the practice of Comparative Literature, there will appear new problems. The primary approach of the study of the history of international literary relations conducted by the French school is positivism, which is in fact regarded by the American school as a serious defect for it fails to analyze aesthetics. The reason is that “Positivism can be used to prove the factual and scientific laws, but cannot be applied to explain artistic creation and aesthetics of reception of literature” [27]. Since influence studies and analogy studies focus on external and internal research of literature, respectively, the attempts of influence studies to reveal the inside from the outside are certainly in vain. Therefore, influence studies is considered to discover an “elusive and mysterious mechanism, through which a work generates influence on another work” [28]. Even Carré who has been stressing positivistic studies also admits, “Perhaps there has been too great a proclivity toward influence studies. These are difficult to manage and often deceptive, since one sometimes deals with imponderables” [29].

Therefore, once there is the involvement of literary aesthetics, influence studies cannot be limited to a simple historical relationship between different literatures. However, at present in a number of textbooks on Comparative Literature, the relationship between the historical study and the aesthetic study has not yet been sorted out. In fact we should divide positivistic study and aesthetic study as two independent fields: the former is the external study on the history of the relationship of different literatures and the latter is the internal study on the aesthetic values in the field of Variation Theory.

Secondly, our proposal of Variation Theory is based on our observation of the history of the development of literature. From the historical point of view, whenever there is a collision of heterogeneous civilizations, in the literary scene there will appear interaction, Variation, and integration among different literatures and even a generation of a new kind of literature. Consequently, literature of this period generally assumes a diversified outlook. The most typical example is the Chinese literature during the Wei, Jin, and Southern and Northern Dynasties. Although this period is characterized by social unrest and frequent wars, the social turmoil actually hastens the exchange and integration of the literatures between the South and the North of China. Moreover, the entry of Buddhist culture from India also stimulates the creativity of China’s native literature. Therefore in the long history of Chinese literature, the literary creation and literary theories of Southern and Northern Dynasties have reached an unprecedented peak. The reason is that the exchange of heterogeneous cultures can activate the intrinsic factors of the two conflicting parties so that in certain conditions these factors can be stimulated to either extend or maintain their own culture, and there will be a series of variations within the cultural mechanism. The variations within the literary or cultural system will be the creative factors to promote literary development. The Variation in literary tradition caused by external heterogeneous factors is a rather complex process, but it can give a strong push to the development of the local literature to become a model for future literature. In this sense the study on the phenomenon of literary variations should be one of the primary perspectives of Comparative Literature.

Finally, the last reason for our proposal of Variation Theory is that our current study of Comparative Literature has changed from the stage of “seeking the same” to “seeking the difference.” The comparative study carried out by the French school and the American school is within the same circle of civilization and from the old mode of thinking without contrast of difference among heterogeneous civilizations. Both schools emphasize the positivistic paradigm within single civilization. However, when we project our vision to different civilizations we will discover there are more variations in expressions or concepts than some common fundamental literary rules. As for the Variation among heterogeneous civilizations, we should jump out of the paradigm of “seeking the same” and redefine the scope and objectives of Comparative Literature using heterogeneity and Variation as the starting point. In this regard the proposal of Variation Theory can be said to be undoubtedly a good embodiment of the shift of the research paradigm.

Based on the above three aspects, the proposal of Variation Theory is not only to regulate the scope and the objectives of Comparative Literature but also is in agreement with the paradigm of cross-civilization. Therefore Variation Theory is initiated with solid theoretical and practical basis.

Based on the above thinking, I first proposed Variation Theory at the Eighth Annual Conference of Chinese Comparative Literature in 2005. There have been hot discussions among scholars after my proposal. In *The Study of Comparative Literature* published by Sichuan University Press, I made a new structure of the theory of Comparative Literature, different from the popular way of the combination of the French school and the American school as two parallel theoretical models. Literary Crossing, Literary Relationship, Literary Variation, and General Literature are included as the four main categories to describe the scope and the objectives of Comparative Literature. Positivistic study is grouped into Literary Relationship. Mesologie, Imagology, and Reception are grouped into Literary Variation [30].

Prior to this, some Chinese scholars have noticed the phenomena of variations in literary study. For example, Yan Shaodang, a professor at Peking University, proposed the study on “variants” in Japanese literature. Xie Tianzhen, a professor at Fudan University, raised a new branch of Comparative Literature—Medio-translatology. Both scholars paid attention to the variations in the spread of literature, but they didn’t make further analysis and summary to this phenomenon. It is from the perspective of construction of the discipline that we first proposed Variation Theory with a detailed description of its scope and objectives. In this sense it is also of great significance to the further development and construction of the theory of Comparative Literature.

Heterogeneity: The Core Concept of Variation Theory and the Basis of Comparability

As we all know, focus and concern on the difference has become the prevailing way of academic thinking at present. However, there is so far not a timely response from the discipline of Comparative Literature to this trend. So Variation Theory might be a possible remedy for this defect.

Variation Theory is an area to be developed in the future study of Comparative Literature. Although the French school has repeatedly stressed the positivism of influence studies, in the process of the “travel” of literature and literary theory, there is inevitable loss and distortion of information. This kind of positivistic study failed to take the variations into account, which is therefore unscientific. In this sense the theoretical defect of the French school must be addressed first.

For scholars who are engaged in theoretical research of Comparative Literature, it will be inevitable for them to face conflicts between heterogeneous civilizations of the East and the West. Though Chinese scholars have been advocating the research on different cultures, some of them have still not grasped the rule of the comparison among heterogeneous cultures and sought only “the sameness,” ignorant of the “difference.” Moreover, some Chinese scholars take the Western theories as universal truth and apply them blindly to interpret Chinese literature. This neglect of the heterogeneity between Chinese culture and western culture leads to the occurrence of the phenomenon of the pattern of X + Y (the random and superficial comparison without consideration of the comparability of the two) and becomes therefore the biggest problem of Chinese comparative studies.

The above discussion tells us that the study of Comparative Literature should not only concern the common rules behind literary phenomena, but also needs to discover the heterogeneity of civilizations. Some French, American, and Chinese scholars only focus on the former instead of paying sufficient attention to the latter. In fact, if we want to promote the study of Comparative Literature further, we should pay more attention to difference and do more research on heterogeneity raised by Variation Theory.

The proposal of Variation Theory is a conceptual change in terms of the construction of the discipline, which enables the study of Comparative Literature to transform from seeking homogeneity to seeking heterogeneity. In other words, not only homogeneity and affinity but also Variation and heterogeneity should be the focus of the Variation Theory. Only when these four aspects are systematically combined together will the discipline of Comparative Literature be satisfactorily constructed. Today, we propose that heterogeneity is the basis of comparability of Comparative Literature, which is undoubtedly an important shift in the construction of the discipline.

Why would heterogeneity become the basis for the comparability of Comparative literature? This is the first issue that needs to be addressed. In the past all the comparisons are made to seek the “commonness.” Are things of heterogeneity comparable? What is the basis for the comparison? These are some questions that need to be answered too.

With the popularity of research on cross-civilization as the general current context of Comparative Literature, the study of analogy studies is still confined in the same circle of one civilization. The heterogeneous factors of different civilizations are not explored, for it is believed that the gap of the difference among the heterogeneous civilizations is too big, and it is impossible for such a kind of comparison to be done. This is a quite common assertion held by many Western scholars including Weisstein. However, in practice such a kind of comparison has always been in

existence. The only problem is that we are not in full awareness of the comparability of differences and fail to offer the appropriate solution to it.

Chinese scholars are used to applying Western theories and viewing it as universally applicable truth without knowing what their “roots” are in the West, and problems are inevitably arising if they are not combined with the “soil” of Chinese culture. When we are introducing Western theories, they should not be treated as absolute truth, the heterogeneity of which with our Chinese culture cannot be ignored. As we all know, the practical meaning of the interaction among heterogeneous civilizations lies in the fact that they are complementary and in reference to each other. Therefore the highlighting of heterogeneity is conducive to communication and integration between different civilizations and more conducive for us in constructing a “harmonious world without uniformity,” which is the ultimate goal of the study of Variation Theory. Of course, the connotation of this theory and from what perspective we should learn about it will be further illustrated in the following parts.

Variation Theory: Reintegration of Contemporary Theories of Comparative Literature

Since Variation Theory is one of the indispensable areas of Comparative Literature, it is necessary to clarify its status and its relationship to other research areas within the whole theoretical framework of the discipline.

First, we need to make a further clarification of the main features of Comparative Literature. For the French school with its initiation of influence studies, the scope and objective of Comparative Literature is the study of the history of international literary relations, which undoubtedly narrows down the research area of Comparative Literature. For the American school with its analogy studies, the scope and content of the discipline has been expanded into Comparative Literature which transgresses “boundaries” [16] and becomes “the study of the literary or of literary scholarship” [31]. As for Chinese scholars who proposed cross-civilization studies, the scope and objective of the discipline is with a clearer sense of cultural consciousness compared with the previous two schools. So we can see, in every stage, different scholars have different perceptions towards the features of Comparative Literature. On this basis, at present most comparatists in China try to put all these three opinions together to build up their theory of Comparative Literature, but they fail to address the issue of the main features of the discipline, which are still left to be specified.

So, how should we define the main features of Comparative Literature? Taking the comprehensive views of the three stages of development into account, we can summarize the features as crossing and literariness.

The first feature is the core of Comparative Literature—crossing. It refers to the comparative study that is crossing different civilizations in order to sort out “the core poetics” of human culture. Not only as a broad view and perspective, crossing also embodies the features commonly highlighted by the transnational research of the French school, the interdisciplinary research of the American school, and the

cross-cultural research advocated by the Chinese scholars. With the embodiment of Comparative Literature's characteristics such as openness, interdiscipline, and pioneering, crossing also exemplifies the ideal of Comparative Literature to explore and pursue "the core" of human literature with a worldwide vision.

The second feature is literariness. This shows the study of Comparative Literature is inseparable from literary studies. The American school criticized the French school for its positivistic studies and lack of focusing on literariness. However, with the development of the discipline and the rise of cultural studies, Comparative Literature has tended to move closer to cultural studies and has even been threatened to be replaced. With this tendency, as Jonathan Culler puts it, Comparative Literature is becoming "the study of cultural productions or discourses of all sorts" [32]. If this trend continued, Comparative Literature would slip to the boundless literary study, whose study objects would cover all disciplines, thus leading to a loss of specific content and scope of itself. However, without the emphasis on literariness, the study of Comparative Literature is also bound to lack aesthetic value.

Thus, crossing and literariness are not only the main features of Comparative Literature, they also decide the scope of this discipline. Variation Theory is established on the basis of these two features and is the combination of the studies on crossing and aesthetics. Because it effectively combines these two basic features, it has become the stable field of research. Compared with the emphasis put on the history of international literary relations by the French school, Variation Theory pays attention not only to the literary Variation of factual contact but to the literary Variation without an actual link. Compared with analogy studies of the American school, Variation Theory focuses more on heterogeneity of aesthetics. Therefore, with a broader view Variation Theory is the further integration of all contemporary theories of this discipline.

Based on the previous discussion, we can define the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature like this: on the basis of crossing and literariness, the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature is the study on variations of the literary phenomena of different countries with or without factual contact as well as the comparative study on the heterogeneity and variability of different literary expressions in the same subject area so as to achieve the goal of exploring the patterns of intrinsic differences and variability.

On this basis, we can re-regulate the contemporary theories of Comparative Literature. The study of the influences is divided into the positivistic study on influence and the study on Variation of influence. Meanwhile, the study of the parallels is divided into the research on parallels of homogeneity and heterogeneity, respectively. And on the basis of this we can re-construct the theoretical system of Comparative Literature. *The Course of Comparative Literature* (Shunqing Cao as editor-in-chief) published by China Higher Education Press in 2006, was an attempt at such. Since this book is available to interested readers, I will not make any further elaboration on it here.

The Scope and Objectives of Variation Theory

After explaining the reasons for initiating Variation Theory, we should have a clear definition of the research scope of Comparative Literature according to this theory. This will be explained in the following five aspects.

The first aspect is the Variation of literary phenomena across different nations. The typical example is the study on the Variation of image, also known as Imagology. The study of image was first included by Guyard as a chapter in his *La Littérature Comparée*. Guyard holds the view that Imagology “opens a new research direction” [33]. Wellek, however, views Imagology as a “social psychology and cultural history” [34], whose opinion thus denies Guyard’s efforts. Later, Imagology has gradually become a branch of Comparative Literature. Imagology focuses on the study of the images of foreign countries—the “national illusion” [35], images of another country in the literary form. Because it is just a kind of illusion, so it naturally undergoes a series of variations. The focus of Imagology should be on the variations generated in the process of imagination and the analysis of the possible rules from deeper cultural patterns.

The second aspect is the Variation of literary phenomena across different languages. It mainly refers to the whole process of the travel of literary phenomena by means of translation, across the language barriers and the eventual reception by the recipients. The typical example of it is Medio-translatology. Nowadays Medio-translatology is grouped into the research area of Mesologie in many Chinese textbooks on Comparative Literature, but actually it involves many linguistic and cultural variations; therefore, this classification is not appropriate: “Though Medio-translatology originally uses the method of Mesologie as its basis, nowadays it focuses more and more on the study of translation (especially literary translation) from the perspective of cultural comparison” [36]. The study of Medio-translatology has shifted from the traditional emphasis on “Faithfulness, Smoothness, and Elegance” to the present foregrounding of “Creative Treason.” Furthermore, there is another transformation in Medio-translatology: from the previous positivism to the study of literary variations under the perspective of culture. In other words, the present Medio-translatology has gone beyond the traditional Mesologie; therefore, we should be more concerned about the variations of words and literature in the process of translation instead of the initial focus on the accuracy of the translation of words.

The third aspect is the Variation on the level of literary texts. The typical example is cultural misreading and literary reception. Since literary texts are the starting point of Comparative Literature, the possible variations of the literary texts in circulation may become the object of the discipline. The Variation of the literary texts refers first to the phenomenon of literary reception in the actual interaction. Literary reception is nowadays a hot research field, as Yves Cherel puts it, “At the moment this study is of great development with privilege in the literary system” [37]. Although some textbooks in China have started to address the issue of literary reception, reception study has up to now no clear theoretical position. So far there is no answer to the questions like how to understand the relationship between

literary reception and influence studies and what are the similarities and differences between them. In order to understand what literary reception is, we can start from the perspective of Variation Theory and the theory of Cultural Reception. Different from the positivistic research of literary relationship, literary reception is mixed with elements of aesthetics and psychological factors, thus belonging to the scope of literary Variation. Secondly, the scope of this research also includes thematology and typology, which initially belong to analogy studies. Though the scope of these two sub-branches of Comparative Literature is different, they do share one common feature: “homogeneity” and “affinities”—the real pursuit of both the French and the American schools. But actually in the traditional research of these two fields, the Variation of themes and types has been inevitably involved. Especially in the study across heterogeneous civilizations, there are more differences than similarities of themes and types. Therefore, our target is changed to “discover the differences as well as the similarities” [38]. Through the study on literary themes and types of different civilizations, we can carry out much more effectively the dialogues between heterogeneous civilizations and draw out the universal rules of human literature.

The fourth aspect is the Variation on the level of culture. The typical example is cultural filtering. Literature has to face the different frameworks when it travels through different cultural systems, which is, as Wai-Lim Yip put it, “the heterogeneity of cultural molds and the heterogeneity of literature resulting from it” [39]. It is the issue comparatists have to face, and it is inevitable for the Variation caused by heterogeneous cultural molds to appear, among which cultural filtering is most typical. In the process of literature’s travel from its origin to the recipient, cultural filtering refers to the changes such as selection, deletion, and innovation made by the recipient, based on its own cultural background, towards the original literature. It is easy for us to confuse the cultural filtering and cultural reception. In order to distinguish these two concepts, we need to understand that the key point is the fact that cultural filtering refers to the phenomena of Variation caused by different “molds” instead of simple reception of the subject. At the same time, cultural filtering results in another obvious literary Variation—literary misreading, which refers to the phenomena that appear when literary phenomena travel across heterogeneous cultural circles after cultural filtering. So what is the relationship between cultural filtering and literary misreading? What are the rules of the literary variations? These questions are supposed to be the main issue to be addressed.

The last aspect is the Variation on the level of civilization. The typical example is the dialogues among civilizations and the Variation of discourses. To literary works the “theory” is a “discourse,” and literary theory is the discourse of literary works. Therefore, we can apply the “Traveling Theories” to the interpretation of “Variation of Discourse.” When one theory travels from one country to another, the theoretical discourse is bound to undergo Variation. Contemporary theories have mostly traveled from the West to the East. Once one theory arrives in China, it usually undergoes two kinds of Variation. On the one hand, China borrows completely the lineage of knowledge from the western theories. In other words, modern Chinese literary theories are westernized, which eventually leads to the state of “aphasia.” On the other hand, many western theories have undergone variations too, namely,

Sinicization [40]. As for the tendency of the Sinicization of western theories, many scholars believe that when Chinese scholars are introducing and applying western theories, they should combine the needs of Chinese circumstances with the inheritance of our cultural tradition, adopt, and select the western theories from the perspective of Chinese traditional literary theories, on the basis of which to promote the development of Chinese literary theories to provide a fundamental solution to the problem of “aphasia.”

In addition, in order to understand “Western Literary Theory in China,” we should first understand the law of “domestic appropriation” of literary theories. In the context of different civilizations, when one culture encounters another one, the culture at the receiving side of communication will adopt, select, and filter the culture at the source, which is inevitably marked with the imprint of the recipient culture. This means that when western theories spread to China, Chinese culture will be certainly imprinted on them. Second, to achieve the real Sinicization, Western theories need to be combined with our Chinese traditional culture and the indigenous way of Chinese literary discourses. We need to discover the valuable aspects of those western theories in order to promote the self-construction of Chinese literary theories.

Now we move back to the issue of the Variation of discourse across civilizations. When we mention the Variation of discourse, the typical example is Illumination Method proposed by Chinese scholars. Chinese scholars used to apply western theories to interpret works of Chinese literature, which to some extent resulted in the Variation of both western theories and Chinese literary works. In this regard, we could understand this issue from two aspects: On the one hand, the application of western literary theories enables us to arrive at a new interpretation of Chinese literary works. For example, the theories of Romanticism have been applied to explain Li Bai and Qu Yuan, while the theories of Realism have been used to interpret Du Fu and Bai Juyi. The application of western theories in understanding Chinese literary works generates Variation in Chinese literature. On the other hand, when western theories are employed in the understanding of Chinese literature, they themselves undergo inevitable changes too. For example, when we apply Romantic theories to the analysis of the poems of Li Bai and Qu Yuan, these theories have undergone changes. Before being introduced into China, the Lake Poets, who are the representative writers of Romanticism, proposed the spontaneous overflow of strong feelings in poetry writing. But when Romanticism is applied to analyze Chinese literature, imagination and exaggeration are highlighted. Therefore, there was Variation on both sides when western theories encountered Chinese literature. The Method of Illumination was proposed on the basis of the observation of the appearance of variations in the process of using western theories to interpret Chinese literature. This method argues that we can also use Chinese literature to test the western literary theories. This process shows that Chinese scholars have recognized the heterogeneity among different civilizations, and there is the possibility for heterogeneous civilizations to interpret each other. This is the breakthrough of Variation Theory of Chinese Comparative Literature towards the research of cross-civilization.

All the five aspects jointly form the applicability of Variation Theory. Of course, as a totally new perspective of this discipline, a lot of questions require further inquiry and exploration. But what is certain is that the proposal of the scope of Variation Theory will be of great significance to the clarification of the content and scope of Comparative Literature and the solution of the crisis of the discipline.

Variation Theory: The Important Breakthrough of Comparative Literature

Although the French school proposed influence studies, the American school proposed analogy studies, it is still obvious to us that the whole theoretical system of Comparative Literature is far from complete. As a new perspective and method, the proposal of the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature will be therefore a major breakthrough. It opens a new stage in the course of the development of comparative theory—the research focusing on heterogeneity and Variation. This theory not only highlights the differences among various civilizations but also promotes the dialogues and exchanges of civilizations, giving rise to a new era of human history of literature.

From the homogeneity to heterogeneity to Variation, the theoretical exploration goes deeper and further. The Variation Theory is not only the most valuable branch of Comparative Literature but an innovative approach to study the whole human culture. Therefore the Variation Theory proposed by a Chinese scholar is a great innovation and push to Chinese comparative theories and will exert great influence and add value to the development of Comparative Literature in the world.

References

1. Shunqing Cao. 2001. Three stages in the development of comparative literary theories. *Comparative Literature in China* 3: 1–17.
2. Shunqing Cao, and Li Weitao. 2006. The research field of literary variation in comparative literature. *Fudan Journal (Social Sciences Edition)* 1: 79–83.
3. Baldensperger, Fernand. 1921. Littérature comparée: Le Mot et la chose. *Revue de Littérature Comparée* 1: 1–29, 7. (*Comparative literature: The word and the thing*, Cited in English in Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 7. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press).
4. Van Tieghem, Paul. 1931. *La Littérature Comparée*, 21. Paris: Armand Colin. Au Contraire, le caractère de la vraie littérature comparée, comme celui de toute science historique, est d’embrasser le plus grand nombre possible de faits différents d’origine, pour mieux expliquer chacun d’eux; d’élargir les bases de la connaissance afin de trouver les causes du plus grand nombre possible d’effets. Bref, le mot comparé doit être vidé de toute valeur esthétique, et recevoir une valeur scientifique.
5. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1951. *La Littérature Comparée*, 5. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. l’histoire des relations littératures internationaux. (Cited in English in Wellek. 1970.

- The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations*, 16. New Haven/London: Yale University Press).
6. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1951. *La Littérature Comparée*, 5. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. Une branche de l'histoire littéraire; elle est l'étude des relations spirituelles internationales, des rapports de fait qui ont existé entre Byron et Pouchkine, Goethe et Carlyle, Walter Scott et Vigny, entre les oeuvres, les inspirations, voire les vies d'écrivains appartenant à plusieurs littératures. (Cited in English in Wellek. 1970. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations*, 16. New Haven/London: Yale University Press).
 7. Etiemble, René. *Comparaison n'est pas raison: La crise de la littérature comparée*. Paris: Gallimard.
 8. Remak, Henry. 1971. Comparative literature: Its definition and function. In *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*, ed. Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz, 2. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
 9. Wellek, René. 1963. The crisis of comparative literature. In *Concepts of criticism*, 282–296, 282. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 10. Remak, Henry. 1971. Comparative literature: Its definition and function. In *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*, ed. Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz, 1. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
 11. Baldensperger, Fernand. 1921. Littérature compare: Le Mot et la chose. *Revue de littérature comparée* 1: 1–29, 7. Une recontre réelle...crée une dépendance. (Cited in English in Wellek. 1970. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations*, 16. New Haven/London: Yale University Press).
 12. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 7. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
 13. Moura, Jean-Marc. 1992. L'imagologie Littérature: Essai de mise au point historique et critique. *Revue de littérature comparée* 3: 271–287.
 14. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1951. *La Littérature Comparée*, 1. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
 15. Wellek, René. 1970. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations*, 20. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 16. Bassnett, Susan. 1993. *Comparative literature: A critical introduction*, 32. Malden: Blackwell.
 17. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 27. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
 18. Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*, 203. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
 19. Wordsworth, William. 2003. Preface to lyrical ballads. In *The Cambridge companion to Wordsworth*, ed. Stephen Charles Gill, 109. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
 20. Coleridge, Samuel Taylor. 1996. In *Samuel Taylor Coleridge selected poems*, ed. Richard Holmes, 149. New York: Penguin Books.
 21. Bai Juyi. 2001. Letter to Yuanjiu. In *Selection of Chinese literary theories*, vol. 2, ed. Shaoyu Guo, 96. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Publishing House.
 22. Qian Zhongshu. 1979. *Four old essays*, 14–15. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Publishing House.
 23. Huntington, Samuel P. 2003. *The clash of civilizations and the remaking of world order*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
 24. Tu Weiming. 2001. In *Clash of civilizations and dialogue*, ed. Hanmin Zhu and Yongming Xiao, 13–15. Changsha: Hunan University Press.
 25. Stallknecht, Newton P., and Horst Frenz (eds.). 1971. *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*, xi. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Press.
 26. Wellek, René. 1963. The crisis of comparative literature. In *Concepts of criticism*, 282–296, 293. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 27. Chen Sihe. 2001. Viewpoints toward “global elements” in the study of China/Foreign literary relations of 20th century. *Comparative Literature in China* 1: 8–39, 18.
 28. Brunel, P., Cl. Pichois, and A.M. Rousseau. 1983. *Qu'est-Ce Que La Littérature Comparée?* 53. Paris: Armand Colin Editeur. “Les influences proprement dites peuvent être définies

- comme le mécanisme subtil et mystérieux par lequel une oeuvre contribue à en faire naître une autre”.
29. Guyard, Marius-François. 1951. *La Littérature Comparée*, 6. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France (Cited in English in Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 5. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press).
 30. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *The study of comparative literature*, 1–3. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
 31. Wellek, René. 1963. The crisis of comparative literature. In *Concepts of criticism*, 282–296, 290. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 32. Jonathan Culler. 1995. Comparative literature, at last! In *Comparative literature in the age of multiculturalism*, ed. Charles Bernheimer, 117. Baltimore/London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
 33. Guyard, Marius-François. 1983. *La Littérature Comparée*, 107. Trans. YanBao. Beijing: Peking University Press.
 34. Wellek, René. 1963. The crisis of comparative literature. In *Concepts of criticism*, 282–296, 285. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 35. Wellek, René. 1970. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations*, 18. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
 36. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 1. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Publishing House.
 37. Yves Chevrel. 1991. *La Littérature Comparée*, 53. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France. De telles études, actuellement en plein développement, privilégient la notion de système littéraire.
 38. Zhang Longxi. 1986. Professor Qian Zhongshu talks about la Littérature Comparée and ‘la Comparaison de la Littérature’. In *Essays in comparative literature*, ed. Comparative Literature Section Chinese Department Beijing Normal University, 94. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
 39. Yip, Wai-lim. 1986. In *In search of common poetics between Chinese and Western cultures—Selected comparative literature studies of Wai-lim Yip*, ed. Wen Rumin and LiXiyao, 3. Beijing: Peking University Press.
 40. Shunqing Cao and Tan Jia. 2004. Another effective way of the reconstruction of Chinese discourses for literary criticism: Sinicization of Western literary theories: 120–126. *Foreign Literature Studies* 5; Shunqing Cao and Li Fusheng. 2004. A new perspective of the reconstruction of Chinese discourses for literary criticism: 8–15. *Criticism and Creation* 4; Shunqing Cao. 2005. The domestic appropriation of literary theories and sinicization of Western literary theories: 8–11. *Journal of Xiang Tan University (Philosophy & Social Sciences)* 5.

Chapter 1

Major Contributions of Influence Study and Its Weaknesses

Comparative Literature (CL), as an independent discipline, did not appear until the 1870s in Europe, and the situation of its rise was very complicated. It was held that Comparative Literature was introduced first by French scholars, which turned out not to be the case for the following reasons: The first monograph on Comparative Literature was not written by the French, but by an Irish scholar, Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett. The founder of the first magazine of Comparative Literature was Hugo von Meltzl de Lomnitz, a Transylvanian. Ten years later, a second journal of Comparative Literature was founded by a German. It is well recognized that Johann Wolfgang von Goethe was the first person in the world who proposed the concept of Comparative Literature. Meanwhile, scholars in Russia, Britain, Italy, and other European countries all had their own contributions on the development of Comparative Literature. Therefore, the complication of the beginning of the discipline deserves careful examination, which will be done in the rest of this chapter.

Section 1.1 of this chapter gives an overview of the basic historical facts of Comparative Literature from its inception, and Sect. 1.2 discusses the French school's disciplinary theories, which serves as preparation for the further discussion in the following chapters.

1.1 The Origins of Comparative Literature in Europe and Its Dead Ends

1.1.1 *The Beginning of Comparative Literature in Europe*

Comparative Literature, as an independent institution, came into being in the 1870s in Europe, with the gradual establishment of disciplinary theories, the growing maturity of research methods, the emergence of academic groups, as well as the publication of monographs and periodicals.

Firstly, the publication of periodicals on Comparative Literature marked the beginning of the discipline. In 1877, Hugo von Meltzl de Lomnitz (1846–1908), a Transylvanian Hungarian, published “Acta Comparationis Litterarum Universarum,” which was a multiple-language journal introducing the literatures in major European countries or the other literatures outside Europe. In 1887, Marx Koch (1855–1931), a German scholar, founded the world’s first journal of truly Comparative Literature named “Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte”; in 1901, he also founded the “Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte.” These two periodicals, whether in editorial ideas or practice, are of groundbreaking significance in the establishment and development of Comparative Literature, seen as the beginning of European Comparative Literature.

Secondly, the publication of the theoretical works on Comparative Literature also marked the beginning of European Comparative Literature. In 1886, Hutcheson Macaulay Posnett, an Irish scholar, published the first theoretical monograph of Comparative Literature, named *Comparative Literature*, which means that the era of Comparative Literature had officially begun [1]. In his book, Posnett emphasized that both the intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of the literary development were relatively the objective of the comparative study [2], which actually outlined the initial contour of influence studies and analogy studies of Comparative Literature.

Thirdly, the fact that Comparative Literature became a course at college also marked the beginning of the European Comparative Literature. In 1870, Alexander N. Veselovsky (Александр Николаевич Веселовский, 1838–1906), a Russian scholar, gave lectures on the general literature at St. Petersburg University; in 1871, Francesco Sanctis (1817–1883), an Italian scholar, chaired *Litteratura Comparata* in Naples; at the same year, Charles Shackford (1815–1895) established a lecture on the general literature and Comparative Literature at Cornell University in the United States; during 1887–1889, Charles Mills Gayley began a “comparative literary criticism” seminar at Michigan University; during 1890–1891, Arthur Marsh opened the first American Comparative Literature Seminar at Harvard University; in 1892, French scholar Joseph Texte, a student of Pierre Brunel, founded in Université de Lyon a seminar named “Littérature allemande depuis la Renaissance jusqu’à la littérature française.” Later on, in European countries, a variety of lectures and courses on Comparative Literature had been introduced. As a result, Comparative Literature, as a discipline, had officially become a permanent course with a clear theoretical guidance and research methodology in higher education.

Driven and influenced by these formal academic lectures, an international literary conference was held in Paris in 1900, officially including the comparative study of the history of national literatures into the conference topics and discussions. The conference also proposed the establishment of the International Comparative Literature Association to promote and facilitate the development of Comparative Literature.

Fourthly, dissertations, monographs, and bibliographies of Comparative Literature marked the beginning of the European Comparative Literature, too. In 1895, Joseph Texte completed the first French monograph on Comparative Literature, which was also the first dissertation in the field of Comparative Literature, entitled

J.-J. Rousseau et Les Origines du Cosmopolitisme Littéraire. In 1895, Louis Paul Betz (1861–1903) completed his doctoral dissertation, *Heine in Frankreich*. In 1900, Betz compiled *La Littérature Comparée: Essai Bibliographique*, which had a collection of more than 2,000 entries of Comparative Literature terms. Danish literary critic Georg Brandes (1842–1927) also completed his monumental work in Comparative Literature, *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature* (1872–1890). In addition, in 1894, Gustave Lanson published *Histoire de la Littérature Française*, which established his status in the French literary studies. In 1904, Frédéric Loliée published *A Short History of Comparative Literature: From the Earliest Times to the Present*. Methodologically, Lanson's and Loliée's works and their research practice had great influence on the formation of the French school.

These historical events have shown that as an independent discipline, the establishment and formation of Comparative Literature apparently could be traced back to the late nineteenth century. But the systematic and fruitful research did not flourish until France became the center of the theoretical research of the discipline.

1.1.2 Comparative Literature in Britain

The sprout of British Comparative Literature as a discipline can be traced back as early as the eighteenth century. In the 1830s, the most influential figure in the disciplinary history was Henry Hallam (1777–1859). He published *Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth and Seventeenth Centuries* during 1837–1839. After that, it is Matthew Arnold who gave the most comprehensive discussion on Comparative Literature in the United Kingdom. In his masterpiece *Culture and Anarchy* (1869), he, skillfully taking advantage of the comparative approach, not only compared the similarities and differences between the concepts of culture and civilization and distinguished the different relationships between three different classes and cultures but also compared the respective impacts of the two traditional spirits on the national character so as to establish a solid foundation for the maturation of British Comparative Literature.

In 1886, H. M. Posnett (1855–1927) published *Comparative Literature*, which is regarded as the first monograph on the theory of Comparative Literature, which marked that British Comparative Literature, as a discipline, had officially come into being. In 1900, Posnett also issued an essay entitled “The Science of Comparative Literature,” which further strengthened his position as a critic, the first person who carefully deliberated the “methods and principles” of Comparative Literature, and insisted on the unified relationship between the “comparative” and “historical.” In 1921, Fernand Baldensperger was invited to deliver eight lectures on eighteenth-century European literature in Aberystwyth University of Wales. Thereafter, Comparative Literature, as a discipline, was formally recognized in the English academic society. Thus, the year 1921 was a memorable time for the academic society of English Comparative Literature. During World War II, studies of Comparative Literature came to a halt in the British literary society until the emergence of studies of Comparative Literature.

1.1.3 *Comparative Literature in Germany*

The history of German Comparative Literature can be traced back to the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. With comparative methods, Gotthold Ephraim Lessing (1729–1781) discussed the European dramas in his masterpiece, *Hamburgische Dramaturgie*.

In the latter half of the eighteenth century, Johann Gottfried von Herder (1744–1803) was a key figure in German Comparative Literature. In a series of works on literary aesthetics, he explicitly put forward, for the first time, the literary concepts of historicism and totalitarianism. He compiled *On the Influence of Poetry on the Customs of People* (1778), which collected the folk songs from other ethnic groups including the German, the British, the French, the Spanish, the Italian, the Greek, the Danish, the Icelandic, the Swedish, and the Polish, and was the first anthology of “World Literature.” The cosmopolitanism dealt with national literature equally, which, in a way, gave birth to Goethe’s vision on “world literature.”

The contribution of Johann Wolfgang von Goethe (1749–1832) to Comparative Literature is of great significance. In his conversation with Johann Peter Eckermann, he made a number of comparative studies. Referring to a legendary Chinese novel, *Hao Kiou Chooan, or The Pleasing History*, he held that the Chinese people thought, acted, and felt almost exactly the same way as Europeans did; and Europeans would soon find that they were perfectly like the Chinese, except that the Chinese actions were more clear, more pure, and more decorous than theirs [3]. More importantly, in 1827, Goethe proposed accordingly the concept of “Weltliteratur,” which pointed out that literature would have the dual nature of global and national identity; when the national literature became part of the world literature, the national literature would be the spiritual wealth enjoyed by all mankind. The concept of “world literature” expressed that Goethe’s hope that all the national literatures would be open to each other and exchange ideas from each other, which illustrated his vision: One day, all the national literatures could be combined into a unified and interconnected whole, which inspired the early research of Comparative Literature and was of great significance to the study of Comparative Literature all over the world.

Before 1887, the German scholars’ efforts in the study of Comparative Literature did not generate any important outcome, until Marx Koch (1855–1931) founded the periodical “*Zeitschrift für die Vergleichende Literaturwissenschaft*,” which not only marked the official beginning of Comparative Literature in Germany but also marked the beginning of the disciplinary history of European Comparative Literature. The Preface, written by Koch for the periodical, marked the turning point in Comparative Literature studies in Germany and revealed two goals of the periodical: The first is to discuss briefly the criticism of German Comparative Literature and its history, and the second is to specialize German Comparative Literature so as to shake off the fact that the study of Comparative Literature was always regarded as a tributary of the study of the literary history. These two goals were also the basic program of “*Zeitschrift für vergleichende Literaturgeschichte*” (1887–1910) and its sister scholarly series “*Studien zur vergleichenden Literaturgeschichte*” (1901–1909),

which Koch summed up into six aspects: art of translation; the history of the literary forms and themes and literary impacts across national boundaries; the history of thoughts; the relationships between the political history and the literary history; the links between literature and arts, and philosophy and literary development, etc.; and the folklore which has been always been neglected in the past and now finally has been paid due attention. These perspectives not only were related to influence studies and parallel studies of Comparative Literature but touched upon interdisciplinary research, which, therefore, opened up a broad field for the study of Comparative Literature. These two periodicals ceased publication respectively in 1909 and in 1910. Thereafter, German Comparative Literature gradually came to stagnation. Especially in the Third Reich period, the Germanistic became an impressive academic discipline, so the status of the Comparative Literature became less important.

1.1.4 Comparative Literature in Italy

Strictly speaking, Italian Comparative Literature began in 1861, when Francesco Sanctis (1817–1883) held a lecture on the history of Comparative Literature at the University of Naples. The lecture marked the beginning of Comparative Literature as a university course and promoted the development of Comparative Literature throughout Europe. Therefore, the laurel of the father of Comparative Literature in Italy usually went to Sanctis. Unfortunately, Sanctis' understanding of Comparative Literature was extremely narrow, because he limited the "comparison" of literature within one country and believed by doing so we could have a unified standard. For him, the comparison made sense only when it was applied within the tradition of one country, for example, the comparison between Dante and Boccaccio, because only in this way could we have a common background. Therefore, he must be against the study similar to the parallel studies that we are familiar with, out of his belief that "the comparison of either the themes or the characters, both should be conducted within a single literature in one country instead of the international field" [4].

After Sanctis, there was another figure in the society of Italian Comparative Literature, who, instead of giving a further push, actually brought the development of Italian Comparative Literature to a halt. This giant is Benedetto Croce (1866–1952). Croce thought that comparison is a simple method for historical research with the aim of using "parallelism" and "similarity" to establish an independent research system, but the basis of it is more general. Croce issued an essay "Comparison of Literature" in the first volume of the bimonthly journal "La Critica," which he himself founded in 1903. In this essay, he maintained that the comparison, as employed in the study of Comparative Literature, was a basic research method, which could not define a specific research field. Instead he believed that "comparison" was a convenient, common, and indispensable method when the specific literary works were put into the historical context of world literature; therefore, it could not by itself constitute an independent and systematic discipline. In the early twentieth century, the challenge of Croce on Comparative Literature resulted in the direct

consequences that the development of the discipline in the rest of twentieth century, after Sanctis, was hindered in Italy and did not flourish up till now. However, Croce's massive and far-reaching challenges towards Comparative Literature have been proved wrong by the fact that the discipline is justifiable and sustainable and continues to develop with boundless vitality.

With the echo of Croce's challenges from time to time, scholars of the discipline need to be always introspective and self-critical so as to ensure the vitality of the study. It is assumed that if Croce had not attacked the weakness of Comparative Literature, it might not have achieved its wonderful success nowadays. Therefore, Croce's theoretical challenge to some extent actually fueled the development of the discipline, which was in a sense Croce's contribution to it.

1.1.5 Comparative Literature in Russia

In Russia, Comparative Literature, as a normative term, is called "comparative literary theory," also known as comparative poetics, and was founded in the late nineteenth century when some scholars began to establish the course of the history of general literature, among whom the most prominent representative was Alexander N. Veselovsky (Александр Николаевич Веселовский, 1838–1906), known as the "Father of Russian Comparative Literature." Veselovsky borrowed and developed the theories and methods of the Western European comparatists and built up the Russian historical comparative literary theory with his masterpiece *Historical Poetics (Три Гловы Исторический Поэтики)*. With regard to Comparative Literature, he had two particularly important arguments: first, he advocated finding the similarities through literary comparison; and second, he emphasized that the development of literature was under the restraint of the development of social history.

From 1917 to the end of the 1920s, Viktor M. Zhirmunsky (Виктор М. Жирмунский, 1891–1971) succeeded Veselovsky with acceptance of his theoretical perspectives and became the representative in the mainstream of Russian Comparative Literature. Zhirmunsky inherited and developed the useful historical comparative literary theory of Veselovsky and applied the Historical Materialism of Marxism to the study of Comparative Literature. As a result, he became the founder of the Historical Comparative Literature of Russia, which was a new school different in methodology from the Western Comparative Literature. In 1935, he proposed, for the first time in his report, entitled "Comparative Literary Theory and the Problem of Literary Influence," that the similarity of the process of the literary history is determined by the common human social history. The purpose and task of Comparative Literature in the USSR was to establish "general literature" (всеобщая литература) based on the Marxist view of the historical development of the world. This report marked that Zhirmunsky, after long-term explorations, finally applied Historical Materialism of Marxism to the historical comparison of the Russian tradition, which played a groundbreaking role in the further development of USSR historical literary theory and was therefore regarded by the modern USSR scholars as a milestone in the history of USSR Comparative Literature.

In 1946, the CPSU Central Committee decided to eliminate the pernicious influence of the bourgeois literature and art. Comparative Literature has been listed as a key target of the criticism, and Veselovsky's theory was completely denied. Consequently, the USSR Comparative Literature study had become a forbidden zone where no one dared to set foot. This situation continued until the mid-to-late 1950s. During the mid-1950s, the Soviet literary society began to "thaw," the study of Comparative Literature began to recover, and many scholars and writers took active part in the boom of the comparative literary study once again. After several decades' efforts, the basic theoretical system of USSR historical comparative literary theory has gradually come into being, and the Russian school of Comparative Literature had been formed, competing with the French school and the American school.

1.1.6 Comparative Literature in France

From the moment when Comparative Literature began to emerge in the European academy, France gradually became the center for its further development. In 1897, the first Lecture of Comparative Literature was officially established at the University of Lyon, and Joseph Texte was nominated as the first Professor of Comparative Literature. In 1901, Fernand Baldensperger succeeded Texte as Professor of Comparative Literature at the university. In 1910, the second Lecture of Comparative Literature was set up at the University of Paris. In 1904, Baldensperger published a monograph on Comparative Literature entitled *Goethe en France: étude de littérature comparée*. In 1918, the third Lecture of Comparative Literature was established in Strasbourg. In the years 1907, 1920, and 1929, Baldensperger published respectively his three-volumed *Études d'histoire littéraire*. In 1921, "Revue de Littérature Comparée," the most important journal of Comparative Literature, was founded, which published a large number of articles which reflected the views of French scholars and became the most influential medium of French Comparative Literature. In 1925, Baldensperger published *Le Mouvement des Idées dans l'émigration Française, 1789-1815*, and in 1927, his *Orientations étrangères chez Honoré de Balzac* was published. In 1925, the fourth Lecture of Comparative Literature was founded in the French Academy. Thereafter, Lectures of Comparative Literature were widely accepted and spread in France. In 1930, the University of Paris founded the Institute of Modern Literature and Comparative Literature, which enabled the university to become the center of the international comparative literary study in a few decades. In 1931, Paul Van Tieghem, a professor at the University of Paris published his notable monograph, entitled *La littérature comparée*, which summed up the theory and practice of Comparative Literature at that time in France; expounded comprehensively and systematically the research methods, principles, and tasks of the Comparative Literature; and constructed the strict disciplinary system of Comparative Literature. This book represented the most authoritative summary of the theory and methods of the French school and became the canon of the school. In 1948,

Jean-Marie Carré (1887–1958) published *Goethe en Angleterre. Étude de littérature comparée* and *Les Écrivains français et le mirage allemand*, respectively. In 1950, *La Littérature Comparée: Essai Bibliographique* had been enlarged from 3,000 entries compiled by Louis Paul Betz, to more than 6,000 entries after Baldensperger's expansion. In 1951, Marius-Francois Guyard published *La Littérature Comparée* which inherited and extended Paul Van Tieghem's *La littérature comparée* and made the theories more complete and systematic. The achievements of Baldensperger, Paul Van Tieghem, and Jean-Marie Carré, on the one hand, improved and developed the theories of the forerunners and, on the other, made the study of Comparative Literature more theoretical, systematic, and disciplinary.

After World War II, a large number of the French Universities, such as University of Dijon (1949), University of Bordeaux and Toulouse (1951), University of Clermont-Ferrand, University of Rennes (1952), and University of Aix-en, added Lectures of Comparative Literature, which expanded the lineup of the discipline and added more vigor to the theoretical construction and disciplinary development of the French school.

The theories and research models of French scholars were widely recognized and appreciated in the international academic field and attracted scholars from many other countries either to follow their lead in research or even to move to France for academic research or study for degrees. Thus, France actually became the center of Comparative Literature in the world. In 1954, the French Comparative Literature Association was established in France, which officially marked the birth of the French school of Comparative Literature and showed that the theory of Comparative Literature in France had fully matured. Due to influence study based on the factual contact advocated by the French scholars, the French school was also called the "School of Influence Study."

1.2 The Major Contribution of the French School: Founding of the First Phase of the Disciplinary Theory of Comparative Literature

As the earliest school of Comparative Literature, French scholars established the first phase of disciplinary theory and exerted great influence. These scholars established Comparative Literature as an independent subject and set up systematic theories. The French school came into being at a time when French literature flourished and had a great impact on that of other countries with the prevalence of scientism and positivism. Through standardized research of objects, scientism tended to seek universal laws and rules which led people to know the world. The French school was also under the influence of positivism represented by Comte which advocated the study of the specific facts and phenomena and the external links between phenomena. Comte denied the study of essence behind the

phenomena and held that the essence of the world was beyond the reach of human beings. Scientism influenced people to adopt methods of natural science to study the literature of difference and originality, while positivism led people to the so-called truth through facts. It was under this double influence that the French scholars embarked on a new attempt.

1.2.1 *The Shaping of the French School*

The lectures and courses offered by those pioneers such as Abel-Francois Villemain (1790–1870) and Jean Jacques Ampere (1800–1864) popularized the new term “Comparative Literature” and made a great contribution to the formation of the discipline. Texte’s monograph *J.-J. Rousseau et Les Origines du Cosmopolitisme Littéraire* paved the way for the further development of Comparative Literature as a discipline and for its becoming a university course. This period was the beginning stage of the French school with creative thinking and writing of individuals and without clear awareness of academic orientation.

In the programmatic article introducing the first number of “Revue de Littérature Comparée” (1921), Baldensperger critically summarized the academic opinions and promoted that scholars should systematically apply empiricism to the research of the relations between foreign literatures and French literature. Since then, the French school took shape and colored its study with positivism.

Paul Van Tieghem’s classical work *La littérature comparée* further elaborated the ideas of the French school including the definition of the term. He held the view that the word “comparative” should avoid its aesthetic value to get a scientific one. Therefore, Comparative Literature essentially studied the relationship of different literatures, mainly including Latin and Greek literature, the relationship of modern literature and ancient literature, and the relationship of national literature in modern times, among which the last was the most important. So he regarded the object of research as emitter and intermediaries’ transmitter and recipient; thus, the main methodology of the French school study started to form.

Jean-Marie Carré (1887–1958), the chief editor of “Revue de Littérature Comparée,” claimed that Comparative Literature was not the comparison of literatures but the study of the factual relationship of literatures in his masterpiece *La littérature comparée*. The concepts of Guyard’s *La littérature comparée* are similar to those of Paul Van Tieghem who held that the essence of Comparative Literature was the study of the history of the relationship of international literatures. This period marks the further development of the French school. A group of scholars set up a relatively complete theoretical system from different angles. Above all they set up scientific methods to establish Comparative Literature as an independent discipline. In 1954, the formation of the Comparative Literature Association in France marked the official establishment of the French school.

1.2.2 The Birth of Comparative Literature as an Independent Discipline and the Formation of Theories of Comparative Literature

The French school had to confront natural scientism from the very beginning owing to the double influence of scientism and positivism. At first some people outside of the academic circle of Comparative Literature questioned the rationality of the discipline, among whom the well-known Italian scholar Croce was the most prominent.

He held that any discipline can make use of the method of comparison which was only a simple and universal way for historic study. Moreover the way itself was the necessary tool for literary study, so it was impracticable to regard comparison as the foundation of this discipline. Under this pressure, French scholars attempted to orient Comparative Literature into a scientific orbit and legalize it. They used “relationship” instead of “comparison” criticized by people so that the study scope of Comparative Literature, which focused on the factual relationship and impact between the national literatures, was greatly narrowed to research on “relationship.” In their view, the name of the discipline was not accurate because they believed that “Comparative Literature is not comparison of literatures.” Guyard once said, “Comparative Literature is not comparison of literatures. It is in fact a scientific method misunderstood.... It is vain to try to make a clear definition of its feature” [5]. The French school argued that Comparative Literature was “the history of international literary relationships” instead of comparison between two literatures: “The object of Comparative Literature is to thoroughly research on the relationship of literary works of various nations” [6]. Comparison without paying attention to relationship was not acceptable.

Van Tieghem held the view that this kind of comparison was in fact the selection of similar characters, scenes, articles, and books from different literatures and the simple juxtaposition of their similarities and differences, which merely was a kind of satisfaction of curiosity and aesthetics and results in a judgment based on personal preference. Other than these, the comparison had no other significance because it cannot promote the deeper understanding of the literary history with its own strength.

Another important theorist of the French school, Guyard, also repeatedly emphasized this point that the object of Comparative Literature was to essentially research the relationship between national literatures. If those objects have no contacts, they do not belong to the sphere of Comparative Literature. Thus, the real foothold of the discipline was “relationship” rather than “comparison.” This emphasis not only laid a foundation for the definition and theory of the French school but also became a prominent and distinct feature of it.

In other words, the French school was against the analogy study. It merely admitted “relationship of literatures” as orthodox on which basis they set up the systematic theory and methodology: from “Doxologie” (start) to “Mesologie” (media) to “Crenologie” (ending). Its major method was “influence study,” which stressed the relationship of facts and explored the borrowing, accepting, and impact of some factors such as subject matters, themes, styles, motifs, and concepts. In this sense, the French school laid a solid foundation for the formation and development of Comparative Literature with a set of theories, methods, and modes.

In addition, the reflection and the pursuit of the French comparatists also contributed to the generation of the theory of the discipline. Being definite and scientific is essential for the establishment of any discipline; the French scholars have been thinking about how to establish Comparative Literature as a closely knit, scientific discipline. After careful consideration, the four representative figures of the French school, Baldensperger, Van Tieghem, Carré, and Guyard, ultimately clearly advocated the following points: First, positivism must be emphasized and arbitrariness must be removed; secondly, the history of literary relationship should be focused, while the analogy study without factual contact should be overlooked; thirdly, a clear scientism instead of uncertain aesthetic values should be obtained.

For the first point, in his *Littérature comparée: Le Mot et la chose*, Baldensperger wrote, “No explicatory clarity results from comparisons restricting themselves to a glance cast simultaneously at two different objects, to that recollection, conditioned by the play of memories and impressions, of similarities which may well be erratic points furtively linked by the mind’s caprice” [7]. To get clear argumentation and an independent method of comparison, Comparative Literature must put great emphasis on positivism and scientism and completely remove the subjective and arbitrary aspect.

For the second point, in his Foreword to Guyard’s *La Littérature Comparée*, Jean-Marie Carré maintained that random comparison regardless of the specific time, space, and other issues did not work because the concept of Comparative Literature must be further specified. He called Comparative Literature “a branch of literary history; it is the study of spiritual international relations, of factual contacts which took place between Byron and Pushkin, Goethe and Carlyle, Walter Scott and Vigny, between the works, the inspirations, and even the lives of writers belonging to several literatures” [1]. After undergoing violent attacks from the American school, Guyard still held the standpoint of his teacher, Carré, and is still adhered to the understanding of Comparative Literature as “the history of international literary relations,” strongly opposing the parallel comparison, as well as the general literature and the world literature.

For the third point, Van Tieghem believed that “the characteristic of Comparative Literature, as the nature of the historical science, is to embrace a great number of possible facts of different origins, then explain each of them, then enlarge the basis of knowledge as to discover the causes of most effects. In brief, the word ‘comparative’ should avoid its aesthetic value to get a scientific one.” Quite obviously, the scholars of the French school expected that they could establish a set of unique systems with scientific and empirical methods.

1.2.3 *Three Cornerstones of Theories of Comparative Literature*

At a time when the French academy was tremendously impacted by Comte’s positivism, the French school formed its distinctive features based on positivistic influence study. Since then, Comparative Literature as an independent discipline was truly rooted in the academic domain, and the first prosperity of it was ushered in after the crisis of it.

Van Tieghem is the first person who comprehensively and systematically illustrated the concepts of Comparative Literature in the French school. First, he divided the domain of Comparative Literature into “the national literature,” “the Comparative Literature,” and “the general literature.” As a result, it laid the foundation for Comparative Literature as an independent discipline, because it has already had its own specific research field. However, with this strict distinction between “Comparative Literature” and “general literature,” it caused Comparative Literature to depart from its original intention. Next, he established the homogeneity of literature as the comparability of Comparative Literature to provide a feasible theoretical basis for the discipline. Then on the basis of homogeneity, he established the theoretical system of influence study, whose three theoretical pillars are Doxologie, Mesologie, and Crenologie. This set of strict disciplinary systems was based on positivism and the discovery of researchers in Comparative Literature in France, and it made apparent the independence of the study even though it deviated from the original intention.

As mentioned above, influence study of the French school paid great attention to the relationship of empirical study and homogeneity with factual linkages among the different countries. Its goal is to seek homogeneity in two or three literatures by studying the “passing route” which consists of three parts: the beginning” (emitter), “the ending” (recipient), and “media” (transmitter), along which “influence” took place. The Doxologie focuses on the route from the beginning to the ending, and the Crenologie is vice versa. The Mesologie specially focuses on media, all of which are the three theoretical pillars of influence study.

1.2.3.1 Doxologie

Doxologie comes from the Greek “doxo,” meaning glory, honor, and praise, while the root of “logie” is “logos,” often referring to “the study of,” “the theory of,” or “the discourse of.” This word is originally a religious term which means the songs of praising God in the worship ceremony. In 1931, the French scholar, Van Tieghem, first introduced this term into the disciplinary theory of Comparative Literature, so Doxologie has become one of the traditional modes of influence study, and the basic method has been widely used in the practice of Comparative Literature.

The Source and Meaning of Doxologie

Van Tieghem in his *La Littérature Comparée* stated that there is close relation between some influence of a writer aboard and the study on him [8]. It can be said that Doxologie starts from the point of the delivery of influence to study the acceptance at ending, which includes the travel, influence, and acceptance of literary genres, literary trends, authors, and texts in other countries.

According to the conventional concepts, Doxologie falls into the category of influence study, and its formation has profound historical and cultural reasons. Out

of the pattern of Western culture, a close relationship may be discerned in politics, economy, and religion among European nations, as well as mass interaction of literature, such as Renaissance and Enlightenment, among which Romanticism particularly adds fuel to the development of Comparative Literature in initiating a new way of thinking that results in the rise of the discipline. It inherits the concept of “world literature” from Goethe while accepting certain viewpoints of Madame de Stael who is one of the French romantic pioneers, such as the focus on the relationship between literary developments and social conditions and the use of the method of historical comparison instead of the pure classical literary criticism. At that time, there appeared a new atmosphere in literary criticism and writing. For example, the French romantic scholars strongly opposed the rigidity of classicism and advocated the transcendence of national limitations. They attached great importance to the internationality of literature, focusing on exploring the influence of the environment and personality on writers and the relationship between different writers. This inspired Comparative Literature from methodology, and then some perspectives became the important components of the study of “Doxologie,” “Crenologie,” and “Mesologie” in Comparative Literature.

Meanwhile, positivism became the basis of the methodology and the epistemology of Doxologie. Established by French philosopher Comte, positivism emphasized “the empirical nature” of knowledge, derived from the specific facts and phenomena, as well as the external linkage between the phenomena, and attempted to transform all academic disciplines with the empirical spirit of the natural sciences. Positivists were good at using the method of comparison. For example, they compared lives in different regions and nationalities in order to understand the rules of the development of society. This methodology and the epistemology had enormous influence on literary works and criticism, such as the rise of Naturalism in late-nineteenth-century literature. Meanwhile some features of positivism such as “the emphasis on the facts and on the external linkage between the phenomena” as well as the use of the method of comparison became the magic weapon of French Comparative Literature. French literary critic Bulvnaier was the first person who applied positivism to literary study, stressing the influence of a work on another; thus, he established the direction of literary criticism including emphasis on evidence, facts, and texts, which had profound influence on the formation and development of French Comparative Literature. Therefore, in the early period of French Comparative Literature, positivism had formed the essential characteristics of influence study—empiricism. As a result, Romanticism and positivism, the two ideological trends in the nineteenth century, together formed the two essential characteristics of French influence study—“empiricism” and “the study of literary relations.”

The Feature, Scope, and Type of Doxologie

Doxologie is the empirical study of the literary relations with empiricism as its feature and relationship of literature as its object.

Doxologie is the study of the relationship of literature. Paul Van Tieghem once limited this study to the relationship between the literatures of two countries, which was of real factual relations in his eyes. Thus, “The typical Comparative Literature most usually studies these ‘dual’ relations only between two factors, which only confirm the binary relation between a broadcaster and a recipient” (Ibid., p. 200). Just along the passing route from “emitter” and “transmitter” to “recipient,” Doxologie seeks for the relationship between emitter and recipient, focusing on the travels and influence of authors, works, literary trends, and schools in other European countries.

Doxologie is empiricism. The literary relationship must be established on the basis of facts, so inevitably the method of the study of Doxologie is to pay attention to facts and collect data with scrutiny, which formed the empirical feature of it. Since this study takes “fact” as its basis, thus it will inevitably adopt a strong sense of history and notice the vertical development of the literary phenomena, ideas, works, and genres, as well as the horizontal comparison, namely, the influence among literatures.

The research scope of Doxologie is determined by its features. Van Tieghem thought the key of influence study is the following three elements, emitter, transmitter, and recipient, and the transmission and interaction among the three elements. Starting from the recipient, the so-called Crenologie traces the source of the influence on writers and works, starting from transmitter. Mesologie studies the media between the emitter and the recipient, such as translating, rewriting, imitating, and quoting, starting from transmitter. Doxologie studies the impact of writers, works, and literary trends on other literatures and writers. Its research field can be grouped into the following categories:

- (a) The understanding of the emitter from the recipient countries and writers, for instance, the evaluation and introduction of the emitter.
- (b) Influence from some specific works of the broadcaster and the evaluation of the recipient towards the emitter.
- (c) The aspects from which the recipient imitates the emitter: style, feature, thought, feeling, theme, and background.
- (d) The contact of the recipient with the emitters’ works is direct or indirect, via reading the original text, translation or comments on the works, and what role the translation plays in the process of influence.
- (e) The reception of the literary circle and publishing industry towards the emitters’ works and their reactions and feelings.
- (f) The travels of the emitters’ works and what group of people accept most broadly.
- (g) The degree of influence: superficial or profound.
- (h) The duration of influence: short or long.
- (i) What helps people accept influence and make it mature and what causes the choice made by the recipient?
- (j) What establishes the image and position of the emitter in the recipient’s minds?

The goal of studying these categories is to seek the “ending” of influence. In the process of seeking “ending,” Van Tieghem divided the types of influence into “general relationship and group effects”; “impacts of one author to another one, a

group or a sect”; “a writer’s experience and influence”; and “traveling, imitation, and successful influence” (Ibid., pp. 13–142). In other words, the influence of groups or individuals, and from the method and contents, they are grouped into the following patterns:

- (a) The influence of the special spirit, personality, and temperament of emitter. Emitters put their own special spirit, personality, and temperament into their works, establishing an influence of self on the recipient. For instance, the fresh and sincere personality of Tagore who pursued the ideal personality and universal love exerted great influence on Chinese scholars and writers in the early and middle period of the twentieth century. Other examples include Shelley’s rebellious spirit, Byron’s unruly loneliness, and Rousseau’s sincere enthusiasm. They all had great impact on Chinese people at that time and later on.
- (b) The influence of writing techniques. It refers to the influence on the recipient of the literary or artistic styles which the emitter innovated in their creations. For example, in the nineteenth century, the French symbolic poetry of Baudelaire exerted profound influence on the later literary writing. The traditional logic of space-time and physics have also been disrupted in his poems, so Baudelaire often uses some fragments of psychological symbols to make up a unique structure with the inner emotional logic instead of traditional poetic logic. Together with symbols, the irregular pause, running lines, and shifting of meter in his writing also have had a tremendous influence on the poets of Europe and China.
- (c) The influence of artistic characters. It refers to the traveling of characters in literature, for example, Don Juan in Spanish legend. Don Juan is originally a rebellious image against religious abstinence; later, it has continuously developed variations in many European literary works, such as Byron’s satirical poem, Moliere’s comedy, Pushkin’s epic, and Mozart’s opera.
- (d) The influence of theme or subject matter. For instance, the theme of Faust has long been in existence before Goethe’s “Faust.” It is said that Faust is a historical figure, who could summon devils and after many bad actions finally died a violent death. Later he turns out to be a half-myth and half-real figure. Many artistic works have stemmed from this theme of Faust, such as *The Tragical History of the Life and Death of Doctor Faustus* written by the playwright Christopher Marlowe, Goethe’s poem “Faust,” Wagner’s “Faust Overture,” and Gounod’s opera “Floating Lester.”
- (e) The influence of framework. It means the influence on other literatures of some particular elements, such as the social environment, historical background, and scenery described in literary works. The mysterious Orient and the plot of pirates in Byron’s works found echoes in adventure stories written by the American writer Cooper as well as in the romance of Dumas.
- (f) The influence of theoretical trend. This kind of “theoretical trend” may be philosophical, political, literary theoretical, and many others, such as the influence of Rousseau, Voltaire on Romanticism, and Saussure’s linguistic theory on modern literary theory and creation.

The above influences usually overlap, which makes the study of Doxologie rather complicated, but all analyses must be based on accurate information with careful observation, following the principles of evidence.

The Model and Case Study of Doxologie

Since the movement of influence always follows a certain direction and route, from the starting point of emitter to the end of recipient, the model of Doxologie can be divided into the following patterns:

- (a) The linear pattern. It refers to the one-to-one influence, which means the influence of one emitter on one writer, one work, one literary trend, and one national literature. It is direct and straight, connecting the starting point and the ending, and is the basic model of Doxologie, for example, the influence of Dickens on Lao She, who stated in his essay "On Studies" that he liked Dickens very much and imitated his works untitled free verse. Another example is the influence of Tagore on Bing Xin who composed untitled free verse.
- (b) The pattern of radiation. It refers to the one-to-many influence, which starts from one point to many ends. It is the influence of one writer, one work, one literary trend, and one national literature on a group of other writers. So the contents of study are the reception of one emitter in many recipients. For example, Baudelaire inspired the European literary world as well as the Chinese literary circle, in which the Crescent School, the Symbolic School, the Modernist School, and so on directly or indirectly had been under the influence of him. Many novelists and poets such as Li Jingfa, Wen Yiduo, and Dai Wangshu all accepted his poetic ideas and artistic thoughts and applied them to their own writings.
- (c) The focal pattern. It refers to the many-to-one influence, the influence of many emitters on one recipient. Usually, the source of influence one writer receives could be more than one. For instance, the influence Shelley got from French philosophy in the eighteenth century came not only from Voltaire and Rousseau but also from Volney and Condorcet. Another example is Goethe, who received the influence of many components of Chinese literature: novels, drama, lyric poetry, and Confucianism.
- (d) The overlapping pattern. It refers to the intersection between the emitter and the recipient because of the multiple roles they assume. It is not the one-way influence, namely, an emitter as a "starting point" may be a recipient at the same time, so it may exert a complicated influence on the end. For example, through the English "Essays" and the Japanese writer Guliayagawa, the French writer Montaigne was recognized and accepted by the Chinese literary world, which in turn formed a kind of essay with unique style. This is a good example of the overlapping pattern: English and Japanese writers are not only the end of the influence from Montaigne but also the starting point for further spreading his works. Another kind of intersection between the emitter and the recipient

reflects the complication of the emitter. In the process of direct to indirect acceptance, there are two recipients who influence each other. Take Byron's direct influence on Pushkin and indirect influence on Lermontov, for example; Pushkin once in his poems directly admitted his imitation from Byron, and Lermontov was well known as Pushkin's heir, so he received indirect influence from Byron via Pushkin and formed his own unique style.

- (e) The circular pattern. It refers to the circle between the emitter and the recipient. This cycle of influence starts from the starting point to the end and finally round back to the starting point. It is full of reaction and interaction and can best represent the value and significance of the study of Comparative Literature. It absorbed material from both imagery in Chinese ancient poetry and Zen Buddhism; Japanese poets formed unique Japanese poetry: haiku. Through Japanese poets and their works, the imagist poets in America and England appreciated and imitated the approach of "something is implied," so there are many similarities between imagist poems and Chinese ancient poems. Later imagism was introduced to China and exerted great influence on free verse in China—a marvelous circle was made.

1.2.3.2 Crenologie

The Definition and Features of Crenologie

Crenologie is also called the study of origin or source, belonging to influence study. It takes the recipient as a starting point to explore the source of the influence a writer or a work received, such as theme, subject matter, characters, plot, style, and language, tracing the discernible evidence of cross-border influence. Thus, we can find two distinct features in the study of Crenologie:

Firstly, it emphasized the tracing of the sources of cross-border influence. Compared with Doxologie, the starting point of Crenologie is changed to be the recipient, which means its study starts from the recipient to explore the source of foreign influence; but Doxologie starts from the emitter to examine the actual spreading and changing out of one national boundary. In fact, the fundamental difference between Doxologie and Crenologie lies in the fact that the starting point of Doxologie is clear, whose foothold is the influence of the emitter over the recipient. On the contrary, the ending of Crenologie study is clear, but its starting point is unclear, namely, its resource of influence requires examination. For example, as for the relationship between Lao She and Dickens, if the starting point is the examination of Dickens in order to study his influence on Lao She, this kind of study should belong to Doxologie. If the starting point of inspection begins with the works of Lao She to trace a foreign and unclear source, this kind of study could be called Crenologie. From the end of literary reception to trace its source, such a kind of research is very common in the study of Comparative Literature. Scholars may study these sources, such as characters, themes, writing techniques, and artistic styles.

Secondly, Crenologie must be based on positivism study with stress on the collection, identification, and analysis of existing materials. Therefore, Crenologie is not a kind of analogical study based on similarity, but a kind of positivism study based on detailed analyses of texts. In this sense, it is a positivism study of literary influence subjected to the history of literary relationship between different countries. The common feature in the study of Crenologie is that it stresses empirical study. Without empirical evidence, Crenologie would be a mere assumption lacking conviction. Only through empirical observation may we undertake a fruitful study of Crenologie.

The Study Pattern of Crenologie

In his *La Littérature Comparée*, Van Tieghem grouped the pattern of Crenologie into five kinds: origin of impression, origin of oral expression, origin of written expression, isolated origin, and collective origin (Ibid., pp. 141–148). Such classification has basically established the scope of Crenologie. It is easy to discover his analysis on two levels: Firstly, from the media of influence, origins can be divided into several types, such as impression, speaking, and writing. Secondly, from the type of the broadcaster, it can be grouped into two kinds: the isolated origin and the collective origin.

(a) The Media of Influence

First is the origin of the impression. It comes from the direct feelings of authors. The initial source of a literary work may come from an impression of other countries or a direct experience of the writers there. The motivation of a writer could arise from all senses or impressions evoked by exotic scenery, social atmosphere, culture, and the arts. As Van Tieghem put it, the literary origin “may be in some visual or hearing ‘impression’, such as scenery, art, music, etc. Poems or novels are often inspired by the natural shifts, so some article has its own color and special sounds. Some of these foreign impacts should be found in this field” (Ibid., p. 143). According to the length of time, the study of Crenologie can be roughly divided into several categories: travel, living and studying overseas, etc. When traveling around Europe, Byron wrote the long poem “Childe Harold’s Pilgrimage” to show the beautiful scenery in Spain, Greece, and other countries and depict the impact of the French Revolution on European society. Sojourning in England, Lao She wrote the novel *Ma and Son* with the background of London to reveal the cultural differences between England and China. Studying abroad in Japan, Lu Xun abandoned his study on medicine and changed to literature. He criticized the weakness of Chinese in his writings. Therefore, the origin of impression did not lie on the indirect textual evidence to show foreign influence but on the direct impressions of the authors’ experience to display the individual origin from foreign culture. And it reveals the history of the literary relationship between nations with more empirical color.

Second is the origin of oral expression. It is a way of speaking to bring about the foreign influence on the literature of one country with myths, legends, stories,

songs, and proverbs from foreign countries, sometimes even with a piece of foreign anecdote or a conversation. As Van Tieghem put it, "Some stories or dialogue heard are often the base of some sections of a writer, a book or even all works" (Ibid., pp. 143–144). He also gave examples of this origin: The conversations between writers once introduced the poems of the Italian poet Petrarch to Spain, German Romanticism to Denmark, and French Naturalism novel to Britain. Unfortunately, the effect of oral sources is difficult to be fixed, because an oral source is often too vague to be traced, which makes it difficult to carry out an empirical study; therefore, "People have to rely on a summary of the original dialogue" (Ibid., p. 143), based mainly on those written records related to oral communication. In other words, the oral origin is also based on the verbal record of it, not in the form of a written language, but in the form of oral texts. In this way, though difficult, the study of the oral source still works within a positivist framework.

Last is the origin of written expression. It is the study of the written texts. Since it is very easy for empirical research, so it is a mode which is frequently used. Examining the origin of written expression may include the following aspects: "First, to identify sources of information; second, to identify the borrowing ingredients; third, to identify the trend of fashion, the so-called ambience or milieu and so on" [9]. All these aspects are stressed in positivism study, so its conclusion must be supported by very detailed information. It should discover the more obvious original relationship of literary works between recipients and broadcasters from themes, subject matter, characters, and plot. For example, Lao She in his article "On Studies" explicitly admitted that when he was young, he loved the works of the English novelist Dickens so much that he cannot bear to be separated from it. At the beginning of his writing, he also somewhat imitated Dickens. Of course, besides the obvious resemblance existing between different texts, the potential relationship between writers could be found in words of the author's memoirs, biographies, comments, prefaces, and postscripts. For example, Lu Xun admitted that the ending of his novel *Medicine* is clearly marked with cruelty that is typical of Leonid Andreyev.

(b) The Types of Emitter. There are two kinds of emitters: the isolated origin and the collective origin.

The so-called isolated origin is also known as linear origin because its purpose lies in finding the root of foreign influence from one work. This kind of isolated origin mainly concerns the subject matter, the theme, and the artistic form.

It is a common practice to study the origin of themes or subject matter between two works. For example, in the study of the typical characters, "Faust" or "Juan," we will examine the origin of these two figures in isolation.

It is a more broad scope of the study to examine the isolated thoughts between literary works which have been continuously inherited and updated by the writers. It also has far-reaching significance, such as the exploration of the origin of romantic thoughts in Hugo's works. For the study of Comparative Literature, Van Tieghem divided the concepts into several areas, which mainly include religious, philosophical, moral, aesthetic, scientific, social, political, and economic.

Besides the aspects mentioned above, artistic form also belongs to this study, but this kind of research is quite difficult since it is related to the understanding of language, which is subject to interpretation; thus, it is very difficult to trace the origin of forms in literary works.

Another type is the study of collective origin which is also called the origin of circle. It studies how a writer accepts influence from more than one foreign works. This kind of study involves a broader scope with the base of large amounts of empirical data, so the difficulty of it is obvious. The first step is to examine what influence of foreign works this writer has received. On one hand, we can collect the key information from a variety of records of the writers themselves, such as the words in prefaces and postscripts and the records of autobiography, diary, letters, notes, as well as personal reading lists. On the other hand, we can collect memories of the writers' influence from people around them, such as the memoirs and letters of family and friends, the comments and critical biographies, as well as the relevant oral record. The latter are often supplement and amend the former, and only in the absence of the former, the latter would possibly become a major basis of inspection. The second step is to trace the connections of this text series and to look for causal relationship between starting points and ending points. More importantly, in this chain of causal relationship, those inner links of themes, ideas, and artistic form became more complex in the series of works of authors. As a result, it can be said that the study of isolated and collective origin cannot be completely separated.

From the methodological point of view, in the study of both isolated origin and collective origin, their objects should be works and works, writers and writers with influence over each other, as well as causal relationships of lines or chains in the possible origins. Therefore, we must empirically study the history of literary relationship on the layers of works and writers in order to ensure the effectiveness of the research.

1.2.3.3 Mesologie

The Definition of Mesologie

Mesologie is a term related to influence study. It is an important part of influence study to research the ways, approaches, and media of foreign works entering one country and the underlying causal laws.

Owing to their emphasis on positivism, the scholars of the French school have always attached great importance to the study of media. In the discussion of the literary influence between countries, Van Tieghem in his *La Littérature Comparée* held that from the literary emitter to the recipient, there is a medium as "the transmitter." Guyard in his *La Littérature Comparée* stated that the object of Mesologie study is people or books that "help the understanding among national literatures." These people and books are referred to as "agents of literary cosmopolitanism," including language knowledge or linguists; translated works or the translator; reviews, newspapers, and magazines; travelers and tourists; and global citizens caused by a

special geographical and cultural cases. Obviously, the medium may be of intermediary things which exchange, influence, and transmit between two or more than two literatures or intermediary actions that introduce and spread one literature and one literary trend into another country. It could be a person, some people, or an organization which plays the role of transmission in some environment. Mesologie is still a positivism study holding the exploration and comparison of the actual materials as the base; at the same time, the object of Mesologie is a kind of intermediate medium, but its essence is the study of literary relationship across countries and cultures.

The Theoretical Model of Mesologie

The study range of Mesologie covers the route of a work entering another country and the media of its spreading. The imitation and acceptance of one writer towards the literary works from another country often take place through the medium of other individuals or groups. Mesologie carries out empirical study through some intermediaries such as people, books, literary groups, and social environment.

- (a) The individual media. The individual media usually refers to the influence of individual to individual or groups to individual. It includes any individual related to literary and cultural spreading across countries, such as writers, scholars, translators, travelers, diplomats, and other literary and cultural communicators. Take the writer as an example; from the angle of Mesologie, some writers in fact are intermediaries of literary relations, such as Lao She's acceptance of Dickens and Rousseau's acceptance of Charlie. Both of them played intermediary roles by accepting the influence. The medium played by the individual to groups is an important aspect of Mesologie. For example, Poe introduced the "end of the century" culture in the European literary world into China, affecting a large number of Chinese poets and writers.
- (b) The group media. The group media refers to the organization such as salon and magazine of foreign literature scholars, who are writers and translators with similar interests. For example, the salon hosted by Madame de Stael attracted many celebrities to discuss new kinds of literary rules. After the May 4th Movement in China, there were also a lot of literary groups highly admiring Western literary thoughts, such as "Literary Research Association" established by Shen Yanbing, Zheng Zhenduo, Zhou Zuoren, and Ye Shengtao and "Creation Society" by Guo Moruo and Yu Dafu. In addition, the social environment can also become media, such as the environments established by immigrants or people in exile directly or indirectly. The group media often is manifested in the influence of literary schools, such as the Western symbolic poetry, which were composed by the poets from various countries, Valery in France, Rilke in Germany, Yeats in Ireland, Eliot and Pound in the United States, etc., which affected a large number of Chinese modern poets, such as Ai Qing, Li Jingfa, Xu Zhimo, Dai Wangshu, and Guo Moruo.

- (c) The text media. The text media is the most important medium. Many works which seem to have disappeared can be found via the clues of comments in the newspapers or magazines. The scholars of Comparative Literature widely consult these periodicals and newspapers, particularly those of foreign literature, which had played an important role of influence and spreading to seek for the source and information.

The Translator and Translation in Mesologie

The role played by translator and translation in Mesologie is significant and involves both empirical research and Variation. In this part, the empirical research will be the focus.

The function of translation is to completely express the meaning of the original work with another language. In order to correctly understand the connotation of the works, the translator must not only possess basic language skills but also know about the social and cultural background of the author's life as well as writing psychology and the growing experience. At the same time the translator is also the media, so the selections, changes, and deletions of the original work not only embody the interest and appreciation of translator towards it but also reflect the choice made by the translator. The translation and communication across space-time are related to the evaluation and criticism of the original work. From the perspective of Mesologie, some similarities and differences in cultural accomplishment, literary ideas, and situation between the original author and the translator are helpful in our understanding of the mechanisms and procedures of influence that the original work has on the recipient countries. And in the process of translation, the style, language, genre, and content of the original work might be rewritten by the translator to comply with his/her own culture with some grammar, idioms, metaphors, and similes borrowed from his/her own language. Thus, in the process of translation, the original work must be reintegrated in order to adapt to the new literary tradition, so the influence of literature occurred.

In the field of translation, the translation from a translated version into a third language is a common phenomenon, and many foreign works were known to people in this way. In modern China, many British, French, and Russian works are translated through Japanese, and some Italian and Spanish works are translated through English, which also have the complex relationship of literary influence among them.

In the comparison of different versions of the same work, including the versions translated at different times, we can find the changes of impression left by a foreign work in the process of spreading, due to the progress of time, the change of interests, and the development of language. As for the preface and annotation in translation, it is not just the criticism and identification of the translator to the thoughts of the original author; it also has all sorts of precious materials about the changes, spreading, media, and influence when a foreign author is transplanted to this country.

The study of the relationship of a work of an author to another one, a literature of a country to another one, and a literary tradition to another one is the basic content

of Comparative Literature, and all these can be possible just through translation in the first place. The study of the history, theories, and skills of translation plays a tremendous role in a deeper understanding of the history of literary communication among different nations and countries and the complex relationship between different literatures. As a result, the study of literary translation and the study of literary relationships in Comparative Literature are the important components of Mesologie.

From the above discussion, we can fully understand the scientism and empiricism in the disciplinary theory of the French school, which is a very systematic theory of Comparative Literature and constitutes an enormous contribution made by the French school to the discipline worldwide.

1.3 “History of Literary Relations”: The Merits of Positivism and Its Weakness

1.3.1 *The Characteristics of Theories of the French School: Positivism of International Literary Relations*

The disciplinary theory of the French school represents a major achievement in the first stage of Comparative Literature. The phrase “La Littérature Comparée” (Comparative Literature), in French, refers to the comparative study of literature. At the same time, it indicates the significant interrelationship and interaction of literature in different nations. So, in this sense, it may be subordinate to the history of international literary relationship. Besides the study on the ties of international literatures, with the employment of the empirical research methods, the study of the French school also covers the study of typology, thematology, and Imagology as well. So, to some extent, it focuses on the exchange of literatures in different nations and other interdisciplinary studies instead of on the inner aesthetic values of the literary work itself with positivism as its feature.

In the nineteenth century, France was known as the Kingdom of History, which has witnessed a bloom of the early scholars who were engaged in the study of Comparative Literature. Most of them have the background of literary history or literary criticism, such as Abel-Francois Villemain (1790–1870), Jean-Jacques Ampère (1800–1864), Fernand Baldensperger (1871–1958), and Gustave Lanson (1857–1934). The rigid empirical methodology has been applied during that period of time on the study of the literary history. As Voltaire once claimed, the historians, when elaborating history, should primarily collect materials based on the principle of eliminating the false while retaining the true and cautiously objectively state the historical facts without any personal bias; meanwhile, the study on those programs, from which reliable historical data could be easily obtained, should receive much emphasis [10]. In his *Histoire de la littérature*, Gustave Lanson, one of the well-known scholars on literary history and Comparative Literature, suggested scholars “hold an objective spirit for pursuing knowledge” and “a stance of serving the facts” [11].

Influenced by the contemporary academic atmosphere, French scholars of Comparative Literature strongly emphasized the literary “history,” during the formative process of the discipline. Paul Van Tieghem (1871–1948) once argued the ultimate goal of Comparative Literature actually is to study the interrelationship between different literatures and a clear notion of Comparative Literature mainly means an explicit concept of literature, while Comparative Literature actually is a branch of literary history [12]. And “the aim of comparative study of literature mainly should research the interactions of distinct literatures.” In this sense, according to him, “comparative study” may also be interpreted as “collecting, making a parallel comparison among similar literary works, typical characters, plot, as well as stories from different cultures, and demonstrating their similarities and divergences, the only aim of which is to meet the curiosity of an aesthetic enjoyment and to satisfy the need of critics, and then rank those works according to one’s various tastes and standards.” And “by doing this, it may be helpful in developing one’s patterns of thoughts and cultivating one’s excellent taste towards literature. Nevertheless, that is to say, it is of no historical significance owing to the fact that it doesn’t make any contribution to the development of the study of literary history” [13]. In the preface of *La Littérature Comparée*, written by his student, Jean Marie Carré (1887–1958), Marius-Francois Guyard also stressed the notion that Comparative Literature is one of the branches of literary history. In his book, Guyard argued, “Comparative Literature is usually misunderstood as the comparison among different literatures from one nation to another. The scope of the study should be narrowed down to only focus on the history of international literary relations, in other words, to concentrate on the communication among literatures of different nations” [1].

The theoretical basis of the French school leads to the philosophy of positivism, which was founded by Auguste Comte (1798–1857), a French philosopher, who put forward this principle and built up the methodology. There are six aspects of his positivism, namely, positivism as truth, practicability, sureness, accuracy, optimism, and relativity as well [14]. Comte once addressed, in his *Système de politique positive*, sociology should be set up as one empirical science with the method of observation, experiments, and comparison [15]. Under his influence, France witnessed a strong trend of empirical thought after the second half of the nineteenth century. At the same time, the concept and methodology of positivism have a significant impact on the disciplinary formation of Comparative Literature and have become the basic premise of the French school and its major research methodology. Under this background, the French school has stressed the study on the influence of literature in different nations. To be more specific, they tend to observe the interrelationship among literary works by their origin, metonymy, imitation, and adaptation, trying to prove, with concrete materials, that those kinds of relations once surely existed.

The French school discarded the analogy of the large scale and concentrated on the empirical study on the relationship among literatures in the international community instead of random research. Moreover, Paul Van Tieghem (1871–1948) induced a scientific notion of the discipline by avoiding the stress on aesthetics. The historical nature and the empirical methodology, in this sense, are a consequence of the accurate processing of the research field and method of the discipline and also constitute an

intelligent response to the challenges proposed by a number of scholars from other fields, led by Benedetto Croce (1866–1952). Just owing to such a scientific and systematic processing of the discipline, which made the research successfully break through various doubts, the study of Comparative Literature could be founded and developed afterwards. While, on the other hand, the narrowing down in the research field and the departure from the study of the aesthetic features may drive the discipline to the embarrassment of being more in name than in reality. Just as the proverb goes, “either success or failure boils down to the same person.”

1.3.2 Criticism from the American School: Ambivalence of Positivism Versus Aesthetics

From the end of nineteenth century, the negative impact of positivism has loomed, and Europe witnessed an anti-empirical trend, including Bergsonism, Croce’s intuitionism in the aesthetic field, and symbolism and Freudianism in the field of literature. This trend caused the study of Comparative Literature to change its theoretical position towards aesthetics, by disproving simple empirical ways. Its exemplification includes the following: On the one hand it opposes factualism and scientism; it rejects mechanism, the theory of cause and effect, and some other methodologies of natural sciences, while, on the other hand, it holds the aesthetic features and literary values of literature as the center of literary research and objects for putting literary works into the flood of simple historical study in the aspects of origins and influence.

Under such an academic atmosphere, based on the awareness of the “literary nature” of Comparative Literature, some American scholars, who sprang up in the late twentieth century, have undertaken a sharp criticism of the theories of the French school, including its object, field, and methodology.

The second Congress of International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA), held at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, in the year of 1958, is where a breakthrough in Comparative Literature was considered to have taken place. At the Congress, American scholars, with René Wellek (1903–1995), Professor of Yale University, as their representative, put forward the overall challenge towards the methodology of the French school. In his article, “The Crisis of Comparative Literature,” Wellek restated that the discipline of Comparative Literature had been on the edge of danger and believed that researchers had already artificially restrained the boundary of content and method of the discipline with a mechanic concept of origin and influence of literature, driven by the more cultural and national than generous motivation of study. All those are identified, by him, as the symptoms of the everlasting crisis of Comparative Literature. What is more, he also stated that the approach, applied by the French school, was out of date, which added a burden to the discipline and made it confined by the stale factualism, scientism, and historical relativism in the nineteenth century [16].

Before the publication of that famous paper mentioned above, as a literary theorist, Wellek, once in *Theory of Literature*, written in collaboration with Warren, had criticized that with the employment of the mechanic methodology, the French school only concentrated on the “international trade” of literature, which has pushed literary research into an embarrassing situation. He stated, “if separated from national literature, the comparison among various literatures will be confined to the study on those external issues, such as origin, influence, reputation, and fame.” And “such kind of research will not allow us to analyze and judge individual literary works and even to consider the complex originality, and what we can do is only to put our major energy into the study on the repercussion of a certain piece of work, such as translation and imitation which may be conducted by those second-class writers; or to study the history before the work’s appearance as well as its evolution and transmission of its theme and form. In this sense, such comparative study on literature is really superficial and during the recent decades, the widespread disapproval of stressing the pure ‘facts’ or the trend of originality and impact of the literary works, has proved the decaying of this style of Comparative Literature” [17].

What is more, in the year of 1953, in “The Concept of Comparative Literature,” Wellek openly criticized the French school and pointed out that its empirical study has involved Comparative Literature in a lifeless context. He wanted to enlarge the scope of research and eliminate the restriction of positivism [18]. According to him, the empirical approach is the obvious drawback of the French school: “(French school’s) statement that there seems a supposed connection between the facts in such a research and the previous ones cannot hold water. And this can also be an alarm that it is too simplified and arbitrary for the French school to interpret the cause and effect, which drives their so-called ‘Positivism’ to the opposite, and they are likely to be lost in the scientific definition that they strive for” [19].

Wellek found fault with the French school in his “The Crisis of Comparative Literature,” delivered on the conference held in Chapel Hill, in which he believed that the French school ignored the literary characteristic of literature research, owing to the prim positivism and unaesthetic investigation. He proposed, “literature research should pay attention to the value of the work itself and it’s miserable to narrow down the scope of Comparative Literature to the international trade of literature. By doing so, the theme of Comparative Literature would fall into a series of scattered and disconnected fragments and a kind of relationship which may be separated from the whole at any time. So the scholars of Comparative Literature, in a narrow sense, can only put their efforts on the origin, impact, cause and effect, and even cannot make a complete investigation of an individual literary art because there is no single piece of work that can be completely regarded as the center of impact on foreign literatures” [16].

At the same time, Wellek expressed his own understanding that “it will be an absolute failure to factitiously separate Comparative Literature from the general literature because the fact that literature history and literature share a common subject: literature. Regarding the discipline as the trade between two types of literature allows scholars only to concentrate on the outside world of the art, such as translation, journals and media etc., that is to say, to make Comparative Literature a branch only

investigating the materials from foreign origin and reputation of the author.” And “the boundary between comparative and general literature should be eliminated, since ‘comparative’ literature has been defined as a fixed term for the research which surpasses a certain national literature.” Here, the general literature, mentioned by Wellek, refers to the “literary research” or “academic literary study.” Afterwards, he stressed that “the concentration of real academic literature study lies in the value and quality instead of the prim facts, that’s why there is no distinction between literature history and literature critique. Even the simplest problem of literature history also should call for the accurate judgment...it is truly necessary to analyze, summarize and evaluate a piece of art with the help of critical principles” (Ibid.).

Another major representative theorist of the American school, Henry H. H. Remak, once pointed out, “The French are inclined to favor questions which can be solved on the basis of factual evidence (often involving personal documents)” and “it (Comparative Literature) can do so best by not only relating several literatures to each other but by relating literature to other fields of human knowledge and activity, especially artistic and ideological fields” [20]. His paper, “French and American Schools of Comparative Literature,” once conducted a summary of the confrontation of the two schools at the opening ceremony in Chapel Hill. To begin with, he summarized the debate as the combat between “literature history” and “literature critique.” And he argued that the discipline has walked into a dead end owing to the fact that the French school excessively adheres to the scientific nature of the research and stresses it as a historic discipline instead of an aesthetic one. According to Remak, “the key foundation of a reasonable study on literature is the literary work itself, and all the investigations should be based on a thorough comprehension of it, so, parallel comparison is good for the appreciation of the aesthetic value and providing a general interpretation of a literary work” [21].

1.3.3 Internal Puzzles of the French School: Ambivalence of Positivism Versus Imagology

Imagology, an important branch of Comparative Literature and a great achievement of the French school on the examination of influence study, has defined its own research objects and methodology with the efforts of the French scholars of several generations. However, what is pitiful is that with the constraint of positivism, its narrow-minded patriotism has served political goals and invited attack from the American scholars led by Wellek [22]. What is more, the conflict between empirical research and “cultural psychology” in Imagology has still been the confusion and embarrassment of this school, leading to the deviation of imagological research from its historical orientation of influence study as well as the empirical approach. Our focus of inspection on the French school should lie on this point.

Actually, much earlier than the emergence of the American school’s challenge, French scholars had already been aware of the limitation of traditional influence study. Noticing the phenomena that there emerged too many papers of influence study

with no satisfactory results (in other words, the development of Comparative Literature seemed inspiring as well as worrisome), Carré believed that scholars pay too much attention to influence study, which is difficult to carry out and unreliable. Looking back to the fact that there were so many “uncontrollable elements” in previous influence studies, he intended to rely on the historical network, intertwined with many factors, such as achievements of the literary work, confrontation of a writer, destiny of a great figure, understanding between different nations, journey, and what one sees and hears [23]. Guyard, one of his disciples, also pointed out “the study on the influence is always depressing” and so “we should do our best to closely examine those that have formed and existed in the awareness of the individual or a group within a great nation” [1]. Based on the observation of influence study, Carré and Guyard once tried to extend the space of influence study. Carré, well known as the founder of modern Imagology, clearly stated that the purpose of Imagology is to examine the “interpretation of various nations, journals and imaginations” [24], which is illustrated in his *French writers and German's illusion: 1800–1940* (1947). Guyard drew a theoretical conclusion to the imagological research respectively in the passage *The Foreign Country We Sees*, belonging to his monograph, *Comparative Literature* (1951), and in *Imagology and Human Psychology*, in *What Is Comparative Literature*, written in collaboration with P. Brunel and others. With their endeavor, Imagology study has been shaped and established its position as a branch of Comparative Literature in the mid-twentieth century.

Though Carré and Guyard made some feeble objections to influence study, when their practice is closely examined, we may still find that the empirical model of influential research has been deeply rooted in their minds, because their imagological study still follows the track of influential research, with the employment of data collecting, phenomena sorting, and other approaches with empirical characteristics, instead of deeply exploring the essential causes of the formation of an alien image.

Guyard holds that the study of alien image should be established on the basis of arrangement and comparison of the facts and “according to a certain route, we may draw an accurate description to the transmission of a specific or some specific images of a nation within a certain period of time, and during which, the investigation should be based on firm literary facts. And as long as the close examination and comparison of those articles have been made (we may say the basis is reliable), we may find something in common, and subtle individual divergence will appear” [1].

In their practice, they were engaged in distinguishing facts of alien images and examining to what extent the image deviates from the original one. As for the causes of deviation, it could not be discussed in a deep manner owing to the fact that their empirical approach always confines itself within the level of phenomena and shows their neglect to the essence behind the phenomena they are investigating. In this sense, it is obvious that the empirical approach may limit the imagological study, as Guyard proposed, “standing on the edge of the language and nation, researchers of Comparative Literature gaze at the interpenetration between two or several literatures in terms of their themes, thoughts, and emotions” (Ibid., p. 4). Therefore, Imagology can hardly meet the needs of “literariness,” as long as it employs the empirical method of study to examine psychological and emotional influence of different nations.

From the 1960s to the 1970s, French scholars have made a fruitful achievement in the field of imagological study, which includes *A Tentative Study on Research History and Methodology of Literary Imagology*, *Literature Image and Mythology Critics*, written by Jean-Marc Mour; *The Study on Image*, written by Michel Foucault; and *From Cultural Image to Collective Image*, *The Study on Imagology: From Literature to Poetics*, written by Daniel-Henri Pageaux [25]. Guided by theories of these scholars, the emphasis of imagological study has shifted from textual examination of the image of others to the examination of the creator of the image, from checking if the image is accurate to exploring the formation of the image.

Daniel-Henri Pageaux, the French scholar, in his *From Cultural Image to Collective Image*, holds “the fundamental principle of imagological study lies in collective summary of foreign image in the process of literarization and socialization” (Ibid., P. 4) and “foreign images should be investigated as a part of comprehensive and complex image. More specifically, it is a description of others or an expression of the relationship and their disparity between two types of cultures” [26]. Jean-Marc Mour, in *A Tentative Study on History Research and Methodology of Literary Imagology*, summarized the essence of Pageaux’s imagological theory as “all the images derive from the consciousness between ego and others, native and alien ties, although it is feeble. So, image can be considered the literary or non-literary description, enabling itself to illustrate the inner-relationship, of the divergence between two types of cultural realities” [27]. Mour also conducted a more elaborate definition to this thought as image is “a foreign image, an image out of one nation (society, culture), and finally, the one created by the unique feeling of a nation” [24].

Meng Hua, a Chinese expert in imagological study, in the preface of her *Imagology in Comparative Literature*, made a summary of the significant transformation of contemporary study on Imagology. To begin with, it focuses on divergence—interaction between “ego” and “other”; in other words, contemporary Imagology has put its emphasis on the interaction between ego and other, native and alien, instead of considering foreign image as the simple copy and description of reality. Secondly, it stresses the investigation on “subject.” That is to say, its focus varies from the examinee to the examiner itself, which is under the awareness of characteristics of foreign images. According to Hume and Sartre, the image is conceptive and is designed by others who are absent or on the spot. Collioure, a French theorist, divided imagination into “redivious imagination” and “creative one,” while contemporary Imagology accepts foreign image as a kind of creative imagination. Thirdly, contemporary Imagology also stresses the analysis of specific image in a general or overall manner. Professor Meng believes there exists a close and complex tie between image and collective social imagination. Therefore, besides the literary works, contemporary scholars believe the study of Imagology should also focus on the situations or conditions of their production, transmission, acceptance, and all related cultural materials. By doing so, Imagology will finally step into the category of “general literature.” Last but not least, contemporary Imagology also should focus on the study of inner relationship within the text itself.

Though the achievement of contemporary Imagology is based on the reform and adjustment of the early empirical model, it could not shake off its empirical feature

and historiography in terms of object and methodology of influence study. For instance, “social collective image,” the key term of contemporary Imagology, is borrowed from historians, containing the intention to conduct a scientific definition of its research object. In this sense, contemporary Imagology has not escaped from the category of “the study of international literary relations” all the way and even endeavored to sort out various elements which will influence the formation of image, in terms of intellectual, ideological, and cultural history. Pageaux remarked, “because image is the image of others, it actually is a cultural fact. And what we are talking about is also the collective cultural image, which should be examined as an object or an anthropological experience [...] actually, illusion contains a political feature. And it is reasonable for us to describe ‘others’ in literature, which will be necessary for us to make a further discussion.” From his viewpoint, the stress the French scholars put on the facts and scientific model can be discerned. What is needed is “to investigate the ties between history and society from the plot of that image, which refers to not only the relation between the text and context, but also between the typical text of the image and the social imagination” [26].

To enhance the maneuverability in research, in his *The Study on Imagology: From Literature to Poetics*, Pageaux divided the inner textual research, the most fundamental one for the study of image, into three layers: lexical level, larger structural units of texts (hierarchies), and plot. With the concept of programming and encoding in semiology and structuralism, he deliberately explores the rules of creation of images in texts, though he also mentioned in it ample aesthetic significance of images and tried his best to raise imagological study up to a poetic level. Actually, the literary image is the combination of emotion and thoughts, of which the emotional factors are forever “unweighable.” Thus, the diversity and abundance of the connotation of “image” in Imagology has always been and will be the unbridgeable obstacle for various empirical and scientific research. Meanwhile, the “creative” feature of the image—the research object of contemporary Imagology—will hardly be met by the need of any dogmatic and scientific explanation, for the author’s innovation has been put in it. To sum up, either the early imagological research or the magnificent contemporary theory of it has stepped into the embarrassment in practice, because of the qualitative research of the discipline and empirical method of the international literary relations, formed in the atmosphere of influence study of the French school.

1.3.4 Challenges in Cross-Cultural Contexts: Variation Everywhere

The retrospection of the French school on influence study, the challenge from the American school, and the attempt at breaking through the limitation of influence study all remind us of the fact that there is a great drawback in the influence study model. The setting of historical tendency and empirical approach of the French school determined the absence of the study on the literariness. And such an

ignorance of aesthetic features in literature works also directly resulted from the indifference to the obvious variations in literary exchanges and interactions. Therefore, under the background of globalization, with the frequent exchange among alien civilizations, it calls for great attention and analysis from researchers on the phenomena of Variation emerging in the process of exchange among different cultural contexts, and this has cast a great challenge to the empirical model of influence study.

Since Chinese scholars have to be confronted with conflicts and shocks between Western and Oriental civilizations at the very beginning, the study of Comparative Literature conducted by Chinese scholars actually belongs to cross-cultural research or cross-civilization study. I put forward the concept of cross-civilization study in “Cross-Civilization Study: Theory and Practice of Chinese Comparative Literature in the Twenty-First Century” and maintains that it is the fundamental theoretical premise, basic academic model, and practical guideline for Chinese Comparative Literature study in the twenty-first century [28]. The specific theory of cross-civilization study in Comparative Literature, as well as the research objective of Variation study, is the literary Variation in foreign cultural context and heterogeneity of literary phenomena in different cultural traditions. The meaning of a literary work, in its traveling, passes unavoidably through various cultural barriers. And its existence in foreign cultural context should be accomplished by deformation, distortion, and loss of cultural image of its content and form. That foreign cultural existence of literature may lead to the phenomena of misreading, misinterpretation, and mistranslation, which have sketched magnificent scenery of literary communication. So, the exchange of literatures may be influenced by linguistic Variation, cultural heterogeneity, and ideological difference. Therefore, it is quite necessary for the research in a cross-civilization context to face Variation.

The overseas circulation and Variation of Chinese classic poems will make a very good example. There are, respectively, 15 and 150 translated versions of Chinese classic poems that have been embodied in *Cathay* [29], published in 1915, by Ezra Pound, the representative of later American imagists, and in *Fir-Flower Tablets*, in 1920 by Amy Lowell. Five years later, more English translations of Chinese classic poems emerged, and contemporary literary historians could not help marveling at the overwhelming flood of Chinese poems in British and American poetic circles [30]. At that time, imagists loved translating, modifying, and imitating Chinese poems. The major contribution of Pound to imagism is his translation and interpretation of Chinese poems, which is, in essence, the demonstration of his own understanding towards the imagery by regarding Chinese poems as his raw materials. To our surprise, Pound, himself, did not know any Chinese characters, and his translation is only with the aid of English annotations of Chinese poems, left by Fenollosa, a scholar on Chinese poems. Therefore, it is quite natural for people to believe that he translated and adapted Chinese poems in a wild manner. For instance, “Chang Gan Xing,” written by Li Bai, was translated into “The Merchant’s Wife”; “Luo Ye Ai Ming Qu” was translated into *Liu Ch’e*. All those translated versions are creative imitation. So that is why Pound was called by Thomas Stearns Eliot the person who invented Chinese poems for contemporary Americans.

Imagists also created their own image of poems by misreading of Chinese characters. In *Analects* of Confucius, “学而时习之,不亦乐乎” (meaning to learn and at due times to review what one has learned, is that not after all a pleasure?) was adapted by Pound, as “to study, with the flying away of the white wings of time, is it a pleasure?” (75th chapter, Cathay). With the imagistic interpretation of the character “習,” his need for imagery in poems can be satisfied, without realizing the fact that it has completely departed from the original meaning of that Chinese character. John G. Fletcher, another imagist, interpreted the character “暮” (meaning dusk), as “now, the lowest pine branch already lies in the circle around the sun” [31]. We may marvel at the innovation of their beautiful interpretation, and from which, we may feel that Variation is everywhere in imitation and translation. That is to say, Variation can be obviously detected in the spreading and influence of Chinese classic poems in Britain and America by those imagists. So, in this sense, the contemporary theory of Comparative Literature has ignored this phenomenon in literary communication, which has led this discipline into the danger of departure from the practice of literary study. The need to establish a new research model of influence study is extremely urgent.

1.4 Essence of Influence Studies: Coexistence of Positivism and Variation

1.4.1 *Essence of Influence Studies: The Method of Positivism and the Phenomenon of Variation*

The study of influence is the methodology of the first phase in the development of Comparative Literature. Having pioneered the way for the development of Comparative Literature, influence studies, for which the French school laid the foundation, is of great significance. Positivistic study, advocated by the French school too, seems to be the only methodology in influence studies. Doxologie, one of the three pillars of the French school's theories, studies the propagation and acceptance of literature, schools, writers, and their works of one nation upon another through the transmission from broadcaster to messenger and then to recipient. Its aim is to seek the literary relationship between broadcaster and recipient. And this literary relationship is based on facts. Therefore, the whole process requires a prudent, scientific, and positivistic attitude, from the proposal to the proof of the hypothesis. Crenologie seeks how one literary phenomenon is influenced by another and searches its causes and origins by close-knit research. From its theoretical connotation and research practice, it belongs to a kind of positivistic research. Mesologie is also greatly influenced by positivistic research. Thus, influence studies seem to be the synonym of positivism. However, is that true? Before the French school, the first theoretical work of Comparative Literature is British H. M. Posnett's *Comparative Literature*, published in 1886. The definition of Comparative Literature in this book covers external relations and internal characteristics of the development of

literature; it really has a wide range. “The Journal of Comparative Literature” initiated by a German scholar Marx Koch in 1887 not only includes the studies on arts of translation, literary forms, and literary themes but also touches upon fields of the history of thoughts and history of customs. The range is much broader than that of influence studies. It even launches the study of interdisciplinary comparison. Nevertheless, the French school only focuses on influence studies. They choose positivistic methodology not only because of the influence from positivism’s tradition but also due to the following reasons.

The first reason is in order to meet the challenge from the scholar Benedetto Croce. Croce assumes that comparison is the method that can be applied in all disciplines; so the method cannot be considered a unique methodology in Comparative Literature. Therefore, the perspective that Comparative Literature is a discipline does not hold water. The founder of French Comparative Literature, Paul Van Tieghem, asserts that “the object of Comparative Literature essentially studies correlation among literary works of different countries [...] authentic Comparative Literature usually engages in research on the binary relationship between two factors; it only testifies the binary relationship between a giver and a receptor” [32]. Another representative of the French school, J. M. Carré, also emphasizes that “Comparative Literature is not literary comparison” [1]. So the French school applies a kind of prudent and closely knit methodology to their studies. If the study is not based on precise textual criticism, but on simple comparison, the conclusion would descend into generalities and would not help the development of Comparative Literature.

Secondly, the generation of the French school’s theories is also the result of correction by the French school during the development of Comparative Literature. The first representative of the French school, F. Baldensperger, points out in his famous article “Littérature comparée: Le Mot et la chose” “No explicatory clarity results from comparisons restricting themselves to a glance cast simultaneously at two different objects, to that recollection, conditioned by the play of memories and impressions, of similarities which may well be erratic points furtively linked by the mind’s caprice” [33]. That means Comparative Literature is by no means a simple comparison among analogous elements but a textual criticism and argument by prudent and closely knit positivistic methodology.

Then, is influence-oriented positivism of the French school absolutely mechanical and stark, and does it exclude aesthetics of literature? The scholars who assert that the French school emphasizes too much on positivism all cite what Paul Van Tieghem has said as hard evidence of its lack of focus on literariness and aesthetic appreciation with the old convention of positivism. Certainly, Paul Van Tieghem applies the scientific attitude and positivistic method to the establishment of a methodological system of Comparative Literature. He objects to random comparison which is too broad to be meaningful. However, his opinions are regarded as the target of criticism against the French school.

Emphasis on positivism is a notable feature of the French school; it is also an everlasting contribution made by the French school for Comparative Literature. If we view it from a different angle, we may find that the study of influence emphasizes

more on relationship and factual contact among emitter, recipient, and media. It leads the study of Comparative Literature to seek the connection and similarity between specific facts and phenomena. It pays attention to homogeneity and inheritance of influence. Therefore, it certainly focuses on resemblance and similarity of the literary phenomena after transmission through space and time. But it ignores the friction and the changes produced when different civilizations, cultures, languages, and subjects meet each other. The research also ignores collision and conflict among different cultures/literary systems in the process of influence and reception, as there will be the course of exclusion, reception, internalization, and reaction when one culture absorbs another alien one. In the process of conflict and amalgamation of the two, the internal cultural shock may generate a series of cultural Variation.

For instance, in the period of the Wei and Jin Dynasties of ancient China, the great influx of Buddhist culture caused big confluence and conflict of culture in Chinese history. New genres of literature like *Bianwen* appeared when the culture of Buddhism was absorbed and borrowed by Chinese classical literature. Buddhism helped to develop Zen Buddhism with Chinese characteristics. Buddhist culture also exerted great influence on lifestyles and ways of thinking of the ancient Chinese. We may find that during this period, not only did the Variation emerge in the interior of the Chinese cultural system, but also Chinese Buddhism developed differently from that of India. After the expansion of Chinese Buddhism, both Buddhism and Buddhist culture underwent some mutation. So the transmission of different cultures/literatures is not a mechanical move from A to B or unchanged transmission, but a complicated, dynamic, and delicate process.

First, literary phenomenon is transnational and cross-lingual. Recipients understand literary works or phenomena of other nations usually by reading translation versions, and translation itself contains Variation. French literary sociologist Robert Escarpit presents a concept—creative treason, which means “translation puts works into a completely unanticipated reference system; people say translation is creative, because it gives the works brand-new looks and broadly provides the readers brand-new literary communication, and also because translation prolongs the life of the work and gives it another life” [34]. Chinese scholar Wang Xiangyuan considers translated literature, native literature, and foreign literature as parallel components of literature [35]. It shows the creative role of the translator, translation is an activity of creation, and the translated texts have the characteristic of relative independence. The process of translation can not only be analyzed by positivistic methods, the variability must be noticed too. Secondly, Imagology, besides the perspective of positivistic relation, also includes that of Variation for social collective imagery characterized by Variation. Finally, when two modes of different cultures/literatures intersect, the intersection varies from both of them because the cultural filtration produced in cultural communication is the selection of the alien culture and literature according to its own tradition. So it will cause a series of cultural misinterpretation.

One of the literary subjects, the process of literary reception in Comparative Literature is not only the selective procedure from the receiver according to its own needs but also the course of aesthetic, flexible, and complex psychological process. The collection and selection of materials by comparatists during research contain

unavoidably personal aesthetic preference. Thus, the positivistic method is the basis and starting point for the research. Only with the attitude of positivism can the researchers stick to seeking truth in the study of Comparative Literature rather than jumping to a conclusion without textual research and solid argumentation. At the same time, the researchers should adopt an aesthetic attitude to look at the procedure of literary communication. Only in this way will the literary research not be mechanical or just follow the stale process of the doctrine of borrowing or delivering so that the path of Comparative Literature will grow smoother and wider. With a clear awareness of the disadvantage of overemphasis on positivism, René Etiemble, the French comparatist, points out, “historical method must be joined with the spirit of criticism, material research must be combined with textual interpretation, and the prudence of socialists must be associated with boldness of aestheticians. Only in this way can we endow significant topics and some appropriate approaches in our discipline” [36]. Indeed, if we apply the method combining prudence and aesthetics, we may find that in the process of literary communication and conversation, variability, appearing after the receiver’s feedback, makes the literature grow. And this variability becomes the force for the occurrence and the development of literature. Positivistic methodology focuses on seeking common ground and emphasizes finding inheritance in it. But the methodology of Variation pays attention to discovering differences in it. Because of the Variation, literature keeps moving forward. Inheritance and Variation of literature is a complicated dynamic procedure. Similarities and differences are originally the objective existence in the development of literature. They both are interdependent and inseparable as a whole. The French school continually seeks similarities; in this sense, they expose differences obviously at the same time. Therefore, we say that the essence of the French school lies in coexistence of positivism and Variation, which are two sides of one problem. And we need not only seek similarities but also study literature with dynamic views of development. If we review literary research from heterogeneity and variability, we will draw beneficial conclusions.

1.4.2 Case Study on Coexistence of Positivism and Variation: Exploration of Variation in Literary Communication Between China and Japan

Japanese literature is quite successful in absorbing the influence of foreign literatures and internalizing alien culture to become its own. For instance, Japanese Waka, the pride of Japan, is a traditional poetic genre. Waka poetry specializes in describing nature and personal emotion. It is simple, implicit, lyrical, and euphemistic. Waka poetry appears early in *ManYoShuu*, which adopts Chinese characters as the citation form for Japanese characters, called Manyokana. From the seventh to eighth century, because of the frequent communication between China and Japan and because Japan sent many ambassadors to the Tang Dynasty of China for communication several times, the climax of learning Chinese culture and literature prevailed in

Japan. More and more Japanese wrote poems in Chinese. Moreover, many members of the upper class and intellectuals received a higher cultivation from Chinese poetry. *Kaifusuo*, compiled in 715, was the earliest collection of Chinese poetry composed in Japan. Till the ninth century in the peaceful time of Japan, “Ling Yunji” (814), “Wenhuaxiuliji” (818), and “Jing Guoji” (827) were all Chinese poetry compiled together. Chinese poetry, as the literary form of the Japanese aristocracy, was composed tremendously. Chinese literature at its best became the object of imitation for the Japanese literary circle. And Chinese literature exerted great influence on the formation and development of the Japanese Waka tradition. Tenyuanbincheng (724–790) composed the first monograph of the theory of Japanese Waka. The book imitated Shengbing theory of Chinese poetry and presented seven “gebings” and introduced rhythm of Chinese poetry to regulate the writing of Waka. It also tried to establish a theoretical system for Waka from aspects like form, purpose and interest, and language [37]. However, under great impact of Chinese poetry, in order to maintain its position, Waka evolved to contend with Chinese poetry. The early Japanese poetry did not have fixed rhythm and line. Yan Shaodang holds that in the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries, the interior of Waka poetry, which was originally rhythmless and formless, changed a great deal. Waka poetry gained valuable literary materials from the Chinese Sao style and then formed “Misobitomoji” during contending and struggling with the impact of Chinese literature. Finally Waka poetry became the poetry with rhythm, and it could be read in modern times. Meter constituted by rhythmic unit, phoneme, was the mark of the characteristics of Waka. However, Misobitomoji, as a mode of meter, restricted the poetry in Japanese language. This new form of literature was what we called a variant. The process of its derivation could be called the Variation. In ancient Japanese literature, the change of the poetry from “Jiji Ballads” to “ManYoShuu” was actually the process of Variation of Waka poetry. Rhythmic Waka poetry was gradually stereotyped from *ManYoShuu* to *A Collection of Classical and Modern Japanese Poetry*. Rhythmization of Waka poetry was formed during the cultural communications for hundreds of years [38].

Prefaces to a Collection of Classical and Modern Japanese Poetry, both *Manajo* and *Kanajo*, were apparently influenced by Zhong Rong’s *Shih-Pin Xu* (*Preface to Review of Poetry*). In this article, Zhong Rong illustrated that the four seasons, wind, rain, moon, bird, or emotion like pleasure, anger, sorrow and joy could all be expressed in poetry [39]. In *Kanajo*, when talking about the essence of poetry, Ki no Tsurayuki held that poetry could describe many things in the world including birds, frog chorus, and all living creatures. In *Manajo*, Ki no Yoshimochi said that living in the world, people had all those emotions like happiness or sorrow. And these emotions could be expressed by words. Borrowing from Chinese poetics, Japanese poetics emphasized the expression of mind and intentionally diluted poetry’s functions of reasoning and education. And it had a lasting impact on forming Japanese literature’s characteristics of ultra-utilitarianism, surrealism, and nonpolitics. Emphasis on the feeling of four seasons, the landscape scenery, and the tradition of love and family life exerted far-reaching influence on the formation of literary theories like “mysterious profundity” and “sentimentality” and on the emergence of Japanese

unique literary style like haiku and Watakushi Novel (Private Novel). After Waka poetry, Connecting poetry appeared in the Kamakura period of Japan. Connecting poetry was composed by various people. The first person composed and read aloud the first verse (namely, 5, 7, 5 moras in Waka poetry), which was called the “starting verse.” Then another person composed and read aloud the next verse (namely, 7, 7 moras in Waka poetry), which was called the “connecting verse.” Connecting poetry, a collective writing activity, stressed the flexibility and mental acuteness of the participants. At that time, tinged with some features of logomachy, composing Connecting poetry was an elegant activity for aristocrats and intellectuals. Later, the starting verse of Connecting poetry, containing some humorous and ironic verses, became independent. Then haiku appeared at the end of Waka poetry and Connecting poetry’s prosperity. Haiku, which showed unique Japanese aesthetics and sentimentality, reached its high point in the works of Basho Matsuo.

Another example concerns the formation of the Japanese Naturalistic School. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, under the influence of European literature, a literary trend of large-scale naturalistic literature was formed in Japan. The trend of Naturalism marked the establishment of Japanese modern literature. In the Meiji Period, Japan carried out the Meiji Reformation; Japanese was encouraged to develop civilization and economic and military power, actively learned from Europe and America, and endeavored to develop a capitalistic economy, but the feudal force and national policy still predominated. Moreover, Japanese people lived in an abyss of misery during the Sino-Japanese War in 1894 and the Russo-Japanese war in 1904. People felt tired about the wars and were disappointed about realities; social conflicts also grew tense. Bourgeois intellectuals, on the verge of despair and nihilism, tried to find ways to relieve destructive tension and sadness. At this time, Japanese naturalistic writers noticed the literature of experimentalism of French writers Zola, Guy de Maupassant, and Gustave Flaubert. They appreciated their apolitical attitude with neglect towards the sense of right and wrong and refusal of the participation in the real life.

Overall, “because of blindly yearning for social ideals, Japanese intellectuals went to the other extreme, which was far from real society [...] after frustration of self-consciousness, Japanese naturalist writers developed Naturalism to the other extreme. However, its essence was still with romantic features of self-expression” [40]. Different from European Naturalism, which resisted Romanticism, Japanese Naturalism blended romantic elements with it. This was a thought-provoking Variation of Naturalism during its transmission. Because of Japanese writers’ acceptance and approval, Naturalism had become a striking literary school in the history of Japanese literature that could not be ignored.

Through the exposure of reality, naturalist writers attempted to achieve the purpose of restoring the reality and to correct the bias of Realism. They claimed the exclusion of skills and linguistically accomplished innovation of the identification of vernacular and written language. Japanese naturalist writers dedicated themselves to describe the dark reality. With sad tone and bold and undisguised description of the real world, their works were very bleak and full of pessimism and desperation. Leaving off the description of the historical background, Japanese naturalist

writings highlighted the sensual needs of human beings and narrowed down the scope of description to personal trivialities and mental activities. Then under the impact of the description of mentality, Japanese naturalistic writing produced a unique writing style—Watakushi Novel (Private Novel). Watakushi Novel was filled with strong confession and sentimentality. With its powerful influence, Watakushi Novel quickly impacted Chinese writers Guo Moruo and Yu Dafu. But the depth and the direction of the influence varied from one writer to another. Chinese Private Novel was concerned more with sociality. The writing of Watakushi Novel (Private Novel) became a condemnation to the society. So this is also a kind of Variation of the influence.

Naturalism was introduced to China through Japan. So the influence of Naturalism on China was not only from European Naturalism but also from the varied Japanese Naturalism. One of the most important media of introduction of Naturalism was “The Short Story Monthly” edited by Mao Dun. In December 1912, Xiao Feng translated an article “Naturalism in Literature” written by Japanese naturalist theorist Shimamura Hōgetsu. Mao Dun himself put more emphasis on the realistic aspects in Naturalism as well as objective description and observation of Naturalism. Obviously, the selection was made according to the reality in China. At that time, China was at the crucial moment of surviving. The historical task of fighting against imperialism and feudalism was very urgent and heavy. As foresighted enlighteners, Chinese writers made the literature become the tool to serve “for life.” They participated in wars and awakened the public with their writings. The literature of that time carried strong characteristics of Realism. Moreover, translation of the naturalistic literature promoted the modernization of Chinese literature. In the process of rapid development, Japan not only showed great concern for Zola, Guy de Maupassant, and Gustave Flaubert but also drew close attention to writers like Henrik Ibsen, Fyodor Dostoyevsky, and Ivan Turgenev. According to China’s own need, Chinese writers selected those writers who showed great concern to the social problems, which cause the Variation of Chinese Naturalism to be tinged with realistic connotation. Then it became a branch of Realism in China.

Opposed to the vulgar Realism of Kenyuusya, Japanese Naturalism rose as a new literature. It was independent from the very beginning, whereas Naturalism was introduced into China for the purpose of revealing the reality. Transmission of Naturalism in China and Japan reflected diversity of Variation in influence studies: “The Chinese writers of new-vernacular literature always made an attempt to supplement Realism with Naturalism. But in Japanese literature, Realism was finally replaced by Naturalism” [41].

Thus, during integration and communication with Chinese literature, Japanese literature produces new growing points, from which new literary forms appeared, such as Waka poetry, haiku, and Watakushi Novel. They all become unique Japanese literary forms and are exquisite works of art in the literary world. As Chinese scholar Yan Shaodang puts it, “after the formation of literature’s Variation, and with familiarity and adaptation of national psychology, original elements of coerciveness in the process of their formation are dissolved in literature communication (theoretically they will be permanently retained). Once these elements are dissolved and are

not obvious, people will forget them and will not admit the meaningful connection between them and their alien cultures. Then people believe that these elements belong to their nation. And other new literary forms will derive from the new origin. The national tradition of literature of one nation can be continued and upgraded in the course of Variation. And other literary forms will be born from that basis, Waka poetry of Japan for example, later, connecting verse and Haiku are derived from Waka poetry” [38].

1.4.3 *Chinese Orphan: The European Variation of “Orphan of the Zhao Family”*

Chinese literature first exerted influence on East Asia and then reached out to Europe and ultimately to America. Modern Westerners took interests in China from *The Travels of Marco Polo*. Marco Polo came to China in the early Yuan Dynasty, namely, the fourteenth century. And it was those foreign missionaries in China who officially introduced Chinese culture to the modern Western world. From the seventeenth century onward, the West began to know Chinese literature through letters and articles of those missionaries. Till the eighteenth century, there appeared the first summit of introduction about China in the Western world. At the sixth year of Emperor Tianqi of the late Ming Dynasty of China (1626), *The Five Classics*, translated by Nicolas Trigault, a French missionary, was published in Hangzhou. It was the earliest translated version of the Chinese classical books. Later on, Antoine Gaubil translated *The Book of Songs*, *The Book of History*, *The Book of Changes*, and *The Book of Rites*. But *The Book of Songs* was not published in Western magazines until the eighteenth century. *The Book of Songs* and *The Book of History* translated by Joseph de Prémare were published in *Description de la Chine (Description of China)* of Paris in 1735. Out of great attainments on Chinese literature by reading many Chinese classic books, French writer Victor Segalen found out a lot of common thoughts with him in Taoism, Buddhism, Yi-Ching learning, yin and yang, and five elements. It was under the nurture and the inspiration of Chinese culture in many aspects that Victor Segalen’s literary creation had entered the most fruitful stage. *Stèles (Stele)*, which could best represent his literary achievement, reflected fully the influence of Chinese culture on him. At this moment, Chinese classical novels, dramas, and fables were introduced to Europe and caught the attention of the Westerners.

Without modern fast transportation, it was quite common for people to know foreign countries and cultures by reading. Voltaire was the most typical representative. According to some scholars’ research, Voltaire’s understanding of Confucius’ thought of benevolence is through studying and reading Confucian classics. And this could be seen in the drama “Grand Orphan in Song Dynasty of China” rewritten by him on the basis of the Northern plays (zaju) of the Yuan Dynasty. At the very beginning, Joseph de Prémare translated zaju “Orphan of the Zhao Family” written by Chi Chun-hsiang. In 1734, *France Times* published some segments of the drama in French. In 1735, with the publication of *Description de la Chine (Description of*

China), the segment of translation was known to the French people. Then the drama was released in Britain, Germany, and Russia from the mid-1830s to the early 1860s. French Enlightenment thinker Voltaire adapted it to a new drama called “Grand Orphan in Song Dynasty of China.” In 1781, German poet Goethe read “Orphan of the Zhao Family,” four novelettes in *Spectacular Stories*, and some poems in *The Book of Songs* from a German translation version by Jean-Baptiste Du Halde. In the same year, Goethe tried to rewrite “Orphan of the Zhao Family” into a tragedy: “A Lan Bo Nuo.” Transmission and Variation of “Orphan of the Zhao Family” was a very impressive case in the relationship between Chinese and European literature.

Zaju “Orphan of the Zhao Family” is a historical drama. The original story can be read in “The Chronicle of Zuo.” But it is rather brief. Then the story is recorded with details in “Zhao’s Family of Historical Records, Xin Xu and Shuo Yuan” by Liu Xiang. Zaju is based on historical facts, but the plot varies a lot from the original one. For instance, the background of the story is changed from the period of Duke Jinjing to Duke Jinling. In the original story, the orphan was hidden in the palace, whereas, in the drama, a doctor called Cheng Ying takes the orphan away in a medical box. In the original story, the orphan lived a reclusive life in the mountains, while, in the drama, the orphan is adopted by Tu Anjia as his foster son. When the orphan grows up in the family of Tu, he kills Tu for revenge. In the original story, Han Jue proposed the conferment of the title for the orphan after the orphan grew up, whereas, in the drama, Han Jue commits suicide in order to release the orphan. In the original story, Gongsun Chujiu and Cheng Ying are the retainers of Zhao Dun, while, in the drama, Gongsun Chujiu becomes an old minister and a colleague of Zhao Dun and retires from his position and lives in seclusion out of hatred to the fatuous ruler and treacherous court officials. And Cheng Ying becomes a common doctor and is on good terms with the Zhao family. Through these changes, the shocking struggle in the story becomes more incisive and concentrated.

“Orphan of the Zhao Family” describes the fight between the royalists to their sovereign and the treacherous court officials in Jin Kingdom of the Spring and Autumn Period. It also narrates the fight of persecution and anti-persecution revolving around the orphan of the Zhao family. This zaju drama on the one hand reveals fierce and cruel evil deeds by treacherous court official Tu Anjia and on the other hand describes the chivalrous spirit of Cheng Ying, Han Jue, and Gongsun Chujiu who take risks to find justice. All of these form the violent conflicts of the drama. In the drama, the treacherous court official Tu Anjia is supported by the fatuous ruler and is puffed up with pride. Nevertheless, the side with justice which is in the passive status overcomes unthinkable hardships and resists persecution in all sorts of ways. So these factors determine tragic characteristics of the drama. And the orphan of the Zhao family finally survives and takes revenge. This shows the traditional attitude of Chinese people that “one good return deserves another.” The whole drama is full of the spirit of justice and encourages people to establish confidence that good shall triumph eventually over evil.

The zaju successfully molds a series of tragic characters with distinct personalities and sublime virtues. For example, after 300 people of the Zhao family are killed and

Tu Anjia's claim of killing all the children whose age ranges from 1 to 6 months, doctor Cheng Ying earns the great trust of the princess and risks his life to save the orphan. And he would rather sacrifice his own child to save all the other children. His ideals are quite lofty. Gongsun Chujiu hates injustice like poison and does not like to work with treacherous court officials. Besides, he shields the orphan and would rather die than surrender. He shows us awe-inspiring righteousness. Han Jue used to be Tu Anjia's chancellor. When facing the major issues of principle, he sacrifices himself to set the orphan free and kills himself by cutting the throat to show his high ideals. Even through conversations with only few words, Chu Ni, Ling Zhe, and Ti Miming with various personalities are described vividly. The sublime group of the tragic characters sharply contrasts violence and cruelty of the presumptuous and sinister character Tu Anjia, constituting prominent tragic characteristics of the drama.

The plot of the drama contains obvious tragic elements. At the very beginning, the author briefly narrates the brutal event that Tu Anjia kills 300 members of Zhao Dun's family in the introduction. Then, he intensively describes sharp struggles in the process of searching and rescuing the orphan. Those searchers try to find out the orphan and kill him, while those rescuers take precaution to protect the orphan. In the palace, Cheng Ying rescues the orphan. At the palace gate, Han Jue releases the orphan. In the country, Cheng Ying sacrifices his baby, and Gongsun commits suicide to save the orphan. These devoted officials and righteous men die one after another for the orphan, creating strong tragic atmosphere for the drama. Because of the struggle of these righteous men, finally the murderer is killed by the orphan who is raised up by him. The plot joins the ideal with cruel reality. And it contains strong ironic factors of self-do and self-have and incorporates Chinese national characteristics.

With five acts, "Grand Orphan in Song Dynasty of China" written by Voltaire completely rewrites "Orphan of the Zhao Family." All roles are replaced. The background of the drama is changed from the Spring and Autumn Period to the Song and Yuan Dynasty. And the location of the story in this drama is changed to be Beijing.

At the beginning of the first act, the Mongolians are telling each other the news of the fall of China. The conversation between Idame, the wife of an official Zamti, and her friend Asseli portrays the violence and brutality of Mongolian military officers and soldiers. Genghis Khan used to adore Idame. In order to save the imperial descendant, Zamti hands over his son to the Mongolians as the prince. At the same time, he orders his friend Etan to take the real prince to Koryo (Korea).

In the second act, Etan comes back from Koryo. He tells Zamti the experience of their escape in detail. Meanwhile, out of a mother's love, Idame rescues their son halfway. She scolds her husband to say that he is not qualified to be a father. Suspecting that the couple hides the prince, Genghis Khan becomes infuriated. He captures and then executes the prince.

In the third act, Zamti's own son is caught by Genghis Khan. Idame comes to the palace, explains that the baby in the palace is not the prince but her son, and begs the king to return him. Genghis Khan decides to set the innocent kid free. However, Zamti refuses to tell where the prince is. Genghis Khan gets furious with him. Out of revenge, he decides to marry his former lover Idame and to make her his concubine.

In the fourth act, after careful consideration, Genghis Khan suddenly realizes that he adores and admires the ethic of Chinese civilization. In the conversation between Genghis Khan and Idame, Genghis Khan confesses his admiration for her. And he learns that Idame still has feelings for him. So he urges her to divorce her husband Zamti to become the new queen of China. At that time, people who helped the prince to escape lose their way, so they cannot reach Koryo and have to come back. They hide the prince in the mausoleum of emperors of various dynasties. And the prince is going to be starved to death. Zamti tries to persuade Idame to sacrifice herself to rescue the prince. Idame inveighs against Zamti for his unethical or irrational proposal. She refuses to accept this proposal and decides to have her own way that she will go to the mausoleum through a tunnel to milk the baby.

At the beginning of the fifth act, Idame and the prince are trapped in the jail. That is because, when she goes to the mausoleum, spies have already known what she is going to do. Genghis Khan continues courting her. Her answer will determine the lives of Zamti, the prince, and her own baby. Genghis Khan tells her his pain in the heart and begs her to marry him. However, Idame insists on her choice that she would rather die. She only hopes to see her husband before her execution. Genghis Khan gives her his consent. As the couple meet each other, Idame asks her husband to kill her and then to commit suicide. But before they do it, Genghis Khan overhears their conversation. He falls over their romantic love and indomitable integrity. Chinese civilization unconsciously baptizes Genghis Khan. Then the emperor sets all the people free.

By comparison, we find that “Orphan of the Zhao Family” and “Grand Orphan in Song Dynasty of China” happen at different times; the former is a story of the Spring and Autumn Period and the latter the end of the Southern Song Dynasty. Besides the narration of saving and protecting the orphan, the author of “Orphan of the Zhao Family” emphasizes revenge, while “Grand Orphan in Song Dynasty of China” has a different plot. Voltaire also describes saving and protecting the orphan, but he focuses more on the change of Genghis Khan’s attitude, which highlights fraternity and the concept of the enlightened monarch advocated by Voltaire. So in characterization, Voltaire pays more attention to responsibility and justice and considers rationality and equity as the rule. These ideas are in accordance with the ideas of the French and European Enlightenment. However, “Orphan of the Zhao Family” eulogizes traditional Confucian morality of friendship and loyalty.

In *On Customs of Various Nations*, Voltaire says, “it seems that all nations are superstitious except Chinese intellectuals” [42]. As a leader of the Enlightenment, Voltaire finishes his misunderstanding of Chinese culture in his imagination. He believed that China was an urbane country, and Chinese civilization based on Confucianism was an outstanding representative of civilization. He also visualized a representative of the enlightened monarch—Genghis Khan. Chinese culture embodied his ideals of enlightenment. His praise for Chinese culture is actually the affirmation of his own enlightened opinions and the resistance to the autocratic monarchy in the real society. It is also the rewriting of the other culture out of his own needs which constitutes a form of Variation.

Obviously, literary influence, imitation, and Variation complement each other. Based on positivism, the study of variations of Comparative Literature is a new perspective in influence studies. It objectively studies the dynamic development of literature, penetrates the development of literature through Variation, and combines the positivism of the French school with the study of Variation. This is the correction for defects of the French school, which enriches and supplements the model of influence studies and also greatly pushes the development of the theory of Comparative Literature.

1.5 Important Breakthrough in Comparative Literature: The Shaping of Variation Theory

1.5.1 The Shaping of Variation Theory

1.5.1.1 The Innovation of the Chinese School

Variation Theory is a major achievement which is made by theoretical innovation and systemization of the Chinese school by relying on our own efforts. As is well known, innovation is the soul of a nation's growth. Academic innovation, with awareness of innovation as well as emphasis on independence in the field of academic research, proposed the theory of the third phase of the disciplinary theory of Comparative Literature, aiming to break through the current defective mode of the French school and the American school and to construct a novel and scientific mode of the Chinese school by starting from cross-civilization study on the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western culture [43]. The third-phase theory is a theoretical system of Comparative Literature proposed by Chinese scholars. Its foundation is a great achievement in the field of Chinese human and social science. Variation Theory elaborated in this chapter constitutes the fruit of the methodology of the third-phase theory. We attempt to compensate the major defects existing in the theories of the French and American school and attempt to provide effective guidance on Chinese Comparative Literature.

I have immersed myself in the study of Chinese classical poetics and theories of Comparative Literature. Therefore, Variation Theory is an outcome based on the accumulation of my thoughts on literary theory and criticism. I base my study in the tradition of Chinese literature, holding a stance of Chinese as well as the sharing of the East and the West. In my Ph.D. dissertation *Chinese-Western Comparative Poetics*, I had formed a clear concept of the comparative study of Chinese and Western culture. Since I returned to China after being a visiting scholar from Cornell University and Harvard University in 1994, in the following 2 years issued several articles—"The Strategy of the Development of Chinese Culture and the Reconstruction of Chinese Literary Discourse in the 21st Century" [44], "The Aphasia of Literary Theory and Cultural Pathology" [45], and "The Characteristics of Basic Theory of

Comparative Literature and its Methodology” [46]—in which I explored two aspects: the establishment of the Chinese school of Comparative Literature and the phenomenon of “aphasia” and the reconstruction of Chinese traditional literary discourse. In the past 10 years, these two factors were joined in discussion by many scholars and meanwhile brought on solutions to several problems in Chinese Comparative Literature.

First, due to the lack of the disciplinary theory suitable with Chinese reality, there is the severe separation in China of comparative theory from practice, and often there appears a superficial formula for comparison: $X + Y$, the random comparison of two elements of analogy. Secondly, the heterogeneity of Chinese traditional literary theories with the Western poetics impedes an in-depth comparison of these two. Even the study within the field of Chinese ancient literary theories has totally borrowed the Western genealogy, ignoring the heterogeneous features of Chinese discourse. Nowadays, the study of ancient literary theories has diminished the source-finding study on the hidden cultural principles and directly explains the ancient literature by using the Western theories. This led to serious consequences which involved losing roots of Chinese culture and the “aphasia” of academic study. Thirdly, the tendency to seek the commonness which exists in Comparative Literature becomes stereotyped and confines the progress of the study. The early stage of Comparative Literature developed in the same circle of civilization, while the study of Comparative Literature in the age of globalization has been out of the single civilization and directly involved the clash in the heterogeneous cultures. The comparability on the basis of the “homogeneity” and “analogy” cannot encompass the comparative study of the Chinese–Western literature of a totally different nature. Therefore, the confirmation of the heterogeneity in Comparative Literature became the first imperative.

I think the fundamental way for the solution of these problems is the dramatic change of the paradigm of the disciplinary theory of Comparative Literature. Since 1995 when I first proposed the third-phase theory of the Chinese school, I have published hundreds of articles and several monographs and textbooks to put forward some important disciplinary theories, such as “the third-phase disciplinary theory,” “aphasia,” “reconstruction of Chinese discourse,” “cross-civilization study,” “alienation of literature,” as well as “Sinicization of Western theories”; all these novel theories aim to guide the current situation of Comparative Literature, from which Variation Theory was conceived.

Variation Theory was first introduced in *Study on Comparative Literature* which categorized translation studies, Imagology, cultural filtration, and literary misreading into the branch of Variation and set up a new paradigm. In August 2005, the hypothesis of Variation Theory was formally proposed at the Eighth Annual Conference of Chinese Comparative Literature [43]. In 2006, *The Course of Comparative Literature* was completed which clearly defined one basic feature and four research fields. The basic feature refers to the “crossing” involving cross-nations, interdisciplinarity, and cross-civilization. The four research fields refer to “the study of positivism,” “the study of Variation,” “the analogy study,” and “the general literature.” This book proposed “the study of Variation” in order to expand and refresh the

old theoretical system and to solve some perplexing problems in the study of Comparative Literature. It also created a new system of disciplinary theory with Chinese characteristics in terms of the layout of all the chapters. In 2006, I published a series of articles such as “On the Variation of Comparative Literature” to elaborate the concept of Variation in Comparative Literature.

1.5.1.2 Grasping the Cutting-Edge Issue of Contemporary Scholarship and Highlighting Heterogeneity as Comparability

The proposal of Variation Theory is based on the keen awareness of the present academic trends in the world and profound understanding towards the heterogeneity of Chinese literary theories.

The cutting-edge trends of the academic field focus on the theory of deconstruction and cross-culture research. Their basic ideological orientation is that the pursuit of ultimate and sameness turns to the attention of difference. Cross-civilization research is initiated because of the clash of civilizations, the core of which is the differences of multilevels: “The major modes of development of politics and economy vary with the difference of civilization. The difference among civilization is implanted in the key controversial international issues. Powerful domination is transferring from the West to the other civilization” [47]. As two great academic trends, deconstruction and cross-civilization study share one thing in common, that is, the concern about the difference, which has become the core issue of contemporary academic research. This trend has also greatly influenced the study of Comparative Literature, embodied in the highlight of the problem of Variation in the contemporary cultural translation. “Creative treason” emphasized by translation studies subverts seeking sameness in terms of translation theories.

The neglect of issues of difference makes the previous study of Comparative Literature simplify the “foreign trade of literature” and changes the analogy studies into an analogical exhibition of literature, which aims to establish a world commonwealth where “You have what I have.” This study of Comparative Literature seems simple and promising. Unfortunately, at the very beginning, such a study had been publicly doubted and criticized by the European aestheticians led by Benedetto Croce. In addition, more and more researchers have found that the seemingly scientific theory is difficult to guide the specific studies of Comparative Literature in the process of globalization.

Croce thinks that influence studies led Comparative Literature into a dead end because of the denial of the aesthetic aspect of literature. And these defects so far have not been well addressed. French scholars simplified Goethe’s concept of world literature as a result of the eradication of homogenization of ethnic literature. As the founder of French Comparative Literature, J. Texte hopes that the national literatures in the near future may eradicate individuality and integrate into authentic European literature [48]. Frédéric Loliée in his *History of Comparative Literature: From the Beginning to the 20th Century* similarly predicts in the final chapter that cosmopolitanism in reason would eliminate the interethnic differences and that

human civilization would explore its own way firmly to destroy a variety of local Variation [49]. The upcoming American school attacks the French school, pointing out their neglect of “literariness” in the study of Comparative Literature. However, American scholars are also unwilling to directly face the comparability of heterogeneous literatures.

As a representative of the American school, Weisstein puts in *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory* that comparison cannot be made out of one cultural circle. He did not deny some research is possible, but as for a parallel study of the literary phenomenon extending to two different civilizations, he is still hesitant: “For it seems to me that only within a single civilization can one find those common elements of a consciously or unconsciously upheld tradition in thought, feeling and imagination which may, in cases of a fairly simultaneous emergence, be regarded as signifying common trends, and which, even beyond the confines of time and space, often constitute an astounding bond of unity [50] [...]. In my opinion, only in the context of a single civilization can we find the common factors which consciously or unconsciously maintain the tradition in terms of thoughts, feelings, and imagination and the attempt to find a similar pattern between the West and the Middle East or the Far East is more difficult to be justified” [48]. It can be inferred that unlike the French school, the American school refuses to employ empirical research devoid of aesthetic individuality, but they still refused to carry out the study of Comparative Literature across a heterogeneous range of civilization, which is the exemplification of their failure to recognize the difference in the nature between the East and the West. Similar to the French school, the American school based the comparability of Comparative Literature on the similarity of literary phenomenon in order to pursue the common law of literary development. Their research foundation as well as the disciplinary purpose is to seek common ground. The French school could be described as “seek the sameness forgetting the difference,” while the American school then could be described as “seek the common ground with the denial of the difference.” Nowadays cross-civilization studies have become the world’s academic trends. Under such a circumstance, the research object and the research methods of the French and American schools, resting on their laurels and blindly seeking common ground, have seriously hindered the development of Comparative Literature. Growing up in collision in the Eastern–Western civilizations, Chinese scholars who started from cross-civilization study of Comparative Literature at first did not recognize the difference, either. In Chinese academic circles, it has been a common practice to borrow the literary concepts that are not suitable to Chinese literature out of failure to recognize the heterogeneity of Western–Eastern literature. For a long time, there has been a mechanical application of Western theories, such as Romanticism and Realism for explaining Chinese literature. This can be described as a typical style of “seeking the same without knowing the difference.” Some Chinese scholars, by accepting the modern Western genealogy of knowledge, have forgotten the traditional Chinese literary theories and regard Chinese discourse as “difficult to be seized and expressed though it can be felt. This is a great pity for Chinese contemporary academic research!” [51].

Driven by the theory of deconstruction and the study of cross-civilization, Chinese scholars pay attention to cultural differences between the East and the West, focus on the recognition of heterogeneity of traditional genealogy, and establish heterogeneity as the basis of comparability. In this sense, Variation Theory of Comparative Literature and literary research in general have made a significant contribution.

1.5.2 The Scope of Influence Studies of Variation

1.5.2.1 Proposition of Influence Studies of Variation

Variation Theory of Comparative Literature employs the literariness and the crossing as a research fulcrum. It is the exploration of the rules of literary Variation on the basis of the study on the diversities in the literary exchanges between different literatures and the heterogeneous factors of the literary phenomena without factual contacts. The specific research areas include the phenomena of Variation in actual literary exchange and the literary aesthetic factors of heterogeneous cultural contexts. They may be defined from four aspects: the Variation of literary phenomena across languages, across nations, across literary texts, and across cultures [52].

First, Variation Theory in influence studies is the primary focal point to change the traditional theories of comparative literature and is also an important area of research. Variation Theory was founded by the motivation to solve the anomie of the discipline caused by the disparity between empirical research and aesthetic research. The French school concentrated on empirical study and neglected the study of aesthetics, which is criticized by many other scholars. It was recognized early on that the overemphasis on empirical study cannot fulfill the research on the aesthetic reception and adaptation because “evidence can prove scientific facts and laws, but cannot prove the aesthetic significance of artistic creation and acceptance” [53]. Influence studies need to pay more attention to the mechanism of the literary acceptance and creation, which decides the further refinement of the object of study and updating of the methods. Scholars of Comparative Literature are sharply aware that the important research paradigm—*influence studies*—of the French school cannot be limited to the field of study on the simple empirical relationship in literary history. It must involve the study of acceptance and Variation, which prevalently exist in literary creation under the influence.

Secondly, Variation Theory originates from recognition of variations appearing in the previous study of *Imagology* and *Mesologie*. In recent years, the proper grouping of these two branches of research has plagued academic circles. The study of image established by the French school did not make use of empirical methods, but *Imagology* has long been grouped into the empirical research of literary relations. It actually limited this research from better development. At the Sixth Annual Conference and the International Symposium of Chinese Comparative Literature Association held in Chengdu in 1999, some scholars have questioned the inappropriate

classification of Imagology, but the famous French comparatist She Friar attending the meeting did not respond directly; instead he brushed away the question by answering that nowadays there is no clear distinction among schools. This is clearly a subterfuge and proves that the right location of Imagology is still debatable. The important concept related to the study of image, “national illusion,” in itself means a kind of unreal imagination, which contains the deviation and Variation of prototype. In a sense, the concept of “Orientalism” coined by Edward Said, a post-colonial theorist, can be regarded as a kind of study of image; in his theory, we can clearly see the Variation happening to the alien images in the creating process: “Western knowledge of the East is based on the colonial expansion of the West as well as the new interest in different things. The discourse in this ideology implies that the Orient is irrational, degenerated, ignorant and ‘lunatic’ while Europe is reasonable, chaste and normal” [54]. Said thinks images of the Orient shown by “Orientalism” in the Western academic research are built up in its imperialist ideology by expansion of the West to the East.

There also exist obvious variations in translation studies. Both in China and abroad, the traditional translation theory concentrates on the conversion of language in the process of translation, while translation studies of Comparative Literature focus more on the “creative treason” between different cultures, which is actually a Variation of translation. Although the loss, misreading, and distortion in translation are noticed, the traditional translation studies are to avoid Variation in content and form as much as possible. The purpose is to study how to make translation loyal, faithful, and close to the original works as much as possible. But modern translation theories reveal that the activities of translation are done by the “dialogue” between the translator and the author, the original, and the translated text. There must exist the adaptation in different cultures and literatures, so the process of translation is overflowed with variations of meaning all the time. In translation, creative treason is almost inevitable; it refers to the study of the loss, deformation, and rebirth in translation, concerning the Variation of literary factors in different language systems [55]. The translation studies attributed to the impact studies because they had been defined as one branch of Mesologie which is a literary exchange activity based on people, the transmitting media. In fact, translation studies have not been properly located. This situation is changed in my two books *Studies on Comparative Literature* and *The Course of Comparative Literature*, which creatively categorize the translation studies and Imagology into the Variation study. In fact, influence studies of the French school can also be further divided into the study of empirical influence (including Crenologie, Doxologie, Mesologie) and the study of Variation.

1.5.2.2 General Introduction of Influence Studies of Variation

Based on the above discussion, the influence studies of Variation is an important branch of comparative literary studies. Its object is the Variation of the influence, reception, and imitation of heterogeneous literatures with a method of aesthetic analysis of the rules and laws of international literary relations, based on the

empirical influence studies. Compared with the traditional influence studies, Variation Theory in influence studies chooses the mechanism of formation of Variation as the study target so that it highlights the Variation of external factors over the local literature with the aim to explore the media of Variation in the innovation and advancement of the recipient.

The appearance of variations across cultures is due to such factors as differences of language, the choice made by the recipient, cultural filtering, and literary misreading. However, Variation Theory in influence studies aims to explain the role of external influence in literary formation of a country and to further explore the general laws of literary development through the study of the formation of literary causes and laws of Variation.

Observing the history of the development of literature, we may find phenomena of horizontal communication, accompanied by the exchanges of literature, which contains the collision, conflict, and integration among different cultural and literary traditions. Under the influence of external foreign literatures, there is often a strong excitation caused by the external heterogeneous element, which “activates the internal particles of the conflicting parties and makes them have access to the excited state. Either desiring to extend their own culture or hoping to conserve their own culture, cultural mechanism will go through a series of ‘variations’” [56]. Local cultural and literary systems may be altered under the influence of external factors, which causes the innovation of the recipient’s own culture and literature. The heterogeneous composition of alien civilizations will change and even subvert the inherent native literary tradition and so, consciously or unconsciously, drives itself into self-renewal and transformation. In that sense, foreign literature would be one of the powerful driving forces to promote the development of indigenous literature and compose the developing momentum with indigenous literature on the horizontal and vertical dimensions [57].

However, the traditional French school ignored innovation and Variation during the influence of the literature. The American school merely attacked influence studies for the sake of literariness and gave a blind eye to the Variation in literary exchanges, which has been a great pity for the discipline of Comparative Literature. For example, Buddhism in China has undergone tremendous changes, but the Sinicization of Buddhism has long been neglected by scholars. The Sinicization of Buddhism has gradually fused Buddhist and Chinese culture and formed a Zen. The Zen poetry of Han Shan with tremendous international impact is the literary fruit of heterogeneous cultural hybridization and fusion between Indian and Chinese cultures. Today China has fallen into a sad state of “aphasia” during century-long “Westernization” in the face of powerful impact from Western genealogy and poetic discourse so that we lose opportunity to generate theories via the cross-cultural dialogue with the West [58]. Variation Theory advocates the new road from “Westernization” to “Deconstruction of Westernization,” recovers the bones and blood of Chinese culture in the way of learning Western theories, and seizes the opportunity to introduce Chinese culture to create a new theory to achieve the great rejuvenation of Chinese culture in the cultural hybridization (Ibid.). Only in this way can the concept of “harmony without uniformity” proposed by Chinese scholars be achieved.

1.5.2.3 Research Fields of Influence Studies of Variation

Literary influence and reception undergo a series of collision and conflict. Literary works and the concept of heterogeneity in the integration of another culture will experience rejection, acceptance, internalization, and reaction. Translation and the recipient's choice can lead to textual variations. First, one literature usually travels across different languages, and the recipient understands the literary works of another country through the translation. There is Variation in language. Second, the influence and reception of one literature constitute a complex psychological process, in which an individual conducts aesthetic choices. In the process of the integration of different literary traditions, there is selection and filtering, which will cause "misreading." Therefore, based on the reasons mentioned above, we can divide the research fields into three major sections.

First is the study on Variation in translation of literary works. There is overlapping of the research object between the Variation of translation with the translation studies and contemporary theories of translation. Different from the traditional translation standard, "faithfulness, expressiveness, and elegance," current translation theories focus on the translation process of creative treason after experiencing cultural shift. Translation studies are not a research of language conversion but "concerned about the information, lost, distorted, adding, extending, and stretching and so on during the conversion between the two languages and about the unique value and significance of translation as cross-cultural activities" [59]. Translation studies are essentially a kind of translation research on Variation in terms of Comparative Literature and comparative culture. In China, the traditional textbooks of Comparative Literature follow the point of view of the French school and put Medio-translatology into Mesologie which falls under the traditional empirical studies. It is hard for translation studies to be combined with Mesologie because it involves factors of Variation in languages and cultures. Chinese scholar Xie Tianzhen clearly pointed out "the initial studies of translation studies started from the perspective of Mesologie in Comparative Literature and currently more and more from the perspective of comparative culture study" (Ibid., p. 233). Translation studies have moved from the traditional empirical research towards the research of culture and literature and no longer apply the evidence-based paradigm of influence studies. It belongs to the research field of Variation Theory of influence studies, more specifically, on the basis of the traditional paradigm, the object of which is the study and analysis of Variation with the use of traditional methods like the analysis on the levels of words, syntax, and discourse to explore the literary deformation of literary texts. The aim is to investigate the influence between literatures, literary texts, and theoretical and conceptual barriers when the Variation occurred, with a view to understand the mechanism of literary exchanges and the laws of Variation.

Second is the study of Variation in terms of textual level. This is so far the major and fruitful areas of research as well as an important branch of Variation. Variation of the texts includes textual circulation, which is conducted in two directions—Crenologie and Doxologie. Doxologie by definition refers to "the study of the recipient starting from the emitter who generates the influence, including influence

and acceptance of a country's literature, genre, trend, writers, and their works [60]. Crenologie is a study in which literary sources of a writer or foundation for a work may be traced based on the recipient" (Ibid., p. 151). Both Crenologie and Doxologie target their study on change and innovation in the process of the influence and acceptance of literary texts. The well-known "Orphan of Zhao" in Europe experienced prevalent Variation. China's Buddhism originates from India and undergoes changes, which is studied in detail by Chinese scholar Ji Xianlin. These two typical examples illustrate the study of textual Variation in light of Crenologie and Doxologie. Secondly, the study of textual Variation includes the imitation and acceptance of literary texts which can be studied empirically. At this level, the individual choice of aesthetic elements and the role of external factors in the recipient's literary creation are emphasized. At present, some Chinese textbooks of Comparative Literature also include the reception research but fail to make a clear distinction on targets and purpose between the study of influence and reception. From the perspective of Variation Theory, study of literary reception can be classified into the study of influence of Variation because it pays much attention to the aesthetic and psychological factors in the process of textual reception and learning as well as the localization and innovative Variation. The influence studies of the text focus on the organization of empirical material and draw on aesthetic reception method to study the innovation and Variation generated by absorbing the external influence based on literary works and theoretical texts. In addition, it can explore the Variation of literary texts.

Third is the study of Variation in terms of cultural level. The study is bound to face the differences in cultural traditions, namely, the differences of cultural mold and the differences of literary modes based on the former in order to transcend the boundary of culture and civilization [61]. It is inevitable for literary prevalence to generate Variation due to the difference of cultural modes, so the cultural filter is supposed to be concerned at first. Filtering refers to the phenomenon in which the recipients select, transform, excise, and misread the literary information consciously or unconsciously from the disseminating party because of his or her own cultural background and traditions in literary exchanges and dialogue. Imagology belongs to the cultural dimension and involves literary imagination and cultural filters. It refers to a study on alien images demonstrated in a country's literary works. Alien images are fantasy to other country's images in the literary works and the text reflection of "the national illusion." The founder of the modern Imagology, Carey, points out that Imagology is a kind of interpretation among the various nationalities, various travelogues, and fancies. In his book, *The French Writer and Germany Mirage 1800-1940 (1947)*, the "Mirage" indicates the variability of the image [24]. Since the 1960s and 1970s, French scholars have produced fruitful works in the field of the study of image. French scholar, Daniel-Henri Pageaux, in one of his articles *From the Cultural Images to the Collective Imaginations*, states "alien images should be studied as a part of extensive and complex imaginations as a whole. More specifically, it should be the depiction of the other...the expression of the realistic distance which can signify between two different cultures" [26]. Another French scholar Marc Moja holds, "All images derive from the self-consciousness of self and others, the relationship between the local and the exotic, even if this awareness is very

weak. Therefore, Imagology is the presentation which is literary or non-literary and can signify relations in term of the distance between two cultural realities” [24]. It is inferred that the distortion and beautification in the process of the creation of image originate from the mechanism of filtering as a result of misreading the alien images of exotic countries. Therefore, the study of the Variation of images in terms of cultural psychology became an important part of influence studies of Variation.

1.6 Two Sustainable Points of International Literary Relations: That of Positivism and That of Variation

The study of international literary relations is the focus on the Comparative Literature from the very beginning. While traditional literary research is confined to the literary study of only one particular country, Comparative Literature breaks through the boundaries of time and space from an international angle, working on the literary communication and mutual influence among literatures of different countries, languages, and cultures. From the positivism study founded by the French school to cross-civilization heterogeneity study of the Chinese school, it can be told that both the perspectives of positivism and Variation are the indispensable parts in the study of the international literary relations in Comparative Literature. That is to say, the study of the international literary relations in Comparative Literature includes not only the positivistic relations of different nations and different literary systems but also the relations of Variation among different literatures when it comes to cross-civilization heterogeneity. Thus, the positivistic approach and that of Variation in the study of international literary relations constitute the two indispensable pillars in this field.

1.6.1 “International Literary Relations” from the Positivistic Perspective

Influence study based on factual evidence originates from the French school in the early twentieth century and is one of the means of the traditional study of the history of international literary relations, which focuses on the relations and mutual influence among different literatures. Represented by scholars such as Paul Van Tieghem, Jean-Marie Carré, and M. F. Guyard and under the influence of the ideology of “world literature” proposed by Goethe, the French school advocated a study of literature beyond the boundary of countries. Also, it preaches the approach of positivism to influence study and has established a set of strict theoretical systems of positivistic study in Comparative Literature, which provides the literary study with a brand-new perspective.

Since the main feature of positivism of the French school has been discussed in detail in the previous sections, it will not be repeated here.

1.6.2 Limitations of Positivistic Study of “International Literary Relations” and Its Challenges

Positivistic study is continuously challenged, questioned, and criticized since the birth of its application in the study of Comparative Literature by the French school in the process of its formation. But it has obtained great achievements in the early stage in that it has enabled literary study to trespass the confinement of the national literature and to focus on the “factual evidence” between literatures of two countries. However, this method at the same time has limited the scope of the related study to a very narrow one: “After breaking through the confinement of national literature, Comparative Literature has confined the study of international relations instead of striding into a broader field. In order to confront the challenges uttered by some scholars like Claudio Guillen and guard the “scientism” and “accuracy” of its academic foundation, the French scholars draw the “border” of Comparative Literature, restricting it in terms of subject, methods, and purpose of its research so that it can be limited in a relatively narrow ‘domain’” [62]. Henry Remak, a noted American comparatist, also criticized the excessive preference to the positivism and questioned the methodology of “science” and “positivism” of the French school from the aesthetic and artistic angle. Remak indicated that “Comparative Literature advocated by the French school is a historical discipline about literary history instead of an aesthetic discipline about literary criticism. It equates Comparative Literature with factual connection in the matter of objects of study, and it excludes aesthetic analysis, only making empirical criticism in terms of methods. Therefore, Comparative Literature is only the study of origins and influence, causes and effects, which radically excludes the literary values and aesthetic analysis of the literary works, and thus disables us from studying a single artistic work on the whole” [63]. Rene Wellek, another renowned literary critic of the American school, also criticized the French school concerning the nature of the national literary relations and its methodology. He points out that “comparison should not be only confined to the historically factual connection, as the recent practice of linguists to the researchers of literature, since the values of comparison lie not only in the study of influence based on factual evidence, they also exist in typological equivalent comparison of the linguistic phenomena without historical connection” [64]. Aiming at the French school’s methodology of dismissing aesthetic analysis, Wellek remarks in his article “The Crisis of Comparative Literature” that the authentic literary study concerns “standards and quality of aesthetics, rather than lifeless facts.” He says that “we must take a serious look at literariness, for it is the core issue of aesthetics as well as literature and the arts” [65].

Apart from that, the positivism with its tendency of Eurocentrism and Franco-centrism adopted by the French school is also under criticism from other scholars: “For a long time, the French school has restricted the scope of Comparative Literature merely in Europe, excluding Slavic literature, Chinese literature and Oriental literature as a whole. It is argued that the real impact and factual connection only exist within the same cultural system. Outside the same circle, what one can

study is only the occasional coincidence which cannot lead to a scientific conclusion.” Remak also pointed out that “the starting point of the French school is French Literature, whose main concern is French literature’s influence abroad and foreign influence and the foreign literature’s contribution to French literature” [66]. Wellek also puts forward sharp criticism concerning the motivation of nationalism in French school. He criticizes that “the frequently shown primary patriotism in Comparative Literature study in many countries, such as France, Italy and Germany, causes an abnormal phenomenon of treating Comparative Literature as a cultural credit book. It intrigues strong desires to get credits for one’s motherland by means of demonstrating the extensive influence that one’s motherland has on other countries, or in a more subtle way, by means of proving that one’s motherland tops others in attraction to the masters and can better understand them” [67]. Besides the national psychological effect, the reason on a deeper level for the tendency of the French school’s Eurocentrism and Franco-centrism is rooted in that only the literary relations within Europe have sufficient positive “facts” to be collected and organized and only with that can one draw out the “route” that Van Tieghem said of literary influence. The literature outside Europe lacks concrete “dissemination study” facts; hence, it is more difficult when the positivism study is applied.

Although the study of international literary relations advocated by the French school breaks through the boundaries of country and nation on the basis of early theories and has expanded the study of the national literature into the field of international literary relations, contributing indelibly to the development of Comparative Literature, it is confined to study of factual influence and to the positivistic methodology with the “facts” as basis, as well as to the narrow stand of Eurocentrism and Franco-centrism. These limitations impede them from studying the international literary relations on a deeper level in the context of globalization and stop people from looking into the Variation relations which are generated by the literature dissemination in the context of cross-civilization heterogeneity. As a result, the common laws of world literature cannot be revealed with broader views and scientific theories. Despite the fact that criticism of the American school on French school’s positivism study has expanded the space of Comparative Literature and has initiated Comparative Literature to pay attention to the aesthetic nature of literature and the arts, the American school, like the French school, still only studies literary comparison within the same circle of civilization, failing to put heterogeneity of cross-civilization into consideration. Thus it greatly limits the further development of Comparative Literature. While it holds the so-called cosmopolitanism and opposes the “Eurocentrism” and “nationalism” of the French school, the American school, as a matter of fact, also consciously or unconsciously shows the signs of “Western centrism” or “neocolonialism.” Therefore, it is impossible for the American school to meet its promises of achieving cosmopolitanism by literary comparison: “Undoubtedly, after the French school, the American school has founded a new ‘institutionalization trend’ in the theories of this discipline. After breaking the narrow study space of the French school; however, it forms a new encirclement which excludes the cultural exploration of origin of literature and cross study of Western and Eastern culture, etc. In other words, the American school, after solving “the second crisis” of Comparative

Literature, brews “the third crisis” of the disciplinary theories. It is an inexorable trend to break through the new encirclement in Comparative Literature theories built by the American school in the cross-cultural period of Comparative Literature” [68]. Besides, in terms of methods, the American school has excessively misled the comparative study. Professor Gu Zhengkun of Beijing University comments that “the American school’s inappropriate exaggeration of the role the hybrid Comparative Literature plays infinitely extends the boundaries of Comparative Literature. It equals the objects of Comparative Literature with almost all cultural domains, which would ultimately dissolve the discipline itself. If Comparative Literature is everything, then it is nothing” [69].

The greatest drawback of positivistic study, of course, is its overlooking of Variation study, which is the topic of the next section.

1.6.3 The Other Pillar of “International Literary Relations”: Relations of Variation

Variation Theory is the latest trend and direction of the international Comparative Literature study. It is a new theoretical breakthrough for cross-civilization study as well as a major theoretical innovation for the development of Comparative Literature. First proposed in 2005, Variation Theory is established on the grounds of positivism of French school’s study and parallel approach of the American school. It comes into being in the context of the disputation between the French and the American school, of the challenges that resulted from the impact of the reception aesthetics on the traditional Comparative Literature study, and of the new crisis that Comparative Literature encounters in the context of globalization. The theoretical proposition of the Variation study transcends the disputation between the French school and the American school about the “external positivistic study” and the “internal aesthetics study.” Also, it crosses the barriers of the French school’s Eurocentrism and nationalism as well as Western centralism exemplified by the following American school, making an expanding stride in the further development of Comparative Literature, and opens up a broad prospect for the study of the international literary relations in the context of heterogeneous civilization.

After the American school challenged the French school’s positivism, the reception aesthetics theories proposed by Hans Robert Jauss and Wolfgang Iser in the second half of the twentieth century exerted enormous impact on the positive influence study of Comparative Literature. Casting away the traditional models that are author-oriented and text-oriented, the reception aesthetics focuses on the end of reception of literature—the readers as its study objects, studying the readers’ value orientation, aesthetic taste, cultural background, knowledge structure, as well as the perception and reception of the text: “While the influence study of the French school emphasizes the literary influence and the input from the country of influence source to other countries in the transnational literary communication, the influence study of reception aesthetics focuses on the literary selection, filtration, reformation and

transformation of one country to foreign literature, including an overall inspection of its cultural particularities, ideology, historical context and so on” [70]. However, what is the relation between reception aesthetics and positivistic influence study? Which model should it belong to in the study? “Actually, the reception study has countless subtle connections with influence study, but it can’t be simply put into the category of influence study. While influence study focuses on the positivistic literary relations study, the reception study emphasizes the Variation of literary relations” [70].

Literary Variation is everywhere. Besides the certain positivistic influence, there are many other uncertain elements that would affect the transnational literary communication besides the influence of cultural filtration, translation, and reception. Gustave Lanson, a noted French literary historian, holds that the real influence is the literary state in one country when its literary mutation cannot be explained by its usual literary tradition or the author’s own original creation. As for the Variation in literature dissemination, Professor Hu Yamin from the Humanities School of Central China Normal University comments in *The Course Comparative Literature* holds that the dissemination of literature is not a linear or equivalent process. It is nearly impossible to be identical with the spirit of the original works whether it is the dissemination of foreign literature in the homeland or the dissemination of homeland literature in foreign countries—Variation just happens. The recipient would inevitably choose, receive, and reject the sender’s works selectively. Theoretically, the more the intermediaries exist in the reception process, the greater the variations would be. From a certain perspective, Variation is an absolute [71]. In *The Course Comparative Literature*, the Variation of Comparative Literature, together with literariness, is defined as “the pivots of the discipline that explores the internal laws of literature by means of studying Variation in literary communication between different countries and cultures” [72]. Five aspects are further classified, namely, Variation of culture, language, transnational and cross-civilization image, literary text, and literary foreignization, as the main domains of variation study. First, Variation of culture means the filtration and misreading of another culture. More elaborately, it refers to the influence that the recipient’s different cultural background and cultural traditions have on the selection, transformation, replacement, and penetration of the received information during the literature communication process, and it also means the counteraction that is formed by the creative reception of the recipient when one culture influences another one. It is the key factor for the Variation, loss, and misreading when the literature of one country is disseminated into another country by intermediaries [73]. Secondly, language Variation means the Variation produced by the transformation of the literature from one country into another, which is also the reception process of the translated literature. The misreading, mis-translation, and “creative treason” caused by the translator’s cultural awareness and value orientation can be categorized into translation studies or Medio-translatology. Thirdly, transnational and cross-civilization Variation refers to the images of other countries reflected in one country’s literary works and the imagination from the authors and groups on other countries and nations. Daniel-Henri Pageaux, the French imagologist, calls it “Les imaginaires sociaux.” According to his

understanding, image is a cultural fact for it is the image of others and it is also the cultural group image. It is of some significance in the symbolism world in which it plays a very important role. The symbolism world which Pageaux calls “*Les imaginaires*” is inseparable with all the social and cultural organizations, because it is what the society uses to make self-inspection, self-writing, and imagination [74]. Fourth, literary text Variation means the Variation produced by the reciprocal influence between different literary texts or literary traditions. The Variation is based on the reception theories but also differs from it. Built on the reception theories, it places emphasis on the readers’ participation and their understanding and appreciation of the texts. Meanwhile, it pays attention to the readers’ transnational, interdisciplinary, and cross-civilization attributes. Fifth, the literary domestic appropriation means the deeper Variation after the literature of one country has been filtered, translated, and received by other country’s culture. That is to say, the receiving country localizes the received literature by its own literary traditions, literary theories, and cultural rules. Only when the disseminated literature is domestically appropriated on the basis of the receiving country’s cultural rules can it be truly received by the receiving country and participate in the renewal and recreation of the receiving country’s literature.

Literary Variation is everywhere. It is more common and inevitable in the context of transnational heterogeneous civilization and in the dissemination process of different literatures. Its influence on Chinese contemporary literature is most eminent when the Japanese aestheticism literary trend was introduced into China in the 1920s. However, its influence did not flourish in the garden of Chinese literature as it did with the Japanese aestheticism literature. Many writers, such as Yu Dafu, Guo Moruo, and Tian Han from the Creation Society and Yu Pingbo, Zhu Ziqing, and Zhou Zuoren from the Literature Research Association, all gave up the aestheticism literature which they previously highly praised, choosing other ways instead. The main reason is rooted in the Variation of the Japanese aestheticism literature in Chinese contemporary literature. In other words, the Chinese contemporary writers have filtered and selected when they received the Japanese aestheticism literature. The aestheticism in Chinese contemporary literature has been “Sinicized.” The “art for art’s sake” proposed by the Chinese aestheticism differs from that of the Japanese contemporary aestheticism. It is not only a simple literary and artistic attitude for the Japanese aestheticism. To some extent, it is an idea of value. In the opinions of the Japanese aestheticians, literature should dissociate from actual life and downplay any ideology, refusing any service to practical purpose. In addition, writers should pursue the pure beauty with a surreal state of mind. However, because traditional Chinese culture holds that “writings are for conveying truth” plus the national crisis stirred the writers’ spontaneous national responsibility and concerns, their writings were mostly for the waking of people’s awareness for the survival of the nation. Therefore, the contemporary writers who are inclined to the aestheticism endowed a new connotation to Japanese aestheticism’s “art for art’s sake” trend [75].

Likewise, after the birth of the New Chinese Literature, the Marxist literary theory was successfully Sinicized and worked as the scale of the art and literature criticism at that time, because during the process of receiving, the emphasis was put

on the literature's reflection of reality. The Variation examples are everywhere in the literary works. For example, *Orphan of the Zhao Family*, created by Chinese dramatist in Yuan Dynasty named Chi Chun-hsiang, was introduced to Europe and was translated into French entitled "A Chinese Tragedy of the Orphan of the Zhao Family" in 1732. The great French writer Voltaire adapted and rewrote it into a five-act play named "The Chinese Orphan." The play was put on stage in 1755 and became a sensation in Paris. Voltaire adapted the story of "dissension and fights between civil and military feudatories" in the Chinese Spring and Autumn Period into a story of "fights between civilization and barbarism," represented by the fights between the Hans and the Tartar ethnic group in the early Yuan Dynasty, in order to demonstrate the theme that "the barbarism" would certainly be assimilated and conquered by the civilization, so that to change the spiritual emptiness and moral degradation of the upper class in the French society at that time [76]. In the translation of Hugo's *Les Miserables*, Su Manshu, the modern Chinese translator, changed the seventh chapter according to his own will. For the purpose of criticizing Confucianism, he even made up a story and a character named Nan De to speak his mind: "only the slavish Chinese treat the enslaving preaching of Confucianism from China as the golden rules. We noble civilians of France don't listen to the bullshit!" [77] In his book *Medio-translatology*, Professor Xie Tianzhen from the Shanghai International Studies University lists and analyzes many examples of literary Variation produced during the process of dissemination by means of translation.

To sum up, the Variation due to the differences of culture, ideology, reader/translator's personal factors, etc., is inevitable in the process of communication and dissemination of the literature among different civilizations. The development of Comparative Literature cannot and should not avoid the emphasis on the Variation. In the same civilization circle, the theories of the French school and American school of Comparative Literature cannot notice the differences in heterogeneous civilization, and it is more unlikely for them to propose Variation Theory of Comparative Literature from the height of Comparative Literature. The Chinese school, however, proposes a Comparative Literature study under the light of the Variation study, trying to inspect the Variation factors in the international literary intercourse on the basis of the heterogeneity culture/civilization's interactivity with a brand-new model of disciplinary theory and angle. Surpassing the disputation between the French school and the American school about the positivism and aestheticism, it forms a pattern of criticism that centers on the literary aestheticism and traces the cultural origins, which successfully find a mode of connection between literature and civilization. From this point of view, the Variation study of Comparative Literature undoubtedly pioneers a new perspective for the Comparative Literature study; at the same time, it also enormously enriches and develops Comparative Literature, which is a valuable attempt at the solution to the crisis of Comparative Literature.

Taking a chronological look at the formation and development of Comparative Literature theory, we may say that the international literary relations are the integration and complementarity of the positivism and Variation. Although the positivism international relations study started by the French school has its historical limits, it

reached a significant milestone in the first developmental period of Comparative Literature. The positivism comparative study founded by the French school who values the organic connection in the international literature development will still exert great values in the international literary relations study, constituting one of the indispensable methods. In recent years, I have developed and innovated Comparative Literature theory with the Variation study which I proposed and founded. The proposition of Variation Theory makes up for the deficiency of the positivism study in international literary relations study; furthermore, it broadens the horizon of international literary relations study, leading it into a wider space.

References

1. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1969. *La Littérature Comparée*, 2. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
2. Posnett, H.M. 1886. *Comparative literature*. London: K. Paul. Repr. New York: Johnson Reprint Co., 1970.
3. Eckermann, Johann Peter. 1848. Gespräche mit Goethe in den letzten Jahren seines Lebens 1823–1832. Herausgegeben von Ernst Merian-Genast, Vollständige Ausgabe in 2 Bänden.
4. Deeney, John J. 1978. *New trends in comparative literature study* (Bijiao Wenxue Yanjiu Zhi Xin Fangxiang), 103. Taipei: Linking Publishing.
5. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1951. *La Littérature Comparée*, 5. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
6. Van Tieghem, Paul. 1931. *La Littérature Comparée*, 21. Paris: Armand Colin.
7. Baldensperger, Fernand. 1921. *Littérature comparée: Le Mot et la chose. Revue de littérature comparée* 1: 1–29 (*Comparative literature: The word and the thing* cited in English in Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 7. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.).
8. Van Tieghem, Paul. 1931. *La Littérature Comparée*, 134. Paris: Armand Colin.
9. Liu Jieming. 1993. *Comparative literature methodology*, 212. Tianjin: Tianjin People's Publishing Press.
10. Chen Zhenrao. 1989. *The history of French literature*, 190. Beijing: Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press.
11. Lanson, Gustave. 1896. *Conseils Sur L'Art D'Ecrire Principes De Composition Et De Style*. Kessinger Publishing's Photocopy Edition.
12. Jost, François. 1992. Le Comparativisme: Chemin faisant. In *Bologna, la cultura italiana e le letterature straniere moderne*, vol. 2, ed. Vita Fortunati, 75–78. Ravenna: Longo.
13. Van Tieghem, Paul. 1939. *La Littérature Comparé*. Paris: A. Colin.
14. Feng Tang, et al. 1997. *History of French culture*, 258. Beijing: Peking University Press.
15. Comte, Auguste. 1969. *Système De Politique Positive*. Paris: Les Presses universitaires de France (Troisième édition).
16. Wellek, René. 1963. The crisis in comparative literature. In *Concepts of criticism*, ed. Stephen G. Nicholas Jr., 282–295. New Haven: Yale University Press.
17. Wellek, René, and Austin Warren. 1956. *Theory of literature*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
18. Wellek, René. 1953. The concept of comparative literature. *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature* 2: 1–5.
19. Wellek, René. 1970. *Discrimination: Further concepts of criticism*, 6. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
20. Remak, Henry. 1961. Comparative literature, its definition and function. In *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*, ed. Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz, 4–10. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.

21. Remak, Henry. 1986. *French and American schools of comparative literature*. Group of comparative literature. Materials of comparative literature, ed. Beijing Normal University, 63–75. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group.
22. Wellek, René. 1963. *The crisis of comparative literature*, 282–295. New Haven and London: Yale University Press.
23. Wellek, René. 1970. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Discriminations: Further concepts of criticism*, 1–30. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.
24. Moura, Jean-Marc. 1992. L'Imagologie Littéraire: Essai de mise au point historique et critique. *Révue de Littérature Comparée* 3: 271–287.
25. Meng Hua. 2001. *Imagology in comparative literature*, 3. Beijing: Peking University Press.
26. Pageaux, Daniel-Henri. 1981. Une perspective d'études en littérature comparée: l'imagerie culturelle. *Synthesis* 8: 169–185.
27. Meng Hua. 2001. *Imagology in comparative literature*, 4. Beijing: Peking University Press.
28. Shunqing Cao, and Zhang Deming. 2003. Cross-civilization study: Theory and practice of Chinese comparative literature in 21st century. *Foreign Literature Studies* 5: 81–87.
29. Many translations of Poems written by Li Bai and Wang Wei, has been embodied in, some have been taken into *Poetry of Ezra Pound*, as his creation.
30. Pound, Ezra. 1986. *Poetry of Ezra Pound; digest of world literature*, vol. 4, Group of comparative literature, *Materials of comparative literature*, ed. Beijing Normal University, 176–179. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing.
31. Zhao Yiheng. 1986. *Imagists and Chinese classic poems*, 176–179. Chengdu: Sichuan People's Publishing House.
32. Van Tieghem, Paul. 1906. La Notion de littérature comparée. *La Revue du Mois* 10(3): 268–291.
33. Baldensperger, Fernand. 1973. Comparative literature: The word and the thing. In *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction*, 7. Trans. Ulrich Weisstein. Bloomington/London: Indiana University Press.
34. Escarpit, Robert. 1987. *La Sociologie de la Littérature*, 268. Trans. Wang Huamei and Wang Pei. Hefei: Anhui Literature & Art Publishing House.
35. Wang Xiangyuan. 2004. *Introduction to translated literature*, 3. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group.
36. Zhu Zhiwei. 1992. *Comparative literature in China and other countries*, 56. Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
37. Rao, Pengzi, and Wang Zhuo. 2002. *Collection of research materials of Sino-Japanese comparative literature*, 42. Hangzhou: China Academy of Art Press.
38. Yan Shaodang. 2000. Cultural context, variation, and genealogy of literature. In *Comparative literature in China*, 3. Shanghai: Fudan University Press.
39. Zhong Rong. 1980. Shih-Pin. In *Collection of history of Chinese aesthetics*, ed. Aesthetic Teaching and Research Division of Dept of Philosophy of Peking University, 212–213. Beijing: Zhonghua Book.
40. Rao, Pengzi, and Wang Zhuo (eds.). 2002. *Collection of research materials of Sino-Japanese comparative literature*, 228. Hangzhou: China Academy of Art Press.
41. Wang Xiangyuan. 1998. *The theory of comparison in Chinese and Japanese modern literature*, 64. Changsha: Hunan Education Publishing House.
42. Voltaire. 1995. *Essay on the Customs and the Spirit of the Nations (1756)*, 28. Trans. Liang Shouqiang. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
43. Shunqing Cao. 2007. Chinese school—The construction of disciplinary theory of the third phase of comparative literature. *Foreign Literature Studies* 3: 127–138.
44. Shunqing Cao. 1995. Chinese culture development strategy and the reconstruction of Chinese literary discourse in the 21st century. *Oriental Series* 3: 214–228.
45. Shunqing Cao. 1996. Literary theory aphasia and cultural pathology. *Arts Contend* 4: 50–58.
46. Shunqing Cao. 1995. The characteristics of basic theory of comparative literature and its methodology. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 1: 18–40.

47. Huntington, Samuel P. 1993. The clash of civilizations? *Foreign Affairs* 72(3): 22–49.
48. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory; Survey and Introduction*. Trans. William Riggan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
49. Loliee, Frederic. 1903. Littérature comparée: Du 20ème siècle a marqué le début, 461. Paris.
50. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory; Survey and Introduction*, 7–8. Trans. William Riggan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
51. Shunqing Cao, and Wu Xingming. 2001. The introduction on ‘heterogeneity’ of traditional Chinese poetics. *Journal of China Three Gorges University* 2: 12–19.
52. Shunqing Cao, and Li Weitao. 2006. Comparative literature studies in the literary variation. *Journal of Fudan University* 1: 80–83.
53. Chen Sihe. 2001. Reflections on the “global factors” in the study of the literary relationship between Chinese and Foreign in the 20th century. *Comparative literature in China* 1: 8–39.
54. Said, Edward W. 2003. *Orientalism*, 49. New York: Knopf Doubleday Publishing Group.
55. Xie Tianzhen. 1998. *Translation studies*, 233. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
56. Yan Shaochang. 2000. On the ‘cultural context’ and ‘variant’ as well as the occurrence of literary studies. *Comparative literature in China* 3: 1–14.
57. Shunqing Cao. 2002. *History of world literature (preface)*, 2. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
58. Shunqing Cao, and Jin Yizeng. 2007. On aphasia. *Literary Review* 6: 77–82.
59. Xie Tianzhen. 1998. *Translation studies*, 1. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
60. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *Comparative literature studies*, 163. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
61. Ye William. 1987. The application of mode in Western-Eastern literature. In *Pursuit of the common literary laws across Western-Eastern culture*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
62. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *Theory studies of comparative literature*, 158. Chengdu: Bashu Publishing House.
63. Henry Remak. 1986. Comparative literature at the crossroads: Diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis. In *Study materials of comparative literature*, ed. Comparative Literature Study Group of the Department of Chinese of Beijing Normal University, 66. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
64. René Wellek. 1985. The crisis of comparative literature. In *The collection of translated comparative literature studies*, ed. Gan Yongchang et al., 133. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
65. René Wellek. 1986. The name and nature of comparative literature. In *Study materials of comparative literature*, ed. Comparative Literature Study Group of the Department of Chinese of Beijing Normal University, 28. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
66. Henry Remak. 1986. Comparative literature at the crossroads: Diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis. In *Study materials of comparative literature*, ed. Comparative Literature Study Group of the Department of Chinese of Beijing Normal University, 74. Beijing: Beijing Normal University Press.
67. René Wellek. 1985. The crisis of comparative literature. In *The collection of translated comparative literature studies*, ed. Gan Yongchang, 129. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
68. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *Theory studies of comparative literature*, 192. Chengdu: Bashu Publishing House.
69. Zhengkun Gu. 2002. The new definition of comparative literature as ontological-hybrid comparative literature. *Journal of Peking University* 6: 68–77.
70. Shunqing Cao. 2006. The transcendent nature of comparative literature theory and variation. In *Cultural studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 118. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
71. Yamin HU. 2004. *The course comparative literature*, 67. Wuhan: Central China Normal University.
72. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *The course comparative literature*, 97. Beijing: Higher Education Press.

73. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *The course comparative literature*, 99–100. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
74. Pageaux, Daniel-Henri. 1999. From the cultural image to social image. In *The imagology of comparative literature*, ed. Meng Hua, 124. Beijing: Peking University Press.
75. Nengquan Zhang. 2006. Japanese aestheticism literature in Chinese modern literary arena variation. *Journal of Yanbian University (Social Sciences)* 2: 21–25.
76. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *The course comparative literature*, 75. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
77. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 159–160. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Chapter 2

Major Contributions of Analogy Study and Its Deficiencies

Strictly speaking, analogy study had started before the American school of Comparative Literature existed. Long before the influence study theory of the French school, the idea of divergence in north and south literature proposed by Madame de Stael who was the pioneer of world Comparative Literature could be called analogy study. So the analogy study had already existed before the American school sprang up. But generally speaking, its practices of that time were lacking theoretical awareness of Comparative Literature. The American school clearly advocated that the analogy study should be rooted in developing awareness of the discipline and especially be aimed against the influence study of the French school which has dominated the studies of Comparative Literature for a long time.

2.1 Major Contribution of Analogy Study

The analogy study was formally established in 1958 when the second annual meeting of the International Comparative Literature Association was held. At that meeting, Wellek, a Czech-American scholar, read his report "The Crisis of Comparative Literature." This report sharply criticized the French school and remarked that the Comparative Literature was faced with significant crisis. He thought that the crisis was in the following three parts: First, the disciplinary theory of Comparative Literature was incomplete and immature and lacked clear research content and methodology; secondly, the influence study limited Comparative Literature to the study of origin and influence which belong to social psychology and cultural and historical research and lost the literariness; thirdly, the influence study embodies some cultural nationalism such as the literary influences of one nation on other nations and their own understanding of foreign authors were more accurate than that of other nations. Therefore, Comparative Literature lost its objectivity. Based on this criticism, Wellek appealed that analogy study should replace influence study. It shook the established

pattern of Comparative Literature, which was at the same time a chance for the French school to reflect about their own methodology.

2.1.1 Contribution of Analogy Study and Its Characteristics

After several decades of theoretical study and research in practice, the methods of analogy study had increasingly been showing its vitality and popularity and developed into the second phase of Comparative Literature in the world. What is analogy study? What has it achieved? To learn analogy study comprehensively, we should first know the basic characteristics and merits of it from the following aspects.

First, the analogy study expanded the scope of the discipline, once limited within the relationship of emitter and recipient, and extended the scope and opened a new field of Comparative Literature. Henceforth, Comparative Literature was not limited by various conditions such as time, space, statue, and level. This is the most prominent feature and also the greatest merit of the analogy study. Literary phenomena of different times, different countries, and different cultural backgrounds, which as long as they possess a certain degree of comparability as well as the same purposes, can be incorporated into the field of analogy study. Thus, it has had a very extensive scope and objects including some subdisciplines such as comparative poetics, thematology, genealogy, interdisciplinary research, and literature anthropology. Apparently, the analogy study has an unprecedented freedom in comparison with the influence study which relies on factual relation.

Secondly, the analogy study regards literariness and aesthetics as its basis. Though it has a great degree of freedom, it stresses that the analogous relationship must originate from or revolve around aesthetic characteristics. The so-called literariness means that the focus and content must be related with the literature itself but not outside of it. However, literariness itself is a complex and broad concept which must embody aesthetic characteristics as a language art. The reason that the analogy study emphasizes on literariness and aesthetics is related to the influence of New Criticism on the American school. Although New Criticism emerged in the 1920s in Britain, it grew to fruition and spent its heyday in America. Many American scholars themselves were members of the New Criticism, such as Wellek. New Criticism stresses that the research should focus on a literary text, aesthetic value, and literary form rather than authors' biography and background. Such features made studies of Comparative Literature stray away from positivism dominated by the French school at that time. The French school's critical ways did depend much on materials that made comparative criticism overly verbose, such as sociology, history, communication studies, and textual criticism. In this regard, it was a great achievement for the analogy study to lead Comparative Literature back to the field of literature.

Thirdly, the analogy study is increasingly concerned with the problem of comparability, because the analogy study compares literary phenomena without influential relationships, and it does not need to research factors and materials. These resulted

in arbitrary comparison or analogy in the practice of analogy study as if the analogy study were with the “infinite comparability.” In China, abusing pattern of “X+Y” model is very common, so some scholars call it the new crisis in Comparative Literature. Therefore, the problem of comparability has become the major problem as to whether analogy study can be reliable or not. The comparison of two things is based on the premise of similarities as well as differences because completely identical or sharply different things cannot be compared. Certainly, this is not from the general view of philosophy since no two things are completely identical or sharply different. The key point for analogy study is to find the same and different points as well as their relationship which means to uncover certain relationships among the similarities and discover the similarities among the differences or among seemingly unrelated literary phenomena to find certain relationship on the certain aspects of ideological concept or structure. The methodological premise of analogy study is “There is no incomparability or complete comparability in literary phenomena. Analogy study is in a delicate position of being comparable or incomparable” [1]. However, finding comparable points is not equal to obtaining complete comparability. In order to avoid suspicion while comparing for the sake of comparison itself, analogy study must further clarify its comparative objectives. Comparison is not a reason, but a research method. The final goal of comparison is to explore in-depth implication among the similar or different phenomena, to discover the common “poetics” of human beings and to “find out unique contributions of various ethnic groups to the world’s literary theory and ultimately create a better system of literary theory” [2]. A clear problem of awareness must lie in the comparison in terms of the concrete operational level. Some scholars believe that a conclusion must be drawn from the comparison to implement the comparability. Actually, ambiguity in literary research is unavoidable. It is difficult to require every article to have a definite conclusion, but at least we can demand that comparison must be established around a certain topic and the topic should be as specific as possible to avoid the broad boundlessness or the grandiose but impractical way. In short, with the further establishment of the disciplinary theory, more and more attention has been paid to the comparability of analogy study in the field of Comparative Literature. As a result, regulating parallel study by comparability has become the feature of its own.

Fourthly, the analogy study is extending to a greater scope in the comprehensive cross-disciplinary field. Literature itself is not an isolated phenomenon because it is impossible for literariness or aesthetics to get rid of the influences from the outside world. In fact, literature is a complex system with various factors, so the aesthetic research will inevitably absorb achievements and methods from other areas. It is a kind of understanding to comprehensive cross-disciplinary research. However, literature as the center of the comprehensive cross-disciplinary research does not only lie in Comparative Literature. General literature research is often cross-disciplinary so as to involve sociology, psychology, art, religion, philosophy, history, ethnology, etc. If these studies dubbed the name of Comparative Literature, Comparative Literature would apparently lose its assets. Another understanding of the comprehensive cross-disciplinary research is “the study of literature beyond the confines of one particular country, and the study of the relationships between

literature on the one hand and other areas of knowledge and belief, such as the arts, philosophy, history, and the social sciences, the sciences, religion, etc., on the other. In brief, it is the comparison of literature with other spheres of human expression" [3]. Such research is also known as cross-disciplinary research, which aims at shedding light on consistency and commonality of different knowledge in the human cultural system, while it demonstrates the unique nature of literature and grasps the inherent laws of literature. But the American school has different views on this problem. For instance, Weisstein advocated that such research should not go beyond national boundaries in his *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction*. He thought that different cultures do not have the commensurability. But in that case, the question is that whether it is possible for the general literary principle to be abstracted from the interaction between literature and art in one country. In fact, the study can combine the two kinds of understanding and place them under the vision of cross-culture and cross-civilization. On the one hand, different cultures and civilizations can be incommensurable in some aspects but can be commensurable in some other aspects. So the cross-disciplinary dialogue needs a cross-culture and cross-civilization perspective in order to "clarify position and evolution of the literature and other disciplines [...] clean up the concept and discourse rules of various disciplinary knowledge systems within different cultural contexts" [4]. On the other hand, a comprehensive study of interdisciplinary literature itself not only is the dialogue with the other arts but also refers to the social and historical phenomena in other research scopes, which are regarded as the breakthrough point or the reference system. At the same time, these breakthrough points or the reference system must have the nature of cross-culture or cross-civilization circles, namely, with the literary phenomena being studied in a different cultural circle [5]. It is not only to ensure analogy study without losing its inherent properties but also to broaden its developing prospects.

In general, from the perspective of historical merits, analogy study, with its open-minded studies, has opened up new areas for Comparative Literature both at the theoretical level and at the practical level. It has infused the new vigor for Comparative Literature and promoted this discipline to a new stage.

2.1.2 Problems of Analogy Study in Practice

The word "analogy" itself means "parallel" as well as "similarity" and "comparison." Obviously, its original meaning has duality: On the one hand, parallel lines do not overlap, which shows that the compared objects have no factual relationship and they are in different countries and cultural ideology. Because they belong to different literary traditions, therefore they have respectively different natures. On the other hand, parallel lines have a common direction, indicating similarity and comparability with each other. Similarity and comparability are rooted in people's mind, poetic spirit, as well as the similar situation of human existence. Analogy study theory appears to be simple, but there are still some problems in practice in need of solving.

In China's analogy studies of Comparative Literature, objects that are compared in practice usually involve two items. Therefore, people tend to have the misconception that analogy studies can only include a comparison between two things, that is, one-to-one comparison. In fact, the analogy study definitely may be the multinomial, namely, one-to-many comparison. Chien Chung-shu frequently used parallel polynomial methods in his *Guan Zhui Bian and Tan Yi Lu*, which are books of groundbreaking comparison between Chinese and Western poetics and other works. Moreover, the multinomial comparison may reduce the question which the parallel research meets frequently to some extent that is "the conclusion often as a result of the two levels of material, which is a lack of foundation of the regular opinion refined from the numerous factual materials" [1]. Actually, with either two or several items, the successful parallel research demands a definite object in view and then rational comparison.

The relationship between analogy and influence study is not merely exclusive. We know that analogy study in fact is not the invention of the American school. Before the French school emerged, there were some practices, such as Madame de Stael's *On Literature and On Germany* and Grimms' comparing various national folk stories. Later, the rise of the French school was influenced by evolution theory and positivism; thus, influence studies began to occupy the leading status. It should be said that this was an important development in Comparative Literature, which endowed Comparative Literature with unprecedented scientific evidence and prevented arbitrary and unreasonable comparison. However, with the development of literary research, people found some problems. Because of tedious stacking of material and historical textual research, the influence study did not look like literary research. Moreover, although the influence study attached great importance to scientific evidence, literature itself is related to the common poetics of human beings. And it is difficult for us to clearly present the influential relationship among literary phenomena by way of scientific research. With this background, the American school put forward the theory of analogy study with the report "The Crisis of Comparative Literature" by Wellek as a beginning. It is more a recovery than an invention. After several decades of practice, the achievements of analogy study were great. However, during the process of rebelling hypercorrection on the influence study, the analogy study itself also appeared moving towards the situation of arbitrary comparison or forced analogy as I mentioned before. As for this reason, scholars of the analogy study regulated themselves and began to reconsider its relationship with the influence study. As a result, analogy and influence study became integrated with each other. On the one hand, influence study reflected on itself and no longer confined to research the outward spreading and acceptance. With the lead-in of the aesthetic factor, it started to research from the text to analyze the content and form of works in all aspects of the complex composition, which pointed out the influential relationships among literary phenomena. On the other hand, analogy study began to realize that the conclusion from the comparison of the aesthetic characteristics still has to experience the ultimate test by facts. Of course, the truth is not in the traditional French school's requirement of linking facts, but the fundamental principle of literature itself, like the refined expression, the actual state of literary

historical development, and so on. It can be said that influence and analogy study have found each other's conjunction in the context of literary works so that it can learn from each other and complement with each other. To a certain extent, they have got rid of the opposition and estrangement caused by human factors in the history of Comparative Literature. Actually, except for the American school, the historical typology of the Soviet school also made a contribution from another kind of academic background, which enriched parallel research and consciously noted the combination of parallel and influence study. For example, Veselovsky, known as the "Father of Russian Comparative Literature," put forward two important concepts in Comparative Literature—the borrowed theory and multisource theory. The former approached the influence study advocated by the French school, and the latter approached the analogy study advocated by the American school. Different from the French school and the American school, the Russian–Soviet school of historical typology emphasized social history, literary development, and internal principles of social development.

2.1.3 Contents of Analogy Study

Concerning research objectives, the analogy study generally includes several categories such as typology, comparative poetics, thematology, genealogy, and interdisciplinary research.

The research goal of typology is to compare similar literary phenomena produced in different space-time cultural backgrounds, to search out general rules and laws of the thorough process of literary evolution, and meanwhile to discover the deep level cultural differences under the similar type representation. Here "type" refers to literary factors with some commensurable characteristics. The Russian–Soviet school had paid the most attention to literary typology. Generally speaking, the fundamental research category of the typology can be divided into many aspects, such as the subject matter, the character image, techniques of expression, literary trend, literary thought, and so on [6].

Poetics has broad, medium, and narrow meanings, which respectively refer to theory of literature and art, literary theory, and poetic theory. As for the disciplinary request of Comparative Literature and representatives of the comparative poetics research, poetics in "the comparative poetics" should refer to the literary theory. The so-called comparative poetics refers to the comparative study of literary theories from different nations and civilizations. Analogy study claims that it focuses on the literary aesthetics without factual links; thus, it provides a valid basis for the literary theory entering the field of Comparative Literature. From the state of comparative poetics, China's comparative poetics studies have focused on the comparison between Chinese and Western poetics, while the Western studies mainly in the same cultural system carry on the comparison. As Western countries have a common source of literary criticism, there are strong differences and complementarities between Chinese and Western poetics.

As a branch of Comparative Literature, thematology tries to break the boundaries of space and time and synthesizes various national cultures. It focuses on the spread, evolution, cause of formation of the same subject matter, motif, themes among the international literatures, and the different treatments by different authors. And thus we can deeply understand the different styles and achievements of different writers, their own characteristics of different ethnic literatures, as well as communications and impacts among different ethnic literatures.

Genealogy studies different kinds and styles of literature to explore how to classify the literary works as well as the evolution of genres and mutual relations among different genres. In general, national literatures include verse, prose, novel, drama, and so on. But as a result of different ancestries of knowledge, literary classifications of methods standards and characteristics are also diversified in various countries. Even in the same type of genre, there are also differences to some extent. The comparison conducted in genealogy contributes to reveal the specialties of different literatures and shed light on literary exchanges.

The preceding analysis of comprehensive cross-disciplinary study has already overviewed interdisciplinary research, so it is unnecessary to repeat. It should be specifically mentioned that the analogy and influence study has actually been harmonized in specific categories of analogy study. For example, it is just for the convenience that thematology and genealogy are classified into analogy research in previous works of Comparative Literature. Actually, they contain analogy as well as influence study. From the perspective of research model, traditional thematology belongs to influence study because its purpose is primarily to study history of development and changes in theme, motif, and subject matter, which is actually a study of “subject history” or “theme history.” After the emergence of parallel study, studies in Comparative Literature emphasized that thematology should study the different ways of expressions of the same subject in different languages and literatures and research reasons and development of the different ways of expressions that are thought equal. This kind of research tends to be analogy study, and so is genealogy. The close integration between influence and analogy study can result in significant utility in exploring the origin, development, and history of genealogy.

2.1.4 Analogy Study in the Perspective of Variation Theory

The formation and maturity of analogy came from decades of efforts that a large number of outstanding scholars made, including Wellek, Remak, Levin, Aldridge, etc. It has overcome positivist limitations of the French school. On the one hand, it has expanded the scope of Comparative Literature; on the other hand, it has focused on the literariness so that Comparative Literature returns to the focus of literature. Although, in the decades of development, analogy study has also met many kinds of problems due to theoretical imperfections, it has been enriching and reconsidering itself. For example, the historical typology of the Russian–Soviet school, who does not claim to be analogy, can be regarded as a branch of analogy in its essence

because it enriches the theory and practice of the field. Another example is the comparative study of Chinese and Western poetics that began from the elder scholars, such as Wang Guowei, Qian Zhongshu, Zhu Guangqian, and so on, to vigorous development recently in 30 years, which is an important complement to the study of Western comparative poetics with more attention with respect to the internal western poetics studies and enhanced the connotation of analogy. The most important outcome of retrospection by analogy study is its reconciliation and further cooperation with the influence study. As early as 1969, an American scholar Block once fairly admitted: “Without efforts of Baldensperger, Van Tieghem, there may not be Comparative Literature. Comparative Literature research is unlikely to flourish in the United States and elsewhere in recent years without the efforts of French masters in the previous half-century.” He further pointed out that “any appropriate Comparative Literature study requires simultaneous application of analytical methods and integrated means...the essence of Comparative Literature is wide and open” [7]. In fact, by the late 1960s, the controversy between the French school and the American school basically disappeared. Both sides were in favor of a plethora of methods and synthesizing utilization with influence studies and parallel studies of historical and aesthetic criticism.

However, from the perspective of the construction of discipline theory of Comparative Literature, it is questionable whether the combination of parallel and influence study has been perfected or not. In fact, most of the works in methodological issues have to satisfy the integration of the American school and the French school and the combination of aesthetics and positivism. In recent years, some of the works have added the new model of Comparative Literature by the Chinese school that claims bidirectional explanations for heterogeneous cultures. The three stages of Comparative Literature are the French school, the American school, and the Chinese school, so the development of the Chinese school is a new construction on the basis of the former two schools. However, the description of these three stages belongs to diachronic and disciplinary history research, which has obvious flaws. Take the thematology mentioned above for an example; it is often classified into analogy study, and also it belongs to the realm of influence study. It deserves our attention that the attribution of thematology reflects an overlap in the process of construction of disciplinary theory by the diachronic module. In fact, “The theory of Comparative Literature as a discipline paradigm that we are pursuing should not be a simple sum of three theoretical systems [...] it should be changed from the research of disciplinary history into the construction of a new paradigm about synchronic discipline” [8]. In this sense, we think it is necessary to put forward the Variation Theory as a new category in the theoretical construction of Comparative Literature. In fact, thematology and genealogy mentioned above can be classified into Variation research, because “theme and genre in literary contexts of various literary/civilization systems have fewer similarities but more differences, thus we study Comparative Literature not only to seek common ground, but also to keep their difference” [9]. Variation Theory in Comparative Literature is not the fourth theoretical system after influence study, analogy studies, and elucidation research,

but universally penetrates into the three traditional paradigms. It should become one of the mainstream perspectives in Comparative Literature.

From the perspective of Variation, we find that the traditional analogy study still has fundamental problems. We know that the analogy research of the American school under the guidance of New Criticism proposes “literariness” and “aestheticism” and emphasizes literary commonplace in different systems, focusing on literary universality and stressing “relationship” (Remark) or “affinity” (Weisstein) between the literary phenomena. In fact, it shows that parallel study regards the convergent thinking as its center of research, while the combination of parallel and influence study has not changed this situation because the traditional influence study was also limited to the convergent thinking. The pursuit of commonness for parallel study means the same kind, while for influence study means the same source. On the whole, it is related with Comparative Literature in the west that is generally confined to a single western literature/civilization system. However, when we broaden our research perspective to different civilization systems, we can find less similarities not only lying in some basic principles of literature or literary phenomena on the surface but “more variations of idea or different ways of expression when facing the same literary subjects” [10]. Of course, some Chinese scholars have currently been aware of the shortcomings of the convergent thinking; therefore, they put forward that analogy study can also use different literary phenomena as its research subject, which can make up for theoretical flaws of the American school to some extent. However, the supplement is not from the consideration of the theoretical construction of Comparative Literature. We have to reexamine and redefine the differences and changes of the phenomena in different civilizations from the perspective of Comparative Literature Variation. Then, we will be more effective at various literary dialogues and much more straightforward to summarize the world literary principles.

The convergent thinking of analogy study of the American school also makes it somewhat the tendency of Western-centrism, whose orientation to literature, literariness, art, and discipline are generally based on western systems. Its “comparison” is “not a dialogue between cultures, but excavations in kinds of literary experiences and theoretical interpretations from the western poetic vision” [11]. If the characteristics of Oriental literature are specified by Realism, Romanticism, imitation, performance, image, and other traditional western literary discourses, some Oriental theoretical categories such as strength of character, artistic conception, imagery, and deficiency-excess complication are excluded. The Chinese contemporary scholars basically are explaining our literature, even classical literature, by consciously or passively using Western literary discourse. It reflects the growing trend of China’s literature to a new pattern, but many scholars have found that the passive absorption appears to be undigested because, on the one hand, western literary theories’ explanations on Chinese literature seem to be paradoxical and, on the other hand, these western theories in China are different from the original ones. The main reason for the former case is that we have not established a complete system of literary theory which is suitable for Chinese literature. The in-depth cause lay in us forgetting our

traditional discourses of literary theory, which caused us not to be equal with the West as far as the literary theories are concerned. Without this foundation, we cannot effectively absorb and integrate literary discourses of other countries, so such indigestion is inevitable. Therefore, the reconstruction of literary discourse system should be scheduled on the agenda, and it is necessary for us to rethink the literary discourse of traditional Chinese literature with the “complementary” and “heterogeneous” comparison between the western literary theories and Chinese literary theories. In this sense, the Variation study of Comparative Literature highlighted its own importance. While learning from the perspective of Variation, the so-called “indigestion” problem will be solved. Because the Variation study is to deeply understand the literary discourse of Western literary theory in the comparison between Chinese and Western literature. “‘The Variation study’ tries to pay attention to the difference between target theory and original theory rather than between them” [12]. Moreover, this “seeking the difference” does not “stem from superficial struggles between seeking the difference and seeking the similarity, but from historical identification of the relationship between history and theory in the theoretical origins” [13].

Certainly, the Variation study of Comparative Literature does not repel the value of seeking common ground. As for the Variation study of parallel relationship, it regards the “identity” as harmonious resonating relations with similarity and dialogism between the literary phenomena without influential relationship. It illustrates these relationships between kinds of civilizations on a higher level, which is for the pursuit of “the sum of difference,” or “harmony without uniformity” based on the differences among civilizations. The so-called harmony without uniformity, which derived from the tradition of the ancient Chinese culture, is now regarded as the ideal form of exchange between Western civilization and Chinese civilization. Just as the name implies, it is composed of “difference” and “similarity.” “The former emphasized the heterogeneity between civilizations, so that it is qualified for communication, then it can be harmonious; the latter illustrates the importance of complement because the heterogeneity between civilizations should not bring conflicts and contradictions but complement and harmony” [14].

The following sections of this chapter will particularly discuss the Variation problems in the analogous relationship. Starting with the Western-centrism and Orientalism, we should not only get away from the position of Western hegemonic centrism but also erase “Orientalism” shadow of the single dimension. We further analyze the relationship between the universal truth and heterogeneous civilizations, pointing out heterogeneity that is neglected by the traditional parallel study, using examples to discuss the frequent problems of elucidation and Variation met by the parallel research, and analyzing the passive application in Chinese literature explained by the Western discourse. Finally, this chapter discusses the discourse Variation of analogy research, pointing out the solution to the dilemma for “aphasia.” Only when we respect the modes of heterogeneous discourse and carry out effective dialogue to avoid homogeneity caused by one-way communication can we activate the discourse of the multidimensional linguistic environment: “The only way to the prosperity of true diversity, is our assumption of ecological and cultural ideals” [15].

2.2 Deficiencies of Analogy Study

The analogy and influence studies are the two important ingredients of Comparative Literature disciplines as well as two important attributes on which the Comparative Literature of the American and French schools had been established. As the theoretical core of the American school, the analogy study comes directly from the reflection on influence study and also the supplement to it, and it has also brought a theoretical innovation in Comparative Literature. But the difficult problems that the analogy study attempts to solve still exist in vision. It is for this reason that Comparative Literature attracts a large number of scholars. Two stages of Comparative Literature (French school and American school) have passed; it still faces a great deal of trouble. However, Comparative Literature flourishes once again in China, namely, the third stage of Comparative Literature that is summarized at present. Whether the Chinese school could become the third stage of Comparative Literature lies in whether it can offer solutions to the problems. In my opinion, the starting point of the Variation in Comparative Literature should be as follows: In order to solve the problems of analogy, we should find its shortcomings. As far as analogy study is concerned, it still has the following problems.

2.2.1 *Western-Centrism and Orientalism*

Analogy study attempts to avoid the crisis caused by influence study. It tries to focus on aesthetic values of the literary works in order to perfect the disciplines. No matter it is influence study or analogy study, the cultural context is based on American–European culture. Influence study made France the center of the literary circle as well as “European center” of Comparative Literature. Analogy study brought about a breakthrough to the disciplinary theories, and it changed the situation of “European center” that is caused by influence study. However, the advocates of analogy study did not possess an international mind. There are obvious relations between North America and Europe in culture and literature, which have identical cultural background and mentality on aesthetics, belonging to the same civilization. They are both in the Western world, no matter in terms of geographical position or cultural structure.

Many Western researchers do not possess real international mindsets and views to proceed thorough comparison. Remak points out in the article “Comparative Literature: Its Definition and Function” that “Comparative Literature research surmounts one country’s literature studies, literature with other knowledge and belief in the field, such as art (such as painting, sculpture, building, music), philosophy, history, social science (such as political science, economics, sociology), and other disciplines, religious studies, etc. In brief, it compares literature of one country with another country’s literature or multinational literature, a literature compared with other fields” [16]. Remak’s definition has nearly become the consensus of the

American school. Through Remak's definition, two research forms (cross-national and interdisciplinary) have been established. The empirical study of the French school has not been the only method used by Comparative Literature, and literary phenomena without connections have entered the research field too, namely, the analogy being valued. However, we should pay attention to the relationship between analogy and influence study. Influence study pays more attention to the impact of French literature (including writers, literary works, literary trends, etc.) on other countries. It is a typical doctrine of European centralism and even can be regarded as French centralism. It was a practical method when Comparative Literature was first constructed and was approved by a lot of researchers. But with the awakening consciousness on Comparative Literature in other countries, researchers will obviously reconsider the international literature relations and demand to break through the research schemata of the French school. So we think analogy study solves problems of influence study and supplements it, which is not only progress in the construction of disciplinary theory but also a great change of international literature in tactics. Through the schemata of analogy study, American literature can break through the bondage of European centralism and obtains the right of discourse to communicate and compare with European literature equally. However, the breakthrough of disciplinary theory, in fact, is the adjustment of the American-European literary relationship. But it causes analogy study not to move towards the real "analogy" because of lacking the participation of eastern literature and researchers. Western scholars still scrutinize the east with the standard of "western center" when the east and the west meet. Said's Orientalism has deeply explored its narrative tactics.

Said has effectively explored and criticized the connotation and essence of Orientalism in his book *Orientalism*. He had combined Michel Foucault's discourse theory with Gramsci's cultural hegemony theory and had pointed out that the essence of Orientalism is a structure of discourse power. It is no longer a simple geographical concept between the east and the west, but is more fully shown as the common narration of politics, economy, and culture. Orientalism and Occidentalism are connected with each other in essence full of western ways of discourse. Therefore, Orientalism is an eastern impression made by the western researchers with western centralism and discourse. Its forming process is often followed by the gradual global modernist reformation: "After the East removed the enchanting glory in ancient and entered modern times, it became a 'Cinderella'; she could only 'speak' to the tune of Europe's imagination. Europeans embody the East with characteristics like void, loss, and disaster to refute the superiority of the East to the West in the past. Westerners feel sorrowful because Easterners excelled them in the magnificent earlier stages, but modern victories finally enable the West to be satisfied, although there is still potential danger that the East will once again be magnificent in modern reforming process. In this respect, the theory of Orientalism has catered to the structure of world political authorities and the intensive conflict of ideology" [17]. In the paradigm of Orientalism, the Western world has fictionalized an East. Its essence is to disassimilate the East. Through this discourse, the East has become a Western attachment. The existence of the East is reread and reconstructed.

The East and the West constituted a relationship of margin and center. Said carried on a powerful critique to Orientalism and attempted to save the East from the historical situation of being marginalized. However, he had certainly no intention to enable the East to become the center but to construct a platform for the East and the West to have reasonable dialogues.

The Orientalism declared by Said is a modern reconstruction of the East by the West as well as a misreading: “When the West was in the era of Euro-centralism, Eastern culture was restrained and repelled as ‘the other’ and ‘non-self’ by the West. Now under the new cultural situation, people have gradually realized any system and center are relative. If a cultural system is to be developed, it needs to strive for a reference—the East undoubtedly will be the one. If Eastern culture wants to determine the status of its native culture in the world, and makes it known and accepted by other people, it also needs to take western culture as the reference, and obtain its own development and renewal. Facing the inevitable connection between the East and the West, no matter culture or literature, people’s vision will move towards the whole world” [18]. In the case of analogy research, Orientalism is an inevitable result of Western center and the cultural context of the Eastern–Western comparison. Then in such a realistic context, how can parallel study be possible? Analogy study advocates equal dialogue and mutual explanation and then advances illumination on literary or cultural meanings and explores common connotation. Therefore, there is a huge theoretical gap between analogy study and Western centralism or Orientalism. It will be difficult to understand analogy study thoroughly without clarifying Western centralism. It is well known that analogy study has a remarkable historical contribution as a research technique because, to some extent, it changes European center which was made by influence study, but it has not essentially got rid of the influence from European centralism that has fallen into Western centralism as well. Undoubtedly it is opposite to the theory of analogy study in depth. That is to say, the confusion of parallel study shows the tangles of current western paradigm of cultural discourse. Analogy study broke through textual criticism and positivism, broadened theoretical horizons, and then highlighted the coexistence of European and American culture or literature. Judged from the appearance, it has led to multidimension; however, this kind of multidimension still belongs to mediation of the identical ancient Greek–Hebrew cultural descendants. Its intrinsic principle has not obtained the fundamental breakthrough. From this point of view, Said has cleaned up the tangles of analogy study in the aspect of cultural narrative strategy, and it also means he has carried on the cultural inspection to the bottleneck of Comparative Literature.

2.2.2 Universal Truth and Heterogeneous Civilization

In terms of both influence and analogy studies, they are the methodology of Comparative Literature, and they have composed the disciplinary structure of it. How does Comparative Literature display its common value as the methodology?

When Remak described Comparative Literature as transnational and interdisciplinary research, further elaboration should be made, such as which countries and subjects should be included because it is closely related to the validity of Comparative Literature as a universal truth and its boundary and applicability.

Analogy research emphasizes the return to “literariness.” Where does this kind of literariness come from? Naturally, it should come from the thorough inspection on world literature. It seems logical that Comparative Literature leads to “cosmopolitanism,” but Western centralism haunts like a nightmare. Therefore, Weisstein once proposed that “I do not deny some researches can do...but still hesitate to actually expand the literature phenomenon of parallel research to two different civilizations. In my opinion, only in a sole civilized scope can we find the same factors that connect the tradition consciously or unconsciously in the thought, the sentiment, the imagination that are discovered consciously or the unconsciousness...But it is not reasonable to discover the similar pattern between Western and Middle East or Far East poetry” [19]. Weisstein’s viewpoint has typically manifested “western centralism.” His narrow-minded idea could hardly cause parallel research to display international characteristics or global character. Is Comparative Literature really difficult to overcome differences among civilizations? Is it a barrier for Comparative Literature as a universal truth because of the existence of different civilizations? Under the influence of western centralism, the confusion of parallel research is more complicated, which urges us to launch further exploration on the common truth and the relations among different civilizations.

Concerned with Weisstein’s worry about parallel research as well as its theoretical defect, it is necessary to solve the tangle through exploring the common value of theory and its function in practice. After the preceding analysis, it is easy to find that the common value of parallel research is dubious, especially when it enters the Eastern civilization. Its essence lies in the lack of inspection on heterogeneity, and it grows from Western civilization just like influence study did, which results in its conscious centralism. Western civilization has the same cultural pattern, on which Comparative Literature depends. Therefore, at that time the confusion of parallel research was not really obvious. However, Eastern literature is also important in the world, and Comparative Literature should pay attention to it. When Comparative Literature moves on to this period, it gets an opportunity to renew its theory. Comparative Literature needs to carry on a theoretical introspection and makes an adjustment, in particular to give reconsideration to East and West cultural relations; therefore, it demonstrates its common value more persuasively. Actually, the American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA) issued a report on the state of the field that also explores potential areas of further growth and development. President Charles Bernheimer wrote a report named “The Discipline Status,” expressing the idea to give up the European center and change the vision to the whole world. Not only parallel research but also the entire Comparative Literature discipline all need to ponder the cosmopolitan factors and inquire into narrative patterns under the global vision. Parallel research tracks down “literariness”; if it does not pay attention to the heterogeneity, it can only be a monism while neglecting

multiculturalism. Therefore, parallel research needs to find an appropriate balance between seeking discrepancy and pursuing sameness.

Although parallel research needs to pay attention to literary comparison between two kinds of nonfactual relations, it has delayed the inevitably existing differences. Difference is the fundamental character for things to exist and to be identified. The difference absolutely exists, so our research direction mostly tends to find a platform to advance dialogues. From this point of view, finding common value should not be criticized, but we cannot regard this as the whole thing. We should pay attention to the context of common value. We cannot use analogy study as the common rule on other civilizations' literature without thinking of its western discursive context. Otherwise, we ignore the deference and the literary multidimensional characteristics. The spread of this pattern could only create the homogenization of world literature. Western literary discourse has become the basic standard and caused Eastern literature "aphasia," and then parallel research could also become the accomplice of cultural imperialism. Through the inquisition, it can be understood that the so-called common truth is conditional and the validity of analogy research comes from certain practical linguistic environments. In order to solve this problem, we must return to study differences among civilizations.

2.2.3 Deficiencies of Analogical Comparison: Ignorance of Heterogeneity

The spread of a parallel research paradigm in China's comparative literary sphere has shaped the formation of an important model—X+Y. This formation has obtained an absolute guarantee for parallel research theoretically; but sometimes in practice, it cannot stand up to the test of facts. This dilemma of parallel research is caused by its problem of theoretical utility.

The so-called X+Y Model—the comparison between certain Xs and Ys—is the comparison between different literatures based on the disciplines of parallel research, ranging from thematology and genealogy to very broad dimensions such as character image, theme choice, literary style classification, and so on. It can be said that the scope of X+Y Model seems to be infinite. In western literature studies, the model does broaden horizons and gets new conclusions without fundamental mistakes. With the ignorance of heterogeneity, the weaknesses of analogical comparison appear when X+Y Model is used to compare different civilizations' literatures: "It is known that the reason that any contrasts or comparisons in logic can be launched on the comparative objects belongs to the identical logical system. In the identical logical system, objects are compared regardless of differences or sameness, all together belong to a more universal logical category. In other words, covering universality and consensus (different phenomena included) are the premise for which parallel study can be established. But such universality and consensus have been determined beforehand in the theoretical system of parallel study

which is the American school's core concept: literariness" [20]. Many categories which are centered around literariness like literary theory, poetics, and so on are classified according to the traditional taxonomy method of European culture. The method has conformed to the western cultural rule and tradition since ancient Greece. It may explain and unscramble Western literature effectively: "But whether it can effectively explain the non-European heterogenic culture and literature is questionable. Whether the European-centered literary research object can legitimately be trans-cultural and interdisciplinary world literature research goal is also questionable. It is clear that since the introduction of western learning to the east during the second half of 19th century, the western knowledge genealogies have massively replaced the Chinese one and then it has produced plenty of disintegrations, retortions, over-interpretations on Chinese traditional literary theories which are based on the standard of western literary ideology. It proves that the "'aphasia' of Chinese modern literature has resulted from the neglect of cultural heterogeneity by western centralism" [21]. Therefore, in order to solve the perplexities in Comparative Literature, we must change western monism and advocate pluralism based on equality-oriented dialogue.

Inspection on heterogeneity is a hot issue, even a key point to solve many problems, just because the east has been aphasic under the western discourse model. We speak in the way of western patterns, Realism and Romanticism, for instance, which becomes the basic point of view for us to unscramble Chinese literature. Even such a scholar as Zhu Guangqian, also made a conclusion that China has no tragedy, or philosophy, with western tragic conception. It has largely claimed to throw away western discourse hegemony since the 1980s, as well as the appearance of different understandings of globalization. But Huntington's theory on the Clash of Civilizations typically reflects on current world cultural development. The theory Clash of Civilizations is the summary that diverse culture reacts to western discourse hegemony. The theory has already prompted that cultural diversity is the worldwide trend whose essence is to deconstruct Western-centrism and dissolve western meta-narrative. The theory does not arise merely from nationalist feelings but as a recollection of globalization. It is widely used in postcolonial criticism, feminist criticism, and mass culture critique.

As for the comparison between Chinese and western literature or literary theory, "Actually it couldn't have been the meaning of Chinese traditional literary theory for a century because of the thorough replacement of Chinese classical knowledge by western knowledge. First, nearly all studies and explanations on Chinese traditional literary theory have been under the influence of western poetic knowledge genealogies, while Chinese classical knowledge is regarded as material. Second, the replacement leads to disguised replacement of Chinese poetic meanings under the circumstances of the absence of Chinese traditional literary theory; the comparison is actually without the Chinese side, and the traditional interpretation is actually without the consideration of tradition. The root of absence lies in the foundation of Chinese traditional knowledge genealogies that have already been deconstructed and replaced by western ones. Third, there is only the western way of learning and researching left in academic fields because of the deconstruction and replacement."

Regardless of the absence of Chinese literature and literary theory, it should be questionable about the result made by the X+Y pattern of parallel research. Once there was a comparison between Tao Yuanming and Wordsworth and astonishing similarities were found, then it was announced a great success. Such comparisons have led Comparative Literature to the forced analogical one, but essentially it lacks in-depth academic inspection. Actually, scholars have also expressed worries to this kind of pattern: “What’s the common foundation between Chinese Qu Yuan, Du Fu, Li Bai and European Homer, Dante, Shakespeare, Goethe? ...comparing reluctantly, it only can be boundless and irrelevant” [22]. Therefore, the X+Y pattern of parallel research has become a research method that lacks academic depth. Facing the confusion of parallel study, we should bravely introspect, clear up, and rebuild. Regarding this matter, some scholars have made their own endeavors, “In the similar research, binomial parallel research has been changed into the multinomial parallel research. Using Fang Ping’s chemical equation, it can be expressed as: $X_1:X_2:X_3:X_4:X_5\dots\dots \rightarrow Y$. In this equation, $X_1, X_2, X_3, X_4\dots$ means similar materials in different nations, different languages, and different cultural backgrounds. They may be writers’ works, concepts, terminologies, propositions, and also may be different disciplines which are related to each other; Y expresses researchers’ new opinion. It is the highest-level of parallel comparison pattern, also is Qian Zhongshu’s method in *Guan Zhui Bian*. ‘Parallel research’ has been not only parallel, but also interlaced since then. Two lines ‘=’ has been changed into ‘#’, which is the form of crisis-crossing harmony between east and west. After this parallel research means ‘parallel-connect’” [23]. It should be said that studying the new pattern can make parallel research more concrete and also can note the different backgrounds in the parallel comparison. But in order to avoid forced comparison risks of the X+Y pattern, it is believed that there are should be two basic principles in comparison, like “independent discourse” and “equality-based dialogue” [24]. To keep discourse independent is the basic premise to reach real parallel research, as well as the essence of Chinese and Western dialogue; therefore, two principles are a whole. In the process of our human development, dialogues with different kinds of civilizations have never stopped. The previous dialogues might manifest differences on politics, economy, culture, and so on, but present dialogues are more diverse because of the complex linguistic environment. That is to say, dialogues between different civilizations accompanied by politics, economy, culture, and other complicated factors cannot superficially cover the intrinsic differences. The cross-disciplinary character is clearly reflected in many domains like country, nation, culture, discipline, and so on. Therefore, maintaining the relatively independent discourse is the premise for carrying on in-depth dialogue as well as a concept that Chinese academia should change. The creation of a new discourse system should be based on the independent discourse and represents the harmony between heterogeneity. In this way, the dialogue is not ruled by a certain present discourse mode; on the contrary, it strengths interactivity between the east and the west and emphasizes the cultivation of problem awareness.

By explaining the fundamental confusion of parallel study, it is easy to see that no matter it is western centralism or Orientalism, common truth or heterogeneous

civilization, or the dilemma faced by X+Y pattern, they are all driven forward by the crisis of Comparative Literature disciplinary theories and all based on the situation of sharply different cultural background and strongly unequal relationship between the east and the west. Comparative Literature was rooted and developed in the West and thus was based on western culture and western literature background. Its long-term research on literary phenomena belonged to the same circle; therefore, it seldom felt puzzled and hardly made fundamental mistakes. However, in the constructive process of the modern world, western disciplinary model spreads its politics and economy widely. Certainly, it is not intended to deny the expansion of western disciplinary model. It not only comes from the modern standard system of the Western discipline but also manifests that the others welcome the trends in the world and their desire to participate in the pursuit of modern construction. Comparative Literature is a branch of western discipline which has scientific and systemic characteristics, and it can easily spread all over the world. But western discipline system is not perfect, and it contains much confusion. To some extent, it can be proved by the crisis that is accompanied with Comparative Literature all the time. It has rapidly changed other countries' disciplinary construction under certain contexts since the western discipline model was established in the world. But it cannot cover the connotative difference, because it ignores the other countries' disciplinary systems and cultural backgrounds, which results in the shrinkage of language in their literary discourses. In the case of Comparative Literature, it elevates the characteristics of crossing and displays the contradiction more obviously. It caused the world culture and literary discourse to homogenize in the name of dialogue, whose key lay in its ideological limitation to require sameness. It has destroyed the ecological balance of world culture and literary discourse and has lost its foundation as a discipline, and then crisis or confusion will be unavoidable. The thought of only seeking common ground has covered differences and varieties of world discourses. Although it has taken the initiative in the name of modern discipline, it actually promotes the intrinsic conflict and changes the world as it is. Therefore, the puzzlement of Comparative Literature parallel research derives from ignoring differences of culture and civilization. Along with the appearance of some worldwide trends, the question is increasingly obvious, so the basic academic direction should move from only seeking for sameness towards the combination of sameness and difference, especially the longtime absence of asking for divergent thinking. It may be thought that the difference is the inevitable existence, and seeking for difference does not have theoretical basis and value. The thought has actually neglected the present state of disciplinary existence. It is actually a kind of introspection on the homogenization trend of current Comparative Literature and a sense of issue to return to the world as it is. The parallel research starts from the concept of the literary phenomenon as relatively independent. Seeking for sameness is acceptable, but whether it is reasonable or not should be reconsidered. Otherwise, there will only be the worthless so-called achievement. Therefore, the neglected Variation perspective should be introduced in order to solve entanglement of parallel research. The disciplinary theory construction of Comparative Literature should be put forward thoroughly based on the concrete

problems. Comparative Literature Variation research has an important theoretical value in the aspect of establishing an academic perspective or method that belongs to the Chinese school of Comparative Literature.

2.3 Elucidation and Variation in Analogy Study

Ulrich Weisstein has always maintained in *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory* that literal imitation is very few in most cases, and to a certain extent, most of influence turn out to be creative adoption [25]. It is impossible for any recipient to accept the influence of the information from emitters as a whole but to take a creative transformation, which is called Variation that occurs in the process of influence. The Variation is created by recipients in the process of filtration, assimilation, and transformation after emitters and recipients interact with each other. That is to say, Variation is always accompanied with influence, and it inevitably occurs during the influence. It is easy to understand the Variation for influence study in Comparative Literature. Then, is there any Variation in analogy study? If so, how can it happen? What are its characteristics and nature? What is its cultural function, social value, and historical significance? And how can it be evaluated? These are the questions to be answered in the following chapter.

2.3.1 Interpretation and Variation

If there is no real connection between objects of study in analogy study, will the Variation occur? If it happens, which side will be varied and under what circumstances? The basic features of parallel study should be clarified before the above questions get answered. The influence study emphasizes factually influential relationship between subjects, but parallel study breaks the limitation and extends its research field to literary phenomena which lack a factually influential relationship. For the parallel study without factually influential relationship, Chinese scholar Wang Xiangyuan believes that there are three basic functional modes. First, it is a kind of comparison of similarity; second, it is a kind of comparison of reflection; finally, it is a kind of contrast comparison [26]. Such classification is helpful in realizing the cultural function of analogy study, but there will be some other classifications from different aspects in order to explore the essential attributes of analogy study. From the number of objects, parallel study can be divided into contrasts and parataxis. If the comparison is only between two literary phenomena, that is a contrast; if the objects are three or more than three, such comparison is called parataxis. Contrast is always used between two objects and parataxis is used among three or more. From the comparative method that is direct or indirect, parallel study can be classified into explicit comparison and implicit comparison. Explicit comparison is a method that puts two or more literary phenomena in one certain comparability,

their similarities or differences, and even roots of them through comparison and then unfolding their different essences to seek for a common literary mind through different civilization. The explicit comparison is a tangible and visible comparison, while the implicit comparison is an intangible and invisible one; or in other words, it is discovering comparative literary research without directly using the comparative approach.

Then, specifically speaking, what on earth is the implicit comparison? According to Donald A. Gibbs, an American critic, *Comparative Literature* also contains this kind of content—to compare literatures without any relationship. In other words, we utilize knowledge of literary tradition or literary experience, to understand and explore some puzzling literary phenomena in a certain strange literature which perhaps cannot be explained by other ways [27]. To compare literatures without relationship is actually the parallel study, proposed by the American school of Comparative Literature, opposed to the influence study of the French school whose emphasis is on the matter of fact. As Gibbs concludes, using one nation's literary phenomenon to study others', in fact, is a problem in mutual interpretation of the literary phenomenon in different civilizations and cultures, as well as the major theoretical pillar of the elucidation research of the Chinese Comparative Literature School. It should be noticed that the elucidation research is equal to the analogy study in Gibbs's opinion; however, it is actually only a kind of method that is the implicit comparison, which has been classified above, belonging to analogy study. Even so, Gibbs' viewpoint is still worth our serious consideration concerning the thought which is worth taking seriously, such as the relationship between elucidation research and analogy study, that is, elucidation research is essentially a Comparative Literature study without any factual relation—analogy study.

In general, elucidation research is solely a literary study approach. Using western methods of literary criticism to study Chinese literature is the same as using it to do national literature research. Neither does it belong to Comparative Literature study nor parallel study. It is a narrow perspective on analogous comparative method, and it ignores the dialogic essence of multi-civilized literature in elucidation research. First of all, in elucidation research, the approach and subject of exotic theory is in accordance with the characteristics of parallel study that is across the boundaries of civilizations/nations without factual connections. In multi-elucidation research, it meets the target of realizing mutual demonstration, co-realization, and inter-complementation, and it also displays the characteristics of national literature and promotes the construction of general poetics. Romanticism can be used to study some writers such as Qu Yuan, Li Bai and, Guo Moruo. Parallel research can also be used to compare these writers with western romantic writers. All above are in order to better understand these writers and their writing. Obviously, elucidation research and narrow parallel research are naturally uniform concerning cognitive value, and it may be said that they reach the same goal or conclusion from different approaches.

Next, Alfred Owen Aldridge, an outstanding representative of the American school, in *Comparative Literature: Matter and Method* stated that at present we all agree that Comparative Literature is not to compare one nation against another in

international literature, but to supply a method which can broaden a researcher's vision when he studies a certain ethnic culture. This method can enable him to overstep the narrow national boundary to research different cognitive trends and the movement in different national culture and realize the relationship between literature and other fields of human activity. Then, Aldridge defines Comparative Literature as a method to study the literary phenomenon through more than one national literature or a study of literature and other knowledge in between [28]. It should say that Aldridge's opinion originates in succession to the American school's mainstream views like Remak's and Welles's which regard Comparative Literature as a literal research, which oversteps the national/cultural boundaries, but there still exist some differences when it comes to a comparison with Remak's famous one. Aldridge believed that comparison just between two countries is not Comparative Literature, but such a viewpoint is obviously simplified, because explicit comparison in form is just between two countries. Aldridge's theory has some merits especially in overstepping the vision of national/ethnic literature, and it is different in approach but equally satisfactory in result with Gibbs's theory. Clearly, elucidation research brings some ideas and experiential criticism of one civilization/culture into another one. With such a paradigm, different literatures and literary theories can have dialogues and syncretize with each other. It broadens the study's scope within single civilization in the research of national literature.

Methodologically, parallel comparison is precisely analogy study. In respect to the expansion of the study's scope and the cross-cultural functions of mutual demonstration, co-realization, and inter-complementation, elucidation research is parallel study in essence and a kind of implicit comparison which is different from explicit comparison.

Elucidation research is an ordinary phenomenon in Western–Chinese Comparative Literature. It may be divided into two main branches. The first branch is the adaptation. It utilizes the elementary terms, ideological concepts, and theoretical frameworks learned from western literary theories to study the phenomenon in Chinese literature. For instance, there are many scholars, like James J. Y. Liu, J. D. Frodsham, Luosaier McLeod, Huang Dewei, A. C. Graham, Stephen Owen, and so on, who utilized “Baroque literature” in western literary history to study problems with the poetry and the history of literature in Tang Dynasty (mainly about the Middle and Late Tang) and so on. James J. Y. Liu has written *Art of Chinese Poetry, Li Shangyin's Poetry—A Baroque-Style Chinese Poet in Ninth Century* and other works. He divided the poetry of Tang Dynasty into three periods—the formative period (about 618–710), the fully matured period (about 710–770), and the Mannerism period (about 770–900). The Mannerism period is “characterized in the pursuit of a style of grandiose and grotesque,” completely similar as the Italian Baroque period in history: “In the 17th century poets of the United Kingdom have always been known as metaphysical, but have been labeled as baroque style recently—such as Donne, Marvell, Crashaw, and so on” [29]. J. D. Frodsham has been trying to find a “Baroque style” which is a “departure from the main vein of traditional Chinese poetry” in poems of Han Yu and Meng Jiao [30]. McLeod believed that the “Baroque period” might be from Du Fu to Li Shangyin in the

history of Chinese poetry [29]. In his long paper, *On Defining the Baroque Poetry of China*, Huang Dewei stated that Li Shangyin's poem "Jinse" is typical Baroque style [31]. And even scholars use the Baroque style to study Du Fu, poets in the Five Dynasties, and dramas of the Ming and Qing Dynasties.

James J. Y. Liu's work *Chinese Theories of Literature* is a typical example in the study of adaptation. According to the introduction, it said "This book researches and evaluates Chinese literature and literary theories with a different respect paid to modern western theories. It excavates the values of Chinese literature within the framework of western literary theories such as metaphysics, determinism, technique-oriented theory, pragmatism, and so on" [32]. Besides James J. Y. Liu, there are still other scholars. Take Donald A. Gibbs for example; he evaluates Chinese literary theories with the mode of western theories. Gibbs in his book *Abrams's Four Elements in Art and the Literary Theory of Ancient China* adapts the four elements proposed by Abrams to interpret some materials of ancient Chinese literature [33].

Such approaches of completely imitating western methods to study Chinese literature and literary theories are not only utilized by scholars abroad but also become a common phenomenon in Chinese domestic research. When speaking of Levin Hary, a scholar of American Comparative Literature, based on one of his papers named "What is Literature If Not Comparative?" I believe that there are extensive connections between ancient literature/literary theories and Comparative Literature. People always take delight in talking about the characteristics of Realism in *The Book of Songs*, the style of Romanticism in Qu Yuan's creations, or Du Fu's Realism and Li Bai's Romanticism, and even the concept "Feng Gu" in *The Literary Mind and The Caving of Dragons* is related to "form/content" or "style" and so on. All these statements are unconsciously immersed in the conflicts and compromises of different literary theories [34]. This kind of literary criticism, to study Du Fu with Realism and interpreting Qu Yuan and Li Bai with Romanticism, is a typical study of adaptation which is widely used in China. According to the statements above, concepts like Romanticism, Realism, and form/content belong to western exotic knowledge systems. Using it to study our ancient literary theories is just a phenomenon of the study of adaptation. To this extent, I illuminate that Chinese literature, whether it is ancient literature/theory or modern literature/theory, has an indissoluble bond with Comparative Literature.

The second branch of elucidation research in Western-Chinese literature is to analyze Chinese literature with western methods such as New Criticism, psychoanalysis, anthropology, and structuralism. How do we distinguish the two branches in the elucidation research? The first branch can be summarized as "unconsciousness." Realism and Romanticism as symbols overspread in Chinese literary history, namely, they connect with Chinese literature studies so closely that we do not know the notion "Romantic poet Qu Yuan" belongs to Comparative Literature. The second elucidation research, compared with the former, contains an explicit theoretical system and reference guide and more distinctive characteristics. The second one is widespread in Chinese literary criticism and is used in many papers and works, such as Yan Yuanshu's interpretation on Du Fu's *Spring View* with the method of New Criticism [35] and on Peking Opera *The Bend of Fen River* with Freud's theory of

unconsciousness [36] and Hou Jian's study of *Expedition to the Western Ocean* which utilizes a mythological–archetypal approach to research popular historical novels [37].

We have borrowed comparison, parallelism, simile, and metaphor, the four concepts from rhetoric to further classify analogy study, so as to seek and define the occurrence of Variation. In this book, comparison, parallelism, simile, and metaphor do not carry the meaning of analogy but rather the meaning of comparison. In Comparative Literature, the meaning of the four concepts has a Variation from rhetoric. Though such Variation is not the same as that in analogy study, it is still helpful for us to understand the phenomenon of Variation in Comparative Literature. In elucidation research, some literary concepts, literary terminology, and literal discourse theories in one civilization are always changeable in connotation and characteristics when they are put in the context of another civilization, which is the Variation in parallel study.

2.3.2 *Variation in Analogy Study*

It has been discussed previously when and where Variation occurs in analogy study, but what is the reason? To clarify the problem, other types of Variation should be compared so as to get a clear picture of Variation in analogy study. In total, the Variation which analogy study is concerned with primarily contains the following four categories: the Variation in influence study, the Variation in analogy study, the Variation in linguistic translation, the Variation in exotic image, cultural filtration, and misunderstanding. Take two variations in cultural misunderstanding as examples. In the novel of Zhao Shuli's *Xiao Erhei's Marriage*, the leading character Aunt Sanxian, is regarded as an avaricious and superstitious mother of the feudal times. In America, on the contrary, readers believe “she is a woman who enjoys life and is courageous to be herself to break the feudal barriers by all means.” But “the regional official is the real successor of feudal and bureaucratic tradition of ancient China” [38]. Such misunderstanding also happened when Mao Dun tried to explain “the will to power” of Nietzsche. For Nietzsche and Germans, “The Will to Power” means to conquer, to occupy, to govern, to be the master of other ethnic groups, and to annihilate the low-level and ignorant people which is the same as eliminating mosquitoes. But to Mao Dun, it means only that human beings have “the will to power” and are never willing to live as slaves and to strive for freedom against powerful rulers [39]. In the two cases above, Aunt Sanxian has changed from a negative role to a positive one and the government power has changed from almighty power to civil rights. There is Variation not only in the writer's original purpose but also in the original intention of culture. The Variation has three features: First, it is cross-civilization or intercultural; second, it occurs in the framework of cultural filtration; finally, it happened among recipients (such as America readers, Mao Dun). The three basic features are very helpful to understand the Variation of parallel study.

Yan Yuanshu, who evaluates Chinese ancient poems utilizing the methods of New Criticism, can be used as an example to analyze the character of Variation in analogy study. There was a poem named “When You Are Out” in Wei–Jin, Southern, and Northern Dynasties (220–581), written by Wang Rong in Qi kingdom: “When you are out, the golden incense burner in my room was never lit. Love-sickness is like the burning candle, it is lonely and burning to nothing in the mid-night” (selected from Guo Maoqian’s *Yuefu Folksongs*). The golden incense burner and candle are daily necessities in ancient life, and their cultural meaning is always closely related to the worship or celebration such as “when passed the palace examination, and on the wedding night.” The aforementioned poem is a poem about lovesick women. The golden incense burner and candle are images that symbolize the women’s thought of longing for their husbands. Not only ancient but also modern Chinese readers have basically received it like this. But Yan Yuanshu believed that images in the poem “When You Are Out” can be regarded as sexual metaphor from a New Critical perspective. Mr. Yan believed that “思君如明烛” the syntax structure may make two kinds of understanding. The one “思君/如明烛” can be translated into “Her thinking of her man is like the burning of the bright candle” or “Her thinking of her man resembles the burning of the bright candle.” The other “思/君如明烛” can be translated into “She thinks her man is like the burning of the bright candle.” The bright candle is not only a metaphor about the thought of longing for her husband but also a description of the man. So the candle is a phallic symbol. The golden incense burner is a symbol of women in Chinese literature that is similar to the chalice like a feminine symbol in Western literature [40]. To Mr. Yan, there are many “sex metaphors” in Chinese ancient poems, such as Li Shangyin’s “Untitled,” “Spring silkworms never stop making silk until their death; candles never stop burning until they dry tears to ashes”; Li Yi’s poem “Songs of the South of Yangzi River,” “If I had known the information of tide water, I would marry the bravest surfer”; Bai Juyi’s poem “Songs of Everlasting Regret,” “A branch of pear blossoms waving in sorrow spring rain”; and so on [41].

There are many similar phenomena in literary studies, for example, a French priest Bai Jin who did missionary work during Kangxi period of Qing Dynasty. He evaluated “human being”, a chapter of “great Ya” in *The Book of Songs* with a western term—“Mystery”—from theology. He believed Jiang Yuan was similar to the Virgin Mary, and Hou Ji to Jesus Christ [42]. Obviously, there is great difference between sex and golden incense burner/candle. And there is no relationship between Jiang Yuan/Hou Ji and Virgin Mary/Jesus Christ within the context of Chinese literature. It is not only that there are no material facts but also Chinese readers cannot find any relationship between them. But to Yan Yuanshu and Bai Ji, golden incense burner/candle became symbols of sex, and Jiang Yuan became Virgin Mary and Hou Ji became Jesus Christ, which are examples of Variation in parallel study.

In elucidation research, Variation happens not only on the study subjects but also on the theories and cultural characteristics. Once in a seminar, some scholars believed that Bai Juyi was a realist poet according to his poem “The Letter to Jiu Yuan”—“All writings are ready for times, all poems are ready for politics”; some other scholars believed he belonged to Romanticism according to his theory that

“poetics—emotion is its root, language is its bud, sound is its flower, meaning is its fruit” [43]. The key point is that there is duple Variation whether it is Realism or Romanticism—not only theories of Realism and Romanticism but also the theories of Bai Juyi’s have been varied. Realism emphasizes typical characters in the specific environment and idiographic or realistic description. If Bai Juyi’s theory is put into the frame of Realism, it will either ignore Bai Juyi’s theory of emotion or blend some Romantic elements into Realism. Romanticism stresses imagination, emotion, and yearning towards nature. If Bai Juyi’s theory is put into the frame of Romanticism, it will either ignore the realistic tendency or add some factors of Realism into Romanticism. Whichsoever, Realism, Romanticism or Bai Juyi’s theory has been varied while adjusting itself to one another’s theoretical frame.

To interpret Qu Yuan with Romanticism would be the same case. A scholar pointed out that strong emotion, aplenty, imagination, and utilizing of myth in Qu Yuan’s creation had many similarities to western Romanticism. But there still exists many differences. The essential characteristics of western Romanticism are opposition and subjectivity. Opposition is “an essential opposite between individual and society, sentiment and reason, ideal and reality, emotion and rationality.” Subjectivity performs as “independent, personality and uniqueness, as well as the breakthrough towards the ancient ethical standards and the universal principles by personal sensitive desires.” However the conflict between Qu Yuan and environment is confined to ethical norms of Confucianism. In terms of aesthetics, Qu Yuan pursues the harmonious beauty in the coherence with form and content but not the lofty beauty. His royalty and patriotism that he would never regret even if he needed to die for his country was sharply in contrast to western Romanticism in its essential purpose [44]. Obviously, the notion “Romanticist poet Qu Yan” has a Variation in Romanticism itself and variations on contents and characteristics.

Based on all cases above, the occurrence, nature, and basic features of Variation in analogy study are as follows: First of all, Variation starts from researchers. So, even if the subjects have never contacted with a foreign knowledge system, it will also happen after it is reevaluated with cross-culture/civilization method by researchers. Next, it happens in the course of criticism on mutual elucidation (implicit comparison) in different knowledge systems. Finally, Variation is cross-culture/civilization. The three features are similar to the Variation in cultural misreading, but they still have some substantial differences. First, it is not Comparative Literature study such as Mao Dun’s interpretation to Nietzsche and the American readers’ evaluation to Aunt Sanxian, but the misreading phenomena occurred in their studies that are the related subjects of Comparative Literature. Utilizing the New Criticism to study Chinese literature belongs to Comparative Literature. Second, the Variation in cultural misreading occurred from cultural filtration, while the Variation in parallel study is the heterogeneity of literature.

A direct complement is that there will be a Variation in explicit comparison, and it has direct connection with implicit comparison. For instance, British Romantic poet Keats composed a narrative poem “Lamia.” In the story, the leading male character fell in love with a woman who changed from a snake, but because of his teacher’s obstruction, it ultimately became a tragedy finally. Taiwan scholar Yan

Yuanshu compared “Lamia” with “The Tale of White Snake,” and he found that Fa Hai (a Buddhist monk in the story) is a “Classicist” and “Rationalist” [45]. With respect to reception aesthetics, Mr. Yan’s understanding has a certain reason, and his conclusion is helpful to understand “The Tale of White Snake.” There is no doubt that Variation happens because the image of Fa Hai is greatly different from the Chinese context during the process of his being a “Classicist” and “Rationalist.” Although such Variation occurs in parallel study (explicit comparison) from “Lamia” to “The Tale of White Snake,” in fact, we can find the utilization of implicit comparison that is the adaptation of “Classicist” and “Rationalist,” which belongs to neither Chinese nor Buddhist culture onto the monk Fa Hai. Besides, we should distinguish the difference between explicit comparison and Variation. Take the famous misers in the world literature as examples—Shylock in *The Merchant of Venice*, Harpagon in *Miser*, Grandet in *Eugenie Grandet*, Pliushkin in *Dead Spirit*, and Yan Jiansheng in *The Scholars*. When we study them with the comparative method of typology, the great difference behind their miserliness should not be ignored. But the difference is not the Variation in parallel study, because parallel study only expresses the uniqueness of misers, respectively, and the connotation of images have never changed.

The reason of Variation occurring in analogy study is related to the difference of the Western–Chinese cultural model. According to Said’s Oriental theory, the Orient is an illusion of Variation in the eyes of western people. James J. Y. Liu’s cultural model discovers the reason for Variation. He believes all mental activities either in creation or in theoretical deduction, or even in final determination and judgment, rely on the starting point of the model itself. He interpreted the function of the cultural model by using a story that a fish understands human beings and the other things with a fish’s model. So, in its imagination, the image of a man with suits, hat, shoes, and a walking stick becomes the image of a fish—with a walking stick on the dorsal fin and shoes on the caudal fin [46]. Then, if we study Chinese literature with a Western critical model, it will result in either Variation in Chinese literature or the modification of western criticism—a Variation in the critical model. As a scholar has pointed out, “because of the utilization of the western method or theories, also the involvement of western literature, there is always an adjustment, namely to prove and revise the original theories and approaches. So this literary study can be regarded as Comparative Literature” [47].

2.3.3 Evaluation of Variation in Analogy Study

We have clarified the norm, nature, and basic features of Variation in analogy study above, so how do we evaluate such Variation?

In the 1970s, a discussion was held in Taiwan about Yan Yuanshu’s method of utilizing western critical approaches such as New Criticism to interpret ancient Chinese literature. One of the focal points is that Yan Yuanshu had over-evaluated the image of classical poetry. His connection of candle with sex is “unacceptable to

Chinese readers who love the peaceful gracious beauty in the classical poem” [48]. In fact, besides readers’ feeling, Yan’s point of view deviated from the principle discourse of Chinese traditional culture. He cannot justify himself according to the method of New Criticism. New Criticism regards the text as a self-sufficient independent art system and proposes close reading and is opposed to interpreting text via the readers’ opinion, authors, and other historical and social factors. To Li Shangyin’s poem “Untitled,” “Time was long before I met her, but is longer since we parted. The east wind is too weak to revive dead flowers. The spring silkworms never stop making silk until their death, candle never stops burning until it dries tears into ashes. At dawn she’d be afraid to see hair gray in mirror; at night she would feel cold while I croon by moonlight. To the three fairy hills it is not a long way; without the blue-bird off fly to see her on their height?” Li Shangyin has poetic expressions such as “The spring silkworms never stop making silk until their death, and candles never stop burning until they dry tears into ashes” and also has poetic expressions such as “O, when shall we snuff candles together near our western windows and chat about the hour I spent on this rainy night?” So, if we regard the image of the candle in the former poem as a phallic symbol, how do we understand it in the latter poem? This problem is common in parallel study, and Yan’s study is just a case of it. It is unacceptable that the studies always make greater differences or even contradict the cultural tradition of the subjects.

Another critical problem in Variation of analogy study is the question of “shadiness.” When it comes to the proposition of “Western–Chinese comparative poetics,” Yu Hong believes that it has defined “the ‘Wen Lun’ (ancient Chinese literary theories) as a type of western poetics” at first. In fact, “the broad sense of ‘Wen Lun’ in ancient China means ‘to incorporate all that has been written’ as in Liu Xie’s *The Literary Mind and the Caving of Dragons*.” “The narrow sense of ‘Wen Lun’ is either a ‘dispute on Wen-Bi’, which means a distinction between Wen and Bi, with Wen as writing with rhyme and Bi as writing without rhyme, or a prose theory based on ‘distinguishing poem from prose.’” While “western ‘poetics’ is Aristotle’s ‘specializing poetry technique’ or part of it,” “Poetics and literary theories as well as Romanticism are imported from the west. So when considering ancient Chinese ‘Wen Lun’ with the term of ‘poetics’, researchers of ‘Western–Chinese comparative poetics’ would utilize the model of ‘western poetry’ unconsciously to choose, add, or reduce the texts of ancient Chinese literary theories. Then it works out a kind of ‘poeticized literary theory’” [49]. This “poeticized literary theory” is a Variation of ancient Chinese “Wen Lun.” In such Variation, the initial nature, study subjects, and ideological materials would be shaded by choosing, adding, or reducing.

In addition, the approach which results in Variation in parallel study is criticized for being adopted mechanically. Such malady was inevitably met even by the master Wang Guowei. In his works *Study of Dream of the Red Mansion*, he utilized many of Schopenhauer’s theories. Some scholars pointed out “the desire in Schopenhauer’s ‘desire of life, which is a German concept, and has different pronunciation with ‘yu’ in Chinese. But Mr. Wang neglected such common sense and adopted Schopenhauer’s theories mechanically to connect the ‘Yu’ of Jia Baoyu

(Yu is a kind of jade, and another Chinese character 欲 means desire which is also pronounced as ‘Yu’), and signified his ‘desire of life’” [48].

Because of the shortcomings mentioned above, in general, scholars are holding critical opinions on the Variation of analogy study. But with respect to modern literary history, it can easily be found that such critical standpoints have many biases. Since the May Fourth New Cultural Movement, Chinese has broken the academic tradition that literature, history, and philosophy are united as a whole and has built a new humanity and social science system referring to the classification model of western disciplines. Literature was independent from history, philosophy, and so on. It was divided into poem, novel, drama, and prose of four kinds of literary styles according to the western classification system. Such a new classification system will inevitably result in a change in the old system, as Yu Hong has mentioned the relationship between ancient Chinese “Wen Lun” and western “poetics.” Similarly, with the influence of western theories such as Realism, Romanticism, symbolism, Naturalism, and so on, Chinese modern literature is underway. With the influence of Marxist literary theories and other kinds of classical or modern ones, critical approach and theoretical framework have been preliminarily formed. Therefore, an unavoidable truth is that modern literature creation, criticism, and theories are established on the basis of western theories during the modernized process with the purpose of struggling for national survival and rebirth. Although there are many debates on “Overall Westernization” or “Chinese Learning for Fundamentals, Western Learning for Practical Application,” reference, or adaptation to the sharply different culture of the other cannot be mirrored totally, and there will be Variation inevitably. The variations occur in both influence study and parallel study. Although they cannot be distinguished in details as a whole, they are the production of literary modernization.

We may also look back further to the history of the localization of Buddhism in China. Confucianism had been established as the orthodox state ideology since the Han Dynasty. From then on, other various Chinese thoughts gradually lost their strong vigor among scholars of Pre-Qin Dynasty. However, the farming culture of Han people and the nomadic culture of northern “Hu people” (non-Han or, namely, Tartar people) were blended harmoniously during the Northern and Southern Dynasties (386–581), and people also localized the Buddhism. All those rejuvenated Chinese culture. Buddhism had boosted the Chinese civilization via its influence. However, there was not any factual connection in parallel. For example, during the translation and promulgation of Buddhism, it was always compared with Daoism and Confucianism and was interpreted by using each other. The two important evaluation methods are “Ge Yi” and “Lian Lei.” First, “Ge Yi” is “matching conceptions, comparing Chinese ideology to Indian ideology.” “Lian Lei” is “adapting Indian Buddhist theory to Chinese Confucianism and Taoism.” In many Comparative Literature textbooks, “Ge Yi” and “Lian Lei” are always mentioned when we trace the early history of elucidation research. Literary creation, literary criticism, and literary theory have absorbed the nutrition of Buddhism actively, though they have differences in thesis, art forms, and language technique. Some words and phrases well known today came from Buddhism such as real, understand, kilesa (worry), the other shore, pure land, world, convenience, wise, absolute, relative, famous case,

dreaming illusion, cut in two with one stroke of the knife, be neither too familiar nor too distant, drag through mud and water, speaking in his own person, the kaleidoscopic world, impenetrable, to give sharp advice for one to wake up from error, and so on [50]. They have greatly enriched the Chinese vocabulary.

The Sinicization of Buddhism has provided us with historical experiences to understand Variation in parallel studies. Literary studies today always have their discourse between the West and China, so it would be a basic fact that the research is full of intermingled categories and different discourses that sound together. In this context, Variation is certainly helpful to expand the form of expression and description and to restructure a vision of modernization and a vision from “the other” for literary creation and literary theory. Therefore, although there still exists many unavoidable problems in parallel study, it should be regarded, if dialectically, as activity elements in respect to the Variation phenomenon in parallel study.

2.4 Discourse Variation in Analogy Study

“The study on Comparative Literature as a discipline lacks variability. Such a problem deserves our special attention with respect to the discipline theory of the French and American school. The study of literary Variation offers a new angle, new method, and new theory to Comparative Literature, and also is a great breakthrough in worldwide Comparative Literature study” [51]. From the development of the Comparative Literature discipline, influence study of the French school and parallel study of the American school have made great contributions to set up a coordinate system of disciplinary theory. However, the coordinate system was set up under the guidance of convergent thinking which reveals structural shortcomings. And the study of literary Variation in the Chinese school is a beneficial supplement under the guidance of divergent thinking: “The Variation Theory makes up the defects in ‘influence study’ of the French school and ‘parallel study’ of the American study and opens a new phase of emphasizing on heterogeneity and Variation of Comparative Literature discipline theory, in particular, a new era of cross-civilization comparative study” [51].

2.4.1 *Spatial Variation: Origin of Discourse Variation in Analogy Study*

The doctrinal clue of Variation is distinct in influence study, but doubts exist in academia whether it is feasible or not in analogy study. There are mainly the following two doubts: First, Variation emerges after the communication among civilizations. Does Variation exist in analogy study without factual connection? Second, Variation is changing as time goes by. Does Variation exist in parallel study if not taking into consideration time?

As for the first question, it seems that there is the time difference in analogy study and Variation study; however, the first step of Variation—the communication and comparison of civilizations—emerged in parallel study. It is believed that influence study depicts the variant process of literature; parallel study puts emphasis on the emergence of Variation: “When we do research on parallel study, two irrelevant objects intersect with each other in full view of researchers, and variant factors of both sides emerge at the intersection, which is called variant issue in parallel study. The collision of different civilizations will result in Variation at the intersection of different civilizations. Such a viewpoint can be held that Variation in parallel study reflects in the intersection of both sides. It is heterogeneous intersections that lead to variations of different civilized literatures” [51]. Variant texts spark when they are put together. Where does literature Variation start? It is from the choice of objects studied by researchers, from the montage created by researchers putting two texts together, from the unavoidable distortion of translation, and from the misreading of pre-comprehension. It can be said that parallel study itself inevitably creates and contains variations.

How does analogy study vary without taking into consideration time? It is doubtful when studying and tracing the history of Variation. In fact, Variation exists not only in influence study but also in analogy study on the basis of Comparative Literature being transcendent; Variation will emerge in spite of time span or the span of space. Analogy study researchers choose authors and works to compare from worldwide view; these authors and works are from different countries without any factual or historical connection, but all share similar beliefs and values and coincident literary creativities. The “choice” is just a kind of trans-space. Just as the phenomenon of Nan Ju Bei Zhi (oranges in different environments tastes different) the horizontal transplantation of parallel study creates space Variation. Yanzi (a famous philosopher, from 578 B.C. to 500 B.C. during the Spring and Autumn Period) said that if an orange grows up in the south of Huai River, its fruit is orange (Ju); if it grows up in the north of the Huai River, its fruit becomes citrange (Zhi) which is not sweet but sour and bitter, different in taste from an orange. Their leaves are still the same in shape but the flavors are different. Why? The reason lies in the difference of soil and water. According to *Yanzi Spring and Autumn Inner Chapters Part B* [52], the reason why sweet oranges from the south of Huai River being transplanted to the north of Huai River turn to be bitter citranges is “because of the difference of soil and water,” commented by Yanzi.

Space cannot be transplanted, but products can be. There is cultural transplantation away from native civilization when putting different cultural texts together in parallel study. Each place has its own way of supporting its own inhabitants as well as geographical products and culture. Orange trees can be transplanted from south to north but the temperature, soil, and climate cannot be transplanted or copied. Therefore, orange trees must adapt to the difference of soil, climate, and temperature in the north and then grow up. Although it survives, its fruit grows up from a different soil; thus, it has a different taste. A plant has its own root—so does culture. The trans-space of literature means the transplanting of cultural acceptance, which inevitably leads to Variation.

All in all, cultural signs which have been transplanted into hetero-civilizations are all cultural products without their roots. Those cultural signs which have been deprived of their original cultural background seem not to fit into a hetero-culture. For the part of receivers, it will be natural to seek and absorb their own cultural resources so as to imagine, digest, and understand these exotic cultural signs, like a fish imagining men's life described in William Yip's allegorical stories. For foreign culture, away from its motherland, it has to accept the hetero-culture's interpretation and to make the agreement with certain cultural elements from the local civilization in order to take its root, such as the introduction of Buddhism to China by means of Taoism. In order to spread Christianity by means of Chinese traditional Confucianism, missionary Matteo Ricci intentionally supported Chinese Confucianism while debasing Buddhism. Therefore, the hetero-signs, growing up in the new conditions, have already absorbed new cultural elements and created Variation.

It seems that time is an inevitable factor for the combination of the research on Variation study with influence study during the process of merging with mutability and with the occurrence of Variation. But in fact, space Variation is the root of discourse Variation. The delusion is created because time is everlasting and never stops; however, space is absolutely unequal since mountains, plains, continents, and oceans are different, and the different natural conditions conceive different cultural space. Therefore, "When a matter is transplanted from one country and transmitted to another, it must conceive a new matter, which is called Variation" [51].

2.4.2 Illustrative Approach and Spatial Variation

To reexamine Illustrative Approach proposed by Taiwan scholars in view of space Variation theory, it is easy to find the core of the approach. In the early days, when the study on Chinese Comparative Literature was initiated, "Illustrative Approach" was considered the research feature of the Chinese school: "The approach which is used to illustrate Chinese literature and Chinese literary theory by means of western systematic literary criticism is called 'Illustrative Approach'. This approach has been adopted by Chinese comparatists" [53]. The debut of Illustrative Approach struck a debate among academia. Sun Jingyao, who opposes the idea, holds that "Illustrative Approach is bound to become a 'Chinese footnote' of western literary theory" [54]. Whereas, Wen Rumin and Lu Kanghua, who support the idea, believe that "to illustrate Chinese literature in view of western theory will make the new ideas emerge endlessly" [55]. Chen Chun and Liu Xiangyu, two Mainland scholars, further propose "Bidirectional Illustrative Approach" which advocates "illustrative study is not one way but bidirectional, which is indispensable to each other" [55]. "Bidirectional Illustrative Approach" can be regarded as the rectification and supplement but still fails to make up for its congenital defect in doctrine.

The Illustrative Approach proposed by Taiwan scholars is not the castle in the air but is based on the Chinese-western Comparison. Chinese scholars have unconsciously applied western theory to interpret Chinese literature since Wang Guowei's

Remarks on Dream of the Red Mansion was published. However, the application of Illustrative Approach brings about many problems. When Romanticism and Realism are used to interpret Chinese ancient literary works, distortion of interpretation by rigidly molding them into conventional patterns has been produced. It is because the ancient Chinese yearned for the state of “unity of man and nature” rather than the westerners’ thinking pattern of dualistic philosophy.

In fact, the difficult position and the value of Illustrative Approach lie in the space Variation of horizontal transplantation. In my view, Taiwan scholars’ Illustrative Approach is perceptive because it reflects the self-awareness of cultural difference, “which obviously differs from the basic characteristics of Comparative Literature in Euro-American circles” [56]. “Illustrative Approach” is concluded by Chinese comparatists in the different cultural system, and the Chinese–western civilizations are various in origin: “Actually, as Ulrich Weisstein once said, Comparative Literature in Euro-American circles is a single cultural system” [57]. In this situation, Chinese comparatists have to cross the hetero-cultural gap between Chinese and Western, and “Illustrative Approach” is the first trans-theory in practice. Therefore, “the theoretical nature of Illustrative Approach is to cross culture” [57].

However, I also think that “it is risky in the course of illustrative study from cross cultural perspective” [58]; “it’s a tentative study in the process of Comparative Literature research” [59]. Just like the allusion of orange sweet in south and bitter in north, its flavor changes when being transplanted from south to north. And also it would be a ridiculous mistake if Freud’s theory were used to interpret Li Shangyin’s “candle.” Problems of feasibility and effectiveness in theoretical application should be paid attention to because of the major cultural difference. As Chen Chun and Liu Xiangyu suppose, “when a foreign theoretical pattern is borrowed to interpret native literary works, it should be cautious to avoid the defect of rigidly copying, and thus demands the full awareness of cultural difference in different nations” [58].

Illustrative Approach is applied to interpreting native cultural phenomenon by means of Variation cultural theory, just like analogy studies, which is also a convergent thinking. However, Illustrative Approach is different from analogy study which is only in Euro-American system, for there is a wide gap of Variation between Chinese and western culture, and it also fails to bridge the Chinese–western gap by convergent thinking. Consequently, it is full of “risks.” On the other hand, Illustrative Approach is directly exposed to the cultural difference between Chinese and western civilizations and to produce interactions and innovations when cultural Variation happens over and over again. For this reason, Illustrative Approach study has paradoxically become “the most criticized” and “the most frequently studied” field in Chinese academic circles [58].

2.4.3 *Aphasia and Variation Theory*

Aphasia is also a kind of phenomenon of Variation, which is caused by the change of discourse rules. In Chinese history, there are two great heterogeneous culture importations—one is Buddhism, the other is Western learning. However, why did

not we get aphasia when Buddhism was introduced into China? Maybe we could find the differences from their seemingly similar journey.

Both Buddhism and Western learning had a hard time when introduced into China. The former, introduced into China in the late Western Han Dynasty, had gradually imposed some influence on the upper class circa 200 A.D. till the late Eastern Han Dynasty but still did not make a name. According to the law in the Han Dynasty, Han people were not allowed to become monks. From when Italian Matteo Ricci (1552–1610) came to China to conduct his missionary career at the end of Ming Dynasty Wanli period, to the forbiddance of Christianity during Qianlong and Jiaqing period caused by “the struggle of etiquette,” Western culture did not draw much attention except for the introduction of Western astronomy, calendar, mathematics, physics, water conservation construction, music, drawing, and so on. It is observed that in the initial period of the introduction, Buddhism and Western learning were just treated as a kind of diorama. Standing at an elevation with overwhelming superiority, Chinese traditional culture overlooked the external civilization and did not pay much attention to them. The external culture brought us some fresh feeling, such as the chime clock brought by Matteo Ricci to the Wanli emperor. However, neither did they touch our fundamental interests nor caused any obvious Variation.

Buddhism started to be popular since the three countries were turned over by Jin and the revolt of the eight emperors. During those days “One cannot protect himself, let alone his wife and son” (Ruan Ji: *Lamentation Poem*); people began to think deeply about the uncertain destiny and the significance of life. The lack of attention on individual life is just the weakness of Chinese native culture centered on Confucianism. And there are some common points between Buddhism’s “for nothing (kong)” and Taoism’s “nonexistence (wu).” Therefore, Buddhism got its place to comfort people’s mind with the help of metaphysics and was prevalent at that time. Western learning, different from our voluntary choice of Buddhism, was a painfully passive choice after the Opium War. Matteo Ricci initially highly praised Confucianism but debased Buddhism and did the missionary work prudently, trying hard to find a way for Christianity. His strategy has obtained such great success that the missionary initially established a standpoint in China. But his successors were not able to insist upon his route so that the “struggle of etiquette” of forbidding the Catholic to warship ancestors greatly hindered the development of the missionary work. However, Western advanced weapons finally broke in, coming with the Western culture. Therefore, we can see the similarities and differences from the importation process of Buddhism and Western learning. The common ground lies in that the heterogenic civilization started to be accepted and varied in spite of Buddhism being our voluntary choice, Western learning a compelled one. The difference lies in that the importation process had different attitudes towards Chinese traditional culture. Buddhism attempted to integrate into Chinese traditional culture with the aid of Taoism, which laid a good foundation for the production of Zen afterward. However, the introduction of Western learning not only spread basically without any aid of Chinese traditional culture but conflicted with Confucian etiquette. Western learning was implanted into China with the power of military science and technology. What followed its spread were critiques and separation on

traditional Chinese culture during the late Qing Dynasty to the May 4th Movement, which became afterward the source of “the aphasia.”

From the Southern and Northern Dynasties to Sui and Tang Dynasties, Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism conflicted and adjusted with each other and gradually formed a situation of tripartite confrontation. Buddhism was gradually simplified and produced Zen under the influence of Chinese traditional thoughts. The philosophy of Lao Zi and Zhuang Zi was developed into Taoism under Buddhism’s influence. Through the interpretation of Confucian classics, Han Yu, Li Ao, and others was also ultimately developed into the philosophy of Cheng-Zhu (the mind–nature theory) and the philosophy of Lu-Wang (the Buddha–nature theory). From a historical perspective, the introduction of Buddhism was just at the growing stage of Chinese civilization. It participated and urged the development and maturation of the Chinese culture and integrated into and became one part of it. Nevertheless, when Western learning was introduced into China, the Chinese civilization had already undergone several thousand years of development and had already been a highly matured civilization. Therefore, it was not as malleable as before. Furthermore, people had no patience under the crisis of “Subjugation and Genocide.” The traditional triteness and backwardness were given a complete blasting. The advanced western civilization was strongly honored, while China’s own cultural origin was abruptly cut off and even an overall overthrow was made! From the May 4th Vernacular Literature Movement to “overthrow Confucianism” to “break Four Olds” in the Cultural Revolution and to the reform and opening-up policy, the traditional culture was repeatedly swept away and ultimately abolished. Meanwhile, Western culture and literary theory were comprehensively introduced into China. From Wang Guowei’s explanation and interpretation of *Dream of the Red Mansion* with Arthur Schopenhauer’s views on tragedy, Lu Xun’s *On Evil Spirit* to initiate Romanticism, and the Realism emphasized by the Soviet Russian literary theory to today’s various western literary theories, Chinese scholars endured unprecedented “aphasia” with rich and diversified Western theories. The complete changing-over from Chinese knowledge origins and systems to Western ones deprived us of our own spiritual home.

“If the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western literary theories can’t be completely realized and processed, it is likely to be obstructed by each other, which will finally lead to the loss of one kind of heterogeneity” [58]. It has gone to extremes when the Western culture does not adapt to the native one. Instead of breeding patiently and comparing carefully, quick success and instant benefit are so eager to get that the native civilization is deserted by vaccinating foreign civilization. “Aphasia” has been the result of “the loss of heterogeneity” caused by this barbaric spatial transplantation. A 100 years from then on, we abandoned imperial civil service examination and writings in classic Chinese, and only learned from the West in the writing coherence, syntax grammar, and ways of expression, so as to find a free and democratic westernized way to make our country prosperous. At first, such copies to enlighten people were fruitful. But, along with the imitation becoming more and more serious, it has been inevitable to see some fierce collisions between Chinese and Western culture, which compels us to make a choice: Western scientific rational spirit or Chinese traditional cultural essence? Which one to take? We have

in fact chosen the former, so to speak, western cultural rules, which have caused the Variation of our cultural rules in deep structure. Therefore, “the source of ‘aphasia’ is not the heterogeneity between the ancient and the modern, but the heterogeneity between the Chinese and the Western” [58]. That is, not the discourse Variation of time, but the discourse Variation of space has created our aphasia.

“The word ‘aphasia’ will probably be used for a very long period of time, because ‘aphasia’ is still Chinese scholars’ sincere feeling” [60]. In spite of this, it is believed that the situation will not last long. Even if it truly requires a very long period of time, which definitely is only a transitional stage, it will surely move on from “aphasia” to “discourse creation” in keeping with the discourse Variation.

The aphasia today does not necessarily mean having nothing at all, but very “rich.” With the reform and opening-up policy, the entire world has emerged in front of China, and so many schools of theories take turns to come on stage. This kind of “richness” actually is the resource for innovation. The question lies in how to digest and how to change it into our own usage. Buddhism successfully varied into Zen in China, but the emergence of Western literary theory has actually created today’s aphasia among Chinese scholars. The difference between them basically lies in the different way of their combination with Chinese national tradition. Buddhism interpenetrated into Chinese culture gradually, whereas Western learning actually was a rigid cut-in to eradicate the tradition; therefore, it caused the pain of aphasia.

Western learning’s rigid demand of cut-in still needs a further cultural “soft landing.” But the premise of “landing” is the regeneration and construction of our cultural background. Without the solid cultural background, only to copy and follow others, Chinese scholars will blindly follow suit and maybe only get more and more confused with the aphasia. Only when the civilized cultural system is built will Chinese scholars have their own academic confidence and interest with independence and self-reliance. Therefore, the most urgent thing, at present, is to reorganize and cultivate China’s seriously destroyed cultural environment. The study on Chinese tradition is actually the study on understanding ourselves. Only when we have a good understanding of ourselves can we understand the western culture and literary theory.

“The grass cannot be burnt out by a wild fire, for the wind of spring will wake it up again.” Traditional culture suffered a lot again and again, but the essence that accumulated during several thousand years cannot be burnt out. If the western literary theories truly want to take root in Chinese land, the way of integrating them with the native civilization has to be taken. In this way, cultural innovation can be formed with the collision and Variation between the Chinese and Western heterogeneous civilizations.

References

1. Wang Xiangyuan. 2003. Rediscovering the functionality mode in analogy study of comparative literature. *Journal of Beijing Normal University, Beijing* 2: 91–97.
2. Shunqing Cao. 1998. *Chinese and Western comparative poetics*, 270. Beijing: Beijing Press.

3. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory; Survey and Introduction*, 23. Trans. William Riggan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
4. He Yunbo. 2006. Cross-disciplinary dialogue in cross-cultural vision. In *Cultural studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 167. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
5. Wang Xiangyuan. 2002. *New theory of comparative literature*, 102–112. Nanchang: Jiangxi Education Press.
6. Shunqing Cao (ed.). 2006. *A course in comparative literature*, 158–160. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
7. Block, Haskell M. 1974. *Nouvelles Tendances en Littérature Comparée*, 99. Paris: Nizet.
8. Shunqing Cao. 2006. Theory of comparative literature the ‘leap’ of features and variation in ‘presentation’. In *Culture studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 119. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
9. Shunqing Cao. 2006. Theory of comparative literature the ‘leap’ of features and variation in ‘presentation’. In *Culture studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 125. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
10. Shunqing Cao. 2006. Theory of comparative literature the ‘leap’ of features and variation in ‘presentation’. In *Culture studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 123. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
11. Shunqing Cao, et al. 2001. *Theoretical study of comparative literature*, 301. Chengdu: Ba and Shu Tract Society.
12. Wu Xingming. 2006. ‘Traveling theory’ and ‘variation’. In *Cultural studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 156. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
13. Wu Xingming. 2006. ‘Traveling theory’ and ‘variation’. In *Cultural studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 157. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
14. Shunqing Cao. 2006. Grasping the basic academic trend in the world: Cross-cultural research. In *Cultural studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 87. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
15. Shunqing Cao. 2006. The academic direction and tendency in the world: Study across civilizations. In *Culture studies and literary theory* (Series No. 13), 87. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
16. Remak, Henry. 1961. Comparative literature: Its definition and function. In *Comparative literature: Method and perspective*, ed. Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz, 20. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
17. Zhu Liyuan. 2005. *Contemporary west theory of literature and art*, 418. Shanghai: East China Normal University Publishing House.
18. Rao Pengzi. 1999. *Chinese and the West comparison literature and art*, 22. Beijing: Chinese Social Sciences Publishing House.
19. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1974. *Comparative literature and literary theory: Survey and introduction*, 5–6. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
20. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *Comparative literature discipline fundamental research*, 288. Chengdu: Ba shu Publishing House.
21. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *Comparative literature discipline fundamental research*, 288–289. Chengdu: Ba shu Publishing House.
22. Ji Xianlin. 1991. Several opinions regarding the kind of X and Y comparative literature pattern. In *Comparative literature and civil literature*, ed. Ji Xianlin’s, 372. Beijing: Peking University Press.
23. Wang Xiangyuan. 2003. New theory of comparative literature parallel research function pattern. *Beijing Normal University Journal* 2: 91–97.
24. Shunqing Cao, Zhiyu. 2003. Chinese discourse in constructing the literature theory. *Social Sciences Research* 4: 138–143.
25. Quoted from Weisstein, Ulrich. 1973. *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction*. Trans. William Riggan. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
26. Wang Xiangyuan. 2002. *New theory on comparative literature discipline*, 78, 79, 81. Nanchang: Jiangxi Education Press.

27. Quoted from Aldridge, A. Owen (ed.). 1969. *Comparative literature: Matter and method*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
28. Quoted from Lu Kanghua, and Sun Jingyao. 1984. *An introduction on comparative literature theory*, 50. Ha Erbing: Hei Longjiang People's Press.
29. Zhou Faxiang. 1997. *Western literary theory and Chinese literature*, 194. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
30. Zhou Faxiang. 1997. *Western literary theory and Chinese literature*, 185. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
31. Zhou Faxiang. 1997. *Western literary theory and Chinese literature*, 186. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
32. Liu Xiangyu. 2006. *Chinese theories of literature (a brief introduce in cover)*. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
33. Gibbs, Donald A. 1988. Abrams's literary theory of four essential elements and Chinese ancient literary theory. In *Analacts of China and Western comparative literature*, ed. Wen Rumin. Beijing: Peking University Press.
34. Shunqing Cao (ed.). 2002. *On comparative literature (introduction)*. Chengdu: Sichuan Education Press.
35. Yan Yuanshu. 1998. On spring view. In *A tap on disciplinary theory of comparative literature*, ed. Huang Weiliang and Shunqing Cao. Beijing: Peking University Press.
36. Yan Yuanshu. 1988. Xue Rengui and XueDingshan: An Oedipus conflict in China. In *Analacts of China and Western comparative literature*, ed. Wen Rumin. Beijing: Peking University Press.
37. Hou Jian. 1985. Expedition to the Western ocean: An experiment on approach. In *The tap of comparative literature in Taiwan*, ed. Gu Tianhong and Chen Huihua. Taipei: Dongda Book, 74th Year Republic of China.
38. Yue Daiyun. 1990. Western literary trend and 20th Chinese literature (preface). In *Western literary trend and 20th Chinese literature*, ed. Yue Daiyun and Wang Ning. Beijing: Chinese Social and Science Press.
39. Yue Daiyun. 1995. Cultural difference and cultural misreading. In *Unicorn and dragon: Misreading in research of universality of Western and Chinese culture*, ed. Yue Daiyun, 111. Beijing: Peking University Press.
40. Yan Yuanshu. 1975. *The ambiguity of Chinese classical poems. On national literature*. Taipei: Students Press.
41. Chen Youbing. 2004. Rethinking and remain on the classical literature study disciplinary. *Fengchia Journal of Humanity and Social Science*, 1–31. Taiwan: The College of Humanities and Social Science of Fengchia University.
42. Zhou Faxiang. 1997. *Western literary theory and Chinese literature*, 6. Nanjing: Jiangsu Education Press.
43. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *The discourse of Chinese ancient literary theory (introduction)*. Chengdu: Ba-Shu Publishing House.
44. Li Qingben. 2000. QuYuan: On the interpretation validity of romanticism. *Chinese Chuci study: The 2000 international symposium on Chuci* 6: 179–191.
45. Yan Yuanshu. 1988. Lamia and the tale of white snake: A subject of comparative literature. In *Analacts of China and Western comparative literature*, ed. Wen Rumin. Beijing: Peking University Press.
46. Yip, Wailim. 1975–1976. The use of 'models' in East–West comparative literature. *Tamkang Review* 6–7: 109–126.
47. Gu Tianhong, and Chen Huihua (eds.). 1976. *The tap of comparative literature in Taiwan* from Preface. Taipei: Dongda Book, 65th Year Republic of China.
48. Chen Youbing. 2004. Rethinking and remain on the classical literature study disciplinary. *Fengchia Journal of Humanity and Social Science*, 5. Taiwan: The College of Humanities and Social Science of Fengchia University.

49. YuHong. 1999. *Chinese literary theory and Western poetry (preface)*. Beijing: SDX Joint Publishing.
50. Liu Changjiu. 2006. *Chinese Buddhism*, 74. Guilin: Guangxi Normal University Press.
51. Shunqing Cao. 2008. Variation: Breakthrough of comparative literature disciplinary theory. *Journal of Zhongshan University* 4: 3–13.
52. Zhang Chunyi. 2006. Revised notes on Yanzi Spring and Autumn. In *Zhu Zi Ji Cheng*, vol. 4, 159. Beijing: China Book.
53. Gu Tianhong. 1978. Comparative literature between China and the West: Initial exploration of category, methodology and spirit. In *Chinese and foreign literature* 7: 11.
54. Lu Kanghua, and Sun Jingyao. 1984. *Introduction to comparative literature*, 328. Harbin: Heilongjiang People's Publishing House.
55. Wen Rumin, and Lu Kanghua. 1987. *Comparative literature in Taiwan, almanac of Chinese comparative literature*, 461. Beijing: Peking University Press.
56. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *Theoretical studies on comparative literature discipline*, 498. Chengdu: Bashu Publishing House.
57. Yip William. 1986. General preface of comparative literature series. In *Seeking for common intercultural literature pattern between China and West: Selected papers of William Yip on comparative literature*, ed. Wen Rumin and Li Xiyao, 1. Beijing: Peking University Press.
58. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *Course of comparative literature*, 251. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
59. Shunqing Cao. 2001. *The discourse of Chinese ancient literary theory (introduction)*, 492. Chengdu: Ba-Shu Publishing House.
60. Shunqing Cao, and Wang Qing. 2008. The discourse reconstruction of Chinese literary theory. *Literature, History and Philosophy* 5: 5–12.

Chapter 3

The Variation Theory in Cross-Language Context

Suppose that cross-country is the first basis for Comparative Literature; therefore, cross-language is the second one, just as French scholar Guyard proposed, “standing on the edge of the language and nation, researchers of Comparative Literature gaze at the interpenetration between two of several literatures in terms of their themes, thoughts and emotions” [1]. Standing at the edges of languages could be regarded as a study of cross-language. Mr. Qian Zhongshu also points out, “as a discipline, Comparative Literature emphasizes the comparison across countries and languages.” And he made a further explanation, “in details, [it is] to compare different literatures from different countries, study their interrelations on literary theories, literary schools, authors, books” [2]. This chapter is about the Variation from the perspective of cross-language.

3.1 Literary Translation: From Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance to Creative Treason

3.1.1 *Original Intention: The Seeking of Equivalence in Patterns of Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance*

With the rapid development of human production and the high frequencies of human activities, the communication which crosses languages appeared, especially in the field of the arts: “It is the artists from different cultures who put new elements into their own cultures without destroying the competence of a special art and make it possible that world culture could become more colorful, rich, and prosperous” [3]. Under the trend of globalization, as a kind of transformation between languages, the final purpose of the translation serves as the convenience of communication, promoting the harmony and cooperation of different civilizations. In fact, as one of

the literary theories, hermeneutics is the original type of translation. At that time, many scholars explained the difficult texts, such as the Bible as well as the epics of Homer: "In fact, even the name of hermeneutics derives from Hermes, a figure in Greek mythology" [4].

At the very beginning, translation was a kind of hermeneutics. Translation involves the spreading of meaning, which surely includes origin, medium, and reception. It is highly possible that the meaning and its cultural context could be lost, varied, and omitted. The original concerns of translation and hermeneutics are how to reduce the differences to the least degree, mainly from the point of equivalence of meaning. Therefore, in the mode of seeking the equivalence, the translator, often starting from the standpoint of language as a tool, assumes that there is an objective meaning, which becomes the object of the study of translation. As a result, under the domination of meaning, language is used as merely a tool for expressing thoughts or emotions, and its use is to reflect the meaning truly and exactly. Accordingly, Zhi Qian, the translator of the Buddhist Scriptures in Three Kingdoms Period (220–280), talked in the preface to *FaJu Jing* about his understanding of translation: "passing the truth," "loyalty to the original," "treasure of the fact," "toleration of the vulgarity," and "sticking to the plain." Actually, these are the sources of the principles of "faithfulness," "expressiveness," and "elegance," proposed by modern Chinese scholar Yan Fu, who wrote in the preface to *Evolution and Ethics*, "There are three difficulties for translation, that is to make translation 'faithful, expressive, elegant'." "Faithfulness," "expressiveness," and "elegance" of Yan Fu had become the golden maxim and a very important standard to evaluate translation in China. According to his statement, being faithful means the content is not distorted and the translation is based on the original text to the best degree. Being expressive refers to the fluency of the translation. Being elegant means the perfection of the translation in aesthetics. That is to say, on the basis of loyalty and fluency, the style of the translation is improved.

The principles of "faithfulness," "expressiveness," and "elegance," to some degree, guide the translation in general, while translation discussed in the theory of Variation refers to literary translation. Although literary translation is also a kind of common translation, its own features differ from the "literal translation," which is the word-for-word translation without taking cultural differences into account. This is the rudimentary level of translation. The highest level of translation is "'integration', which refers to the translation of literature from one language to the other maintaining the original flavor and without any traces of foreignness."

"Integration" means that two languages intermingle together and form a new linguistic sign through which they express the same meaning but still keep their own unique characters. The two languages could enter the same domain of the significance of different words. To put it in another way, literary translation emphasizes the similarities of content rather than form. Just as Fu Lei stated, "my viewpoint for translation is very simple. That is to emphasize the similarities of content rather than form. The translation must read like real Chinese without foreign traces in the rhythm and consonance" [5].

Just because of its focus on the language, the aim of literary translation is not “direct translation.” Gu Hongming (Ku Hung-Ming), the famous Chinese translator in the late Qing Dynasty, held that it was easier to translate the meaning of one foreign work than the style of it. He claimed, “My aim in translation, after I have thoroughly mastered the meaning, is not only to reproduce the *matter*, but also the *manner* of the original. For, as Wordsworth says of all literature of really intrinsic value,—‘to be sure, it is the manner, but the matter always comes out of the manner.’ But to be able to reproduce the manner, what in literature is called the style, of the great and wise men of the past, one must try to put oneself in the same state of temper and mind in which they were—a thing one finds not easy to attain, living in this modern world of the ‘civilisation of progress.’” [6] Tullius Cicero, one of the great thinkers, once stated in *On the Most Excellent Orators*, “I translate as an orator rather than an interpreter...not the word-for-word translation, but to keep the whole style and power of translation” [7]. “The whole style and power” means the meaning expressed, no matter how the language changes, always keeps an integrated quality. Therefore, the pursuit of the accuracy of the meaning as a whole supersedes the pursuit of that of individual words, which is so-called integration.

“There are several paradoxes in translation, including the paradoxes of understanding and expression, correspondence and coherence, literal translation and indirect translation” [8]. If we are too loyal to the original text, it is likely to make translation a fixed formula. If we pursue coherence, it is easy to make the translation different from the original meaning. Therefore, in the 1920s and 1930s, there was a debate among Chinese scholars about “literal translation” and “indirect translation.” The former holds that the translator must express the same meaning of the original text, while the latter holds that the original form could be changed on the condition that the whole style remains the same. The members of the “literary translation” school included Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai, while the members of the “indirect translation” school included Zhao Jingshen and Liang Shiqiu. The former insisted that “to be true rather than coherent,” the latter “would rather to be wrong than word-for-word correspondence.” Zhao Jingshen wrote in *On Translation*, “What is most important is to maintain coherence” [9]. He also changed the order of “faithfulness,” “expressiveness,” and “elegance” to “expressiveness,” “faithfulness,” and “elegance.” For example, he translated the English expression “the Milky Way” to be “the Way of Milk” in Chinese. When Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren were translating *The Novels of Other Counties*, they mainly adopted the standards of “literal translation.” Of course, their emphasis on the “literal translation” is only a general principle instead of stubborn insistence on it. Otherwise, for example, Lu Xun would never have criticized Zhao Jingshen’s “the Way of Milk” as a wrong translation. Of course, their influence could not be compared with that of Lin Shu, who was also a member of the “indirect translation” school. Lin Shu could not understand foreign languages, but his translation fit well with the Chinese culture and was easily accepted by the Chinese readers. However, it did not mean that his translation was better than what Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren did, for they were two kinds of translation.

3.1.2 *Bewildering: Phenomena of “Intention Beyond Language” and Utopia of Equivalence*

In a sense, literary translation is the faithful expression of “meaning” with the appropriate linguistic form. However, since content and form are two different things, it remains a question to arrive at the stage of correspondence between these two.

If the study of literary translation is conducted in the mode of pursuing faithfulness, it must be confronted with the following problems. Is the meaning of the original text identical with that of the author? Is the meaning of translation identical with that of the original text? Could the words used by the translator express and embody the meanings as being understood? Is the meaning perceived by the readers identical with that expressed by the translator? Since there are many such gaps from the original meaning to the perception of a reader of another country, what is the real difficulty for an equivalent translation? Is the equivalence pursued by literary translation a practical goal or a utopian vision? In fact, these difficulties are decided by the attributes of literary translation, which differs from the general translation, such as scientific translation, or that of daily use, whose highest aim is how to make the translation embody the principle of truth. However, it is an inevitable fact that it is impossible for literary translation to realize 100 % loyal translation. Just as Qian Zhongshu put it, “Complete and absolute integration is a dream that cannot be realized.” Zhu Guangqian also maintained that “The absolute loyalty is a dream, which is hard to realize” [10].

Therefore, seeking truthfulness is the common goal shared by literary translation and general translation, but the degree of truthfulness in literary translation is lower than that of the general translation: “Literary translation is artistic, which reflects the translator’s aesthetic understanding of the content and style of the original, expresses the images and style of the original one, inspires and touches the readers as the original texts” [11]. “The purpose of the general translation is to faithfully convey the original meaning, while literary translation is to convey the aesthetic information in addition to that” [12].

Undoubtedly, the artistic and the aesthetic are the important characteristics of literary translation, which inevitably result in the contradictions between the principles of truth and coherence. Qian Zhongshu elaborated the three distances between the original text and translated text as “First, the distance between two different languages; second, the distance between the content and form of the original text and the understanding and style the translator adopts; third, the distance between the translator’s understanding and his/her linguistic competence” [13]. Only when these three distances are minimized is it possible to arrive at the ideal of “integration.” Among the above three points, the hardest is to convey the aesthetic information, which is not a piece of simple reality but exists in a complicated process of ideology. Different from the general discourse in science, the aesthetic aspect in literary translation is more subjective and places more emphasis on the abstract “flavor.” Accordingly, it must face the aforementioned problems. Actually these problems have been discussed by ancient Chinese thinkers.

It is stated in *Changes* that “the text could not express words, and the words could not express the meaning.” Is the meaning of a saint invisible? “A saint lets the image express the meaning.” Obviously this standpoint means that the meaning could be expressed. It depends on image, which is an abstract artistic imagination; it is hard to measure it with a concrete standard. Confucius said “the words contain meaning, it is all right.” But this was not explained well by Confucius. From a Confucian perspective, only the saints could overcome the contradiction between words and meanings. If we could not make an objective judgment for a literary translation, the standard of “faithfulness” could not be set up because the content is unclear, and its identity may drop into crisis. Lao Zi also said “the beautiful words are not true; the true words are not beautiful”; “the way that can be spoken of is not the constant way; the name that can be named is not the constant name.” According to Zhuang Zi, the meanings of the saints could not be expressed—just understood.

Lu Ji said in *On Literature*, “I constantly fear failure in my conceptions’ not being equal to the things of the world, and in my writing’s not being equal to my conceptions. I suppose it is not the understanding that is difficult, but rather the difficulty lies in being able to do it well” [14]. Liu Xie also said, “Before we start to write something, we are full of ideas, after we finished it, the ideas expressed by the words just contain part of them. Why? The meaning tends to be changeable, and the words tend to be unable.” Zhu Guangqian said, “It is said that words can express meaning, but meaning could not be expressed fully, because the words are fixed and visible whereas meaning is various; words are partial whereas meaning is the whole; words are limited whereas meaning is unlimited. Expressing meaning with words, just like drawing an object with separated lines, only gets similarities” [15].

In modern Western philosophy, the “linguistic turn” actually touches upon the relationship between word and meaning in a new way. According to traditional linguistics, language appeared as a result from humans’ using the sign system to represent and express the world. Human beings obtain the agreement for the objective reality by the way of naming. However, the modern “linguistic turn” started from doubts towards language itself. Is language only a tool? Could language really express meaning as human beings expected? At the same time, the “being” itself must also drop into the strange circle of language—“language, by naming beings for the first time, first brings beings to word and to appearance” [16]. Heidegger therefore reaches the revolutionary idea, which is that “language is the house of being.” That is to say, language is not a simple tool used for expressing something; it is a spiritual field where the subject and the object meet. Without it, how could we know things? How do the things come into our realization? The relationship between the language and the world is not that between sign and object. Hans-Georg Gadamer, the student of Heidegger, said, “Verbal experience of the world is ‘absolute.’ It transcends all the relative ways being is posited because it embraces all being-in-itself, in whatever relationships (relativities) it appears. [...] The object of knowledge and statements is always already enclosed within the world horizon of language. That human experience of the world is verbal does not imply that a world-in-itself is being objectified.” [17] Heidegger also said, “The word itself is the relation [of word and thing], by holding everything

forth into being, and there upholding it. If the word did not have this bearing, the whole of things, the ‘world’ would sink into obscurity” [18]. That is to say, language opens the world and cannot be regarded merely as a passive sign system.

Therefore, the specialty of literary translation lies in the fact that the modes of literary discourse and scientific discourse are totally different as far as the direction of value is concerned. In the process of literary translation, not only a language is changed into another, the system of significance also changes. This complex phenomenon of Variation decides that in the process of literary translation, heterogeneity must be involved. For example, there are some very beautiful lyrics in *Poems* “At first, when we set out,/The willows were fresh and green;/now, when we shall be returning,/The snow will be falling” (James Legge). When these words were translated into English, although the verbal meaning was translated well, it could not express the implications of these words and the deep sadness and happiness. That is to say, something in it is impossible to be translated which results from the heterogeneity of these two languages.

Saussure divided the linguistic sign into two kinds—signifier and signified. Signifier generally contains the sign and its significance. Signified refers to the things correspondent to the signifier in the world. Scientific discourses pursue the truth and the universal, one principle of which is the repetition in different environments. But with subtlety and complexity as its values, literary discourse emphasizes the individualistic signs, with which subjective spiritual value could be expressed. According to Derrida, literature is just the free play of signs. Lacan also points out that literature is a chain of signifiers which is composed of signs, which form a big intertextuality to generate new meaning. Once literature signifies the outside world, the aesthetics in it will be weakened. In a word, the focus of scientific discourse is what is signified—the clearer, the better; the focus of literary discourse is signifier itself—the more complex, the more suggestive, the more aesthetic value, for the process of its understanding is the participation of readers.

3.1.3 The Way Out: Harmony Without Being Identical and Emphasis of Heterogeneity

Although, from the contradiction of words and meanings, it is difficult for the standards of “faithfulness,” “expressiveness,” and “elegance” to be applied in literary translation, the most important question is in the process of translating a language into another one—we have to meet their differences and variations—how could we treat the variations in the cultural communication? How can practical and reasonable academic resources be found?

Above all, in the study of Comparative Literature, the French school affirms that the comparability means that we must find out the same or similar characteristics of different literatures. Therefore, all the disciplines of this school, including Doxologie, Mesologie, and Crenologie, are all based on the study of homogeneity.

In other words, the French school tries to discover the sameness in different languages, civilizations, and disciplines. However, they ignore the variations in different cultural contexts. They care about the sameness rather than difference. Obviously, its biggest disadvantage is to discover the sameness only. The American school recognizes this problem, but they deliberately avoid and even refuse to take the difference into account. Instead, they contend that the Comparative Literature could not go well in different civilizations. That is to say, the American school tries to complement the French school on its absolute neglect of the differences in civilizations. However, the American school also regards the heterogeneous literatures as incomparable. Therefore, if the French school ignores the difference out of their pursuit of the sameness, then the American school embraces the sameness and refuses the differences. The Chinese school, in some way unconscious of the heterogeneity, either compares the Chinese literature with those of foreign countries as they are of the same origin or directly applies the Western theories to analyze Chinese literary phenomena.

If Variation is unavoidable in literary translation, we cannot forget and ignore it as the French school did. Whenever there is a cross-language, a change of time and space, or a confrontation of civilizations, Variation must be there. Therefore, the seeking for homogeneity is just a utopian idea, an academic illusion. At the same time, we cannot shun and refuse it as the American school did. Instead, we need to think whether or not the difference could exist as a kind of comparability. The comparison denotes not only the sameness but also the clarification of the difference. The comparison of the difference of heterogeneous civilizations is also valuable and a new perspective of the study of Comparative Literature. Therefore, we could not keep away from it. Just as Comparative Literature, the study of literary translation should not go for the sameness but for the harmony with difference. In order to positively find the difference, we must recognize the Variation in the process of literary translation and then study the changes in meaning in cultural communication rather than passively accept the difference. In other words, we should stress creative treason.

It is surely right if we study translation only from the perspective of relationship. However, “in the process of literary spreading and communication, besides the factors which are evident and definite, under the influence of cultural filtering, translation, and reception, there are many factors such as aesthetic, psychological, and cultural ones, under which literature has spread and the acceptance has varied to some degree” [19]. But the study of these variations is different from the simple seeking for sameness with difference, but to discover the difference in culture, language, and thoughts. Therefore, for some scholars, the study of translation must lead to *Medio-translatology*. Professor Xie Tianzhen stated in *Medio-translatology*, “Accurately speaking, the study of *Medio-translatology* does not belong to a linguistic field; it is a literary or a cultural field of research. It stresses not the problems of how to translate a language into another one, but of the loss, transformation, addition, and expansion in the process of translation from the original texts into another language. It is concerned with particular values and meanings of the translation (mainly literary translation) as a unique human practice crossing cultures” [20].

“Medio-translatology is a branch of study of Variation in Comparative Literature on the level of language. It is concerned with all kinds of phenomena of Variation in the process of translation and discusses the original reasons of these variations in the context of society, history, and culture” [21]. As early as the year 1934, Qian Zhongshu put forward the distinction between “translation” and “translation as an art” [22]. In a word, Medio-translatology is not about the transformation in the level of language. The biggest difference between the study of translation and the study of Medio-translatology is that the former focuses on the faithfulness to the original text, which holds that the translation should be true, conveying the original meaning to the highest degree. In other words, it is to discover the sameness. But one of the main characteristics of Medio-translatology is creative treason, which confirms the difference in different civilizations, focuses on the particular cultural heterogeneity in translation, and takes the difference as a dimension of comparison. The term “creative treason” was put forward by Robert Escarpit, who was a French scholar of social studies. He maintained, “The translation is always a creative treason,” and “the more important aspect of creative treason is its function for spreading and reception of literary works. A literary work, since it cannot go beyond its surroundings of language and history is impossible to completely convey all the intentions of the author to the readers because every reader understands and accepts them from their own experience” [23].

The core value of the study of Variation is the difference, which is away from the ideas of homogeneity of the French school. It is no longer the objective of translation to pursue the equivalence to the original text; instead, its concerns are what the differences are and, furthermore, why the differences appear. For example, Han Shan, a poet in Tang Dynasty, whose poems have not been regarded as very important in Chinese literary history—there is little coverage of him in literary history textbooks. There existed many kinds of poetry but *baihua* (colloquial) poetry was not recognized as one of them. When Han Shan’s *baihua* poems were translated into English and introduced in America, however, they had become so popular and even became canonized. Especially in the 1950s and 1960s, his poems had swept through American campuses, and Han Shan was even regarded as one of the major sources of inspiration by the Beat Generation. What made the different reactions of Han Shan’s poetry in China and America? Actually in the process of translation, there are different cultural contexts. One of Han Shan’s poems has been translated as the following—“The pig eats the body of the dead man./And the man eats the guts of the dead pig./The pig doesn’t detest the smelly dead man./And the man tastes the pig delicious.” This poem is the representative of typical popular culture, which is different from traditional aesthetics of Chinese poetry. Traditional Chinese poetry pursues “yijing (aesthetic imagery)” or “gracefulness,” which can be hardly found in Han Shan’s poems. But in the 1950s and 1960s, there appeared in America an unconventional artistic view to worship popular culture and ridicule the high arts. Han Shan’s poetry fit in this tendency with their emphasis on vulgarity.

Evidently, the value of Variation is embodied in the study of literary translation, which is not a seeking for equivalence. Literary translation takes literary discourse rather than general discourse as its focus. Therefore, it is an art of

creation where something new must be involved. Just as Professor Xie Tianzhen stated in *Medio-translatology*, “The radical difference between literary translation and other translations lies in the fact that literary language is not ordinary, which is not the language just for daily communication, but a special language of art with aesthetic functions” [24]. Accordingly, “under such circumstances, literary translation is a kind of literary creation, for it is obviously no longer a work of transforming words, but a creative work” [25]. Furthermore, according to the theory of *Medio-translatology*, “The primary feature of the creative treason of literary translation lies not only in ‘transformation,’ but fundamentally in taking the text into an environment which is beyond the author’s expectation, and consequently changing the form given originally by the author” [26].

Of course, this “creative treason” exists not only in the translator but also in the process of acceptance by the readers: “The readers’ creative treason varies with their individual experiences, worldviews, and literary ideas. It also varies with their diversified physical and historical surroundings” [27]. As for literary reception, we may recall what Heidegger said: “The interpretation of something as something is essentially grounded in fore-having, fore-sight, and fore-conception.” Then, “How are we to conceive the character of this ‘fore’? Have we done this when we formally say ‘*a priori*’? Why is this structure appropriate to understanding which we have characterized as a fundamental existential of *Da-sein*? How is the structure of the ‘as’ which belongs to what is interpreted as such related to the fore-structure?” [28]. Heidegger’s questioning for the relationship between understanding and interpretation touches upon the hermeneutic circle. It means if we want to understand a text, we must have been equipped with a pre-understanding, which is the preparation for the understanding of the text. All the understanding for the text must be generated in this context. But the pre-understanding does not appear without any reason—it comes from a concrete text, the process of which forms a circle. This circle embodies both difficulties of literary understanding and values of literary works. On the basis of the above analysis, obviously we should not stress the sameness of the meanings or “faithful, expressive, and elegant.” Instead, we must recognize the difference in the process of translation and consider the “creative treason” in pre-understanding to develop the theory of Variation in Comparative Literature further.

3.2 Non-translatability and the Inevitability of Variations in Literary Translation

The pair of “non-translatability” and “translatability” in translation studies is an age-old paradox and is quite controversial. The controversy is mainly due to the fact that despite that each different language has its own unique grammar, vocabulary, metaphor, and expression, interlanguage translation has been conducted in a relatively successful manner. In the long history of translation, advocacies of “non-translatability” can be frequently heard.

3.2.1 *Literature Review: Debate and Research on Non-translatability*

In the West, Dante (1256–1321) proposed first the view of non-translatability in *Il Convivio*. He argued that “any work of rich phonological harmony is not possible to be translated into another language without undermining some of its original beauty and harmony” [29]. By the end of the eighteenth century, Baron Wilhelm von Humboldt (1767–1835), the famous German linguist, said, “In my view all translations were only trying to accomplish a task that cannot be completed. Each translator was bound to be stumbled by two obstacles in his way in the process of translation. He was either too close to the original text at the expense of the nation’s style and language or too close to national characteristics at the expense of the original text. The middle way between the two is not difficult but impossible to be found.” [30] This is nothing more than to say that there is little commonality between languages and there cannot exist a fusion between the original and the translated. In the mid- and late nineteenth century, Потебня (Александр Потебня, 1835–1891), the Russian linguist and literary critic, from a psychological stance pointed out, “The individual words and word combinations of one language cannot be translated. The translation is only an abstraction from the original thought, so it cannot be equal with the original idea. Once translated into another language, a text’s content is bound to increase” [31]. Obviously this opinion is for untranslatability. Benedetto Croce (1866–1952), the Italian aesthetician and literary critic of the early twentieth century, from an aesthetic point of view maintained that the speech act is not to be repeated and literary translation can only be artistic re-creation of an original work of art, which is essentially a continuation and development of Dante’s “view of non-translatability.”

Similarly, as early as in the period of the translation of Buddhist Scriptures, Dao An proposed his famous “five losses and three difficulties” theory. He believed that in the process of the translation of the Sanskrit Buddhist Scriptures, there are five cases of loss of the original colors, mainly related to the difference of the two languages in word order, syntax structure, chapter structure, style and stylistic construction of meaning, and other issues. The “three difficulties” refers to three difficult aspects to handle in translation such as the difference of era, culture, and understanding, which share with later Croce’s understanding of the problem. Kumarajiva, the famous translator of Buddhist Scriptures in the Late Qin, well aware of the difficulties, warned, “To translate the Sanskrit into Chinese is to lose the style of the original. Though the message can be conveyed, the effect might be of a quite separated style. It is like chewing tasteless rice which grosses people out” [32]. He is the first to notice the phenomenon of loss of flavor and proposes non-translatability in the history of translation in our country. With the further development of translation studies in modern and contemporary time, the controversy of translatability and non-translatability is still on. Zhou Xuliang in *On Translation* maintains that the style cannot be translated, because the medium of the translation is language. Translating something from one language into another language is like using a pencil or pen to copy Chinese painting; thus, it is impossible to reflect the

original style. As for the question of translatability of poetry, a number of translators hold a cautious if not negative stance. Mr. Jin Yuelin also implied that translation is very difficult, philosophical translation more difficult, and poetry almost untranslatable. Wang Ruogu expressed that the translation of poetry is bound to make the original taste lose its flavor. Wang Yizhu even used “On the Non-translatability of Poetry” as the title of his article to emphasize the non-translatability of poetry. A few decades ago, Zhou Zuoren not only upheld that the poem is not translatable but also made a very vivid metaphor that any translation of poetry is like a paraphrase of the teachers to children of poems of the Tang Dynasty. Overtones of poetry are untranslatable; therefore, any translation is detracted from the original artistic expression. Zhu Guangqian also found that some literary works, especially poems, simply cannot be translated. People who held the view that poetry could be translated are those who probably did not know how to translate poetry. Most of the literature that can be translated can only be an approximation to the original.

The above is just a brief introduction to “non-translatability.” Domestic and foreign scholars have discussed this issue from different angles and at different levels. English linguistics translation theorist J. Catford holds the view that due to reasons pertaining to the syntax level, the meaning of the source language would not be able to find a direct expression in the target language. For example, the Chinese word “她们” can only be translated into English as “they” without indication of the gender of the word. Therefore, there is inevitably a loss in translation. The non-translatability caused by semantic features, text features, context features, and form features leads William Frawley ultimately to conclude that any attempt to convert semantically interlingual translation will be doomed to failure. Current domestic scholars who study non-translatability mostly focus on the following two aspects—the first is the existence of the phenomenon of non-translatability in the translation and the second is to collect a lot of examples of this phenomenon. To sum up, at home and abroad these studies confirm the objective existence of the phenomenon of non-translatability, but there is a lack of research on the paradigm from a philosophical level. The following section is to explore from the perspective of philosophical paradigm “non-translatability” and its relevance with literary Variation.

3.2.2 Non-translatability in Two Philosophical Paradigms

According to Mark Shuttleworth and Moira Cowie, “non-translatability” and “translatability” are two inseparable terminologies in discussing the issue—to what extent the individual words, phrases, or text can be translated from one language into another. However, at different times and different countries, some writers, linguists, translation theorists, philosophers, and scientists have been skeptical and even blind to translatability, which means “non-translatability” is not just on a simple linguistic level. In the 1,000 years of Chinese and foreign translation, most of the translation practitioners and theorists have refused to accept the theory of non-translatability, which is regarded as an absurd theory in practice, and harmful, for it not only ignores the role and value of translation but also limits the creation

and development of translation. There has been an application of the achievements of modern science to reveal that non-translatability derives from the idealist theory of agnosticism and its methodology on the linear and absolute. At the same time, it is undeniable that we are discussing translation in the realm of language whose intermediaries are insurmountable in our own existence. To explore intermediaries has been the core issue of modern linguistics since Ferdinand de Saussure, which is an epistemological problem and can be traced back to Kant and Aristotle. On the other hand, obsession with the meaning of the state, as one of the issues of ontology, has been a concern for Derrida, Benjamin, and Heidegger, which can be traced back to Hegel and Plato. Discussion on these two issues inevitably raises the issue within their respective framework of the “non-translatability.” The “non-translatability” discussed here by no means simply refers to the non-translatability on the language level, namely, in terms of linguistic features and physical form. Moreover, as Wilss pointed out, “The translatability of a text can thus be measured in terms of the degree to which it can be re-contextualized in TL, taking into account all linguistic and extra-linguistic factors. [...] The translatability of a text is thus guaranteed by the existence of universal categories in syntax, semantics, and the (natural) logic of experience. [...] Linguistic non-translatability occurs when the linguistic form has a function beyond that of conveying factual relationships and is therefore a constituent part of the functional equivalence to be achieved. This, for example, is true of word play, which can usually be adequately translated semantically but not stylistically.” [33]

3.2.2.1 Criticism on the Essentialist View

Language used to be understood by Plato as a “reproduction” of everything in the world, allowing for interpersonal communication of symbols which exist not only in the objective world but also in the subjective world of people. This view lasted for 2,000 years and has not only dominated but largely blocked another perspective to regard language as an arbitrary and independent symbol system. This view of language reflected in the translation is the author-centric view that language is “transparent,” that is, a perfect translation not only faithfully reproduces the original content but also reconstructs the original style and stylistically shows the aesthetic taste, thus forming the standard of “faithful” translation. The problem with this standard does not lie in its author but in the fact that it presupposes some sort of unlimited cognitive abilities. A Kantian criticism of these abilities drives forward the epistemological exploration of “non-translatability.”

3.2.2.2 “Non-translatability” in the Issue of Mediation

In fact, as early as the period of ancient Greece, there has been another tit-for-tat view of language: Language is viewed as man-made and the formation of the words derives from other words. Aristotle (384–322 BC) in his book *On Interpretation*

proposed that language is formed in practice. According to this view, language is likely to be regarded as a system of symbols, ever-changing, and a continuing process independent of the objective world and people's thoughts. However, this view of Aristotle has not been developed. From the thirteenth century to the eighteenth century, many Western scientists, philosophers, and linguists, such as Roger Bacon, Leibnitz, and von Humboldt, expressed in different ways the position of "non-translatability," but none had fundamentally rejected Plato's view of language as a faithful reproduction of the thoughts of the subject.

Until the early twentieth century, the father of modern linguistics, Saussure, put forward the far-reaching theory of language as a symbolic system of meaning construction and reconstruction, the core idea of which is the value of the elements of language is decided by the elements around it; the confrontation and the difference of elements form a network of relationships which constitute a system of value. Saussure also believes that language is not the links between symbols and names of things, but the concept (signified) and the sound (signifier). The relationship between signified and signifier is man-made, arbitrary, and prescriptive. The concept, which is referred to, does not preexist: "But it is quite clear that initially the concept is nothing, that is only a value determined by its relations with other similar values, and that without them the signification would not exist" [34]. In this way, it is clear that there is much sense to accept the concept that the meaning of the language is determined by the difference between linguistic signs. It is based on the fact that language is likely to be treated as an independent and self-sufficient system containing interrelated elements. Once language is taken as a kind of existence independent of people, the traditional view of language regarded as "transparency" will cease to exist. The idea that language can faithfully convey meaning is fundamentally destabilized.

Moreover, Saussure's theory of value has actually manifested that any language system is a value system; the independent existence of the different national languages is because of that. If we explore this level, the discussion on the "non-translation" would be expanded. The problem of "non-translatability" is directly related to meaning. Saussure divides the relationship and differences between the elements of language (*langue*) into two different categories—syntagmatic and associative relations—each of which will generate a kind of value. These two categories are what later linguists call "syntagmatic" and "paradigmatic," and the relationship between the paradigmatic is where the "system" lies. That is to say, the differences between different languages, in fact, are the paradigmatic differences in articulation and the semantic field, which derives from the different understanding of the different peoples towards the world. Translation is a complete conversion of the structure of language. The similar surface meaning cannot conceal the complete distortion of the original linguistic system. Saussure himself also provides a classic example of non-translatability in discussion of the symbolic value. The French word "mouton" and the English word "sheep" may have the same meaning, but not the same value. In addition to the meaning of "sheep," "mouton" has equivalent word "mutton." In addition to the theoretical significance, this example may have the methodological significance. When we carry out any analysis, the starting point and the guiding

principle should be to request difference in order to locate the same. It is only through seeking unconventionality that the same can be found. The inspiration for the study of Comparative Literature is to find the differences between the various ethnic groups, on the basis of which their relationship can be established, which constitutes the essence of this theory.

After Saussure, modern semantics does not explore specific meaning but pursues all the necessary conditions for the existence of some meaning. According to Jaszczolt, these necessary conditions may be classified into three categories, which in the actual language activities are inseparable. They are denotation, sense, and reference. Denotation of a word refers to common entities and attributes which are stable, because it does not depend on the context. Sense is the main research areas of structural linguistics, which, namely, in terms of its narrow sense, refers to the relationship between the various elements, from which meaning arises. While reference is the relationship between the language elements and the outside world, it depends on the context. From Humboldt and Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, we can easily see that the main concern is the subsection of concept, namely, the denotation. However, there is an inseparable relation between the elements of a language system and the ethnicity, cultural and cognitive. The dependence of reference on the context also forces modern linguists to have to consider the context and the conversion of the types of the context. Lu Jun holds the view that structural epistemological philosophy puts “too much emphasis on the role of language laws, and gradually forms the logo-centric and thus suppresses the human’s creative and dynamic role, puts too much emphasis on homogeneity and neglect of human diversity, making scientificism a dominant position in the humanities” [35]. In this regard, I beg to differ, it is true, if we stick to Saussure’s theory of meaning, we would not give much thought to difficulties of translation caused by changes in the context, but that does not mean that we can negate the difficulties of translation resulting from the contextual changes, because even Saussure himself has taken note of the non-translatability and provides a good example. Literary translation, as one of the major forms of translation in the West, has formed a widely accepted weakened version of the “non-translatability” theory after experiencing the sifting and filtering of formalist aesthetic tradition from Kant to Jakobson—we should dilute referential function but simply highlight the “non-translation” of text essentially out of the formalist aesthetic function. This view was even accepted by the translator and translation theorist Nida who holds the view of “translatability” and claims “anything that can be said in one language can be said in another, unless the form is an essential element of the message” [36].

3.2.2.3 “Non-translatability” in the Pursuit of the State of Meaning

The Western classic linguistics has created a linguistic structure with “logos” as its center; language is intended to convey God’s voice. The structure of this language reflects their world schema. To Plato, “logos” is transformed into “idea,” and he holds that since everything in this world is the production of the “concept,”

meaning is no exception. In the Middle Ages, “logos” is “God.” The last classical philosopher in the West, Hegel, turns “idea” into the “absolute idea,” which means nothing more than absolute. As Plato’s last follower, Heidegger puts the world schema even more succinctly—existence precedes essence. This rationalist intellectual tradition has been called by Jacques Derrida “logocentrism.” According to his interpretation, the main problem of logocentrism is that it is confident that a world exists prior to language, which runs according to its own logic of development and dominates the process of nature and society. Thus, the philosopher’s task is to use language to grope with this truth. However, Derrida puts forth two strategies to destroy such metaphysics: to follow Heidegger’s return to the origin to oppose metaphysical traditions or to use Foucault’s tool of discontinuity and destroy the root of metaphysics to break from it completely.

Heidegger treats discourse as the ontological foundation for a language to survive, for once uttered, it becomes a language. However, there the language is to be regarded as a feature and a link of “Dasein”—“Dasein in a language.” Language is actually “Dasein.” It is not people who speak the language, but language speaks for itself. People are accustomed to talk by the language and thus become people. That is to say, it is not human beings who created the language, but the language has created human beings. Therefore, “Language is the house of existence.” In this way, language is no longer just a tool for thinking and an intermediary for human communication. It is a cultural phenomenon and a product of human practice and wisdom. In *On the Way to Language*, Heidegger also made clear this idea that our relationship with the language is that we have experience in language. Language cannot be seen as some sort of external thing to be studied, for we live in language and to understand language is to understand ourselves. In order to recognize ourselves, we must recognize language. He believes that although we are born in language, but we have turned a blind eye to the language itself, neither do we know what the nature of language is. It is not a poet who speaks the language, but the language speaks via the poet to show its essence in its own way. Therefore, what we can do is to listen to how language speaks. It is not a human being who needs to use the language, but language that needs people to appear to speak for itself. In his view, the essences of language are self-expression, polymer, and silence. Thus, he touches upon the issue of “non-translatability” in a unique manner at the beginning of his book. In his view, he used to clumsily refer to language as the house of existence. But if it is for this reason that we humans exist, then the Europeans and Asians may be living in completely different houses. Thus, Heidegger assumes “a dialogue from house to house remains nearly impossible” [37].

Foucault holds that in the traditional concept of literature and translation, the original text and authors have been given divine status, so any process of the translation of the original text into a second language is the desecration of the original, and it is impossible to create a pure equality. In order to deconstruct the traditional concept of author center, Foucault suggests that we should regard the “author” as a function. He considers that there is not a fixed, primitive body, but rather the links between the texts and the relation between texts with a specific historical context. Therefore, the author’s writing does not come from spontaneous inspiration, but

rather closely links with institutional systems of the times and geography, for which authors have no awareness, neither can they control. Foucault does not think authors should be treated as an individual subjectivity, but rather a series of subjective positions. All this is not decided by the effect of a single harmony, but by discontinuity. Discourse shows how discontinuity structures the integrated, ahistorical, and transparent text. According to Foucault, a specific historical period's discourse can shape an individual. Therefore, the language, especially literary language, presents a new existence of a period. Furthermore, language is no longer the intermediary of the truth in metaphysical philosophy, but becomes increasingly self-referential, and is only the performance of its own existence. So, at the end of his book *Order of Things*, he raises his rhetorical question, "If this same language is now emerging with greater and greater insistence in a unity that we ought to think but cannot as yet do so, is this not the sign that the whole of this configuration is now about to topple, and that man is in the process of perishing as the being of language continues to shine ever brighter upon our horizon?" [38]. He believes that a human being is not a subject to make language their own tools, but the existence of language reveals the meaning of human existence. This dissolves the human existence like the existence of other entities.

In Foucault's theory of "discursive formation," "non-translatability" also appears in its inevitable way. "Discursive formation" refers to the conditions that make all kinds of ideology exist. Foucault believes that any statement, (whether written or oral) as long as associated with other statements, can be regarded as an expression of "collection of discourse." The essence of the theory of "collection of discourse" is that there are various statements generated by a specific time period within a particular discourse. These statements are the conditions to explain the relationship between the ideology that may exist in a variety of factors. The understanding of a statement depends on its relationship with other expressions. In Foucault's words, "Such a scattering of words constitutes an articulation inferior to the unity of the name (whether substantial or adjectival) as required by the naked form of the proposition; none of them processes in its own right and in an isolated state, a fixed and determinate representative content; they cannot cover an idea—even an accessory one—until they have been linked together with other words." [39] This means that in the process of translation, although we can translate denotative meanings, we cannot translate the inherent and underlying areas and networks.

Derrida's method of deconstruction is to expose the contradiction of the text itself, destroying the original structure of the text; exploring the meaning that has been excluded, hidden, or forgotten by its central meaning; emphasizing the multidimensionality and uncertainty and ambiguity of meaning; and thus reversing the structure of the relationship between the center and the periphery and eliminating the structure of all identified and fixed things. Derrida agrees with Husserl's point of view that there is a common internal structure of language, such as pure grammar and norms. In other words, regardless of the difference of the internal structure of language or culture, they always refer to the common world, and the mutual understanding or translation between them is always possible. But totally different from Husserl's view on absoluteness and transparency, Derrida considers that language

itself cannot and should not be fully consistent with the meaning of the expression. In other words, even when using the same language, we cannot unify expression in the various cultural forms, such as myth, religion, science, art, literature, philosophy, and politics. These expressions are not on the same straight line but overlapping like a railway network. In addition, Derrida also believes that the identity of the meaning is not absolute, but relative, since the significance of the relationship is always described as an activity within the system, which is open, and increases its content with its development. The interrelationship of different meanings is complex and not directly transparent. Language has never been a permanent, absolute, and same object. As language is a kind of activity of intention, the same word in accordance with the intention is always different. Therefore, the ambiguity of meaning is inevitable; translation of one language into another language on a nuclear basis is unattainable.

3.2.3 Non-translatability and the Inevitability of Variations in Literary Translation

Whether within the framework of epistemology or ontology, “non-translatability” inevitably appears. As Wang Bin said, “As long as people cannot become God, and any human language cannot purify a language to be universal, then the problem of ‘non-translatability’ will show its existence in various ways” [40]. Different ethnic groups formed the expression of different paradigms due to different worldviews and values. As such, the full and absolute translation among different languages cannot be achieved, which is probably the basis of “non-translatability.” But we should also recognize that “paradigm is not an inseparable whole, but rather a loose relationship between the various elements. When an old paradigm faces challenges, it can give up some elements in it and embrace new elements from other cultures” [41]. The feature that the paradigm can shift causes the understanding of language in the activity of translation. Because of different structures of their language, people have different observations. Even for the similar observation of the external world, they may have different evaluations, so different languages reflect different worlds. Meaning is changeable. However, the internal structure which supports this variability is constant; otherwise, there would be no translatability. Linguistic homogeneity and heterogeneity are always intertwined, laying the basis for the transferability of paradigm, resulting in the unity of translatability and non-translatability. Therefore, in the narrow sense, one language cannot be translated into another language, for different languages have different paradigms which cannot be translated. This does not mean that people are impossible to communicate with different languages. In fact, the exchange of cross-language and cross-paradigm is possible, and with depth exchange, language can develop more creatively and there is filter between different paradigms, which means that the broad translation is possible.

In *The Task of the Translator*, Benjamin uses the concept of “pure language” to describe the binary opposition of translated/non-translation, which has become

somewhat esoteric. In Benjamin's view, it seems that translation is not just for readers to read the text but also a step closer to a "pure language." According to him, "all super-historical kinship of languages rests in the intention underlying each language as a whole—an intention, however, which no single language can attain by itself but which is realized only by the totality of their intentions supplementing each other: pure language" [42]. What he calls the superfamily relationship refers to the fact that despite that all ethnic groups use different languages, there is a consistent way shared in languages, and it implies commonality of human cognition, who are using the same metalanguage. In short, that is, behind different languages hides native commonality. So, Wang Bin holds the view that Benjamin's concept goes "far beyond the contemporary theories and overhangs the issue of translatability and non-translatability" [43]. Jacques Derrida in *Babel* expresses that a translation of the text is an attempt at mission impossible, which coincides with the Chinese concepts such as "Shen Si" and "Hua Jing." Kant puts forward in his book *Critique of Judgment* a question that contains its answer, "But now comes the power of judgment, which in the order of our cognitive faculties forms a middle term between understanding and reason. Has it also got independent *a priori* principles?" [44]. Translators lie in the intersection point between the original language and the reader of the translation and between two languages and cultures. Through translation, the interpreter conducts a dialogue with the original author, the original text, and the reader of the translation, the basis of which is the reader/translator's ability to understand and appreciate the experience and background. This is the accommodation and digestion of foreign cultures.

Literary translation and other translations are fundamentally different. Literary translation aims to convey the original state of the art to the reader and enable them to read in an aesthetic manner. Therefore, the language of literary translation is a kind of artistic language, which can stimulate readers to read in an aesthetic way. But aesthetic language can only be generated in its own history, in cultural traditions, and in the language environment, inseparable of the user's own experience of life. For example, a literal translation of the traditional Chinese expression "fallen leaves stand for sad autumn" is difficult to stir in the Western readers the same feelings as in Chinese. Therefore, in the process of translation, in order to make the translation to generate the same feelings, the translator would have to find a reference to the target language environment. In this way, the Variation in the translation process becomes inevitable. This Variation makes literary translation and literary creation almost the same, for it not only gives the original works new life in another language but also implants a new expression, new ideas, and new vision in that language, culture, and society.

To sum up, "non-translatability" is based on a profound understanding of different languages, different cultures, and different civilizations. In the epistemological and ontological dimensions of the discussion on "non-translatability," we fully understand the significance of the opaque nature of meaning and its relationship with the indivisibility of context, but that does not mean "non-translatability" has resulted in the risk of cancelation of translation. On the contrary, it advances our understanding of the nature of translation and has some positive effects in

accomplishing translation tasks. On the one hand, it gives a wake-up call to the casual attitude of free translation. But what is more important is that in the process of Variation in translation, not only the original text is given a new life but also the target language obtains nutrition and becomes richer in its own expression.

3.3 The Cross-Language Variation Between Western Languages and Chinese

A legend about human languages in the Bible tells us the difference in languages is a result of God's wrath: Since we had different languages, the Tower of Babel collapsed. This legend has an underlying meaning: The ideal situation of language is the existence of one common language instead of any Variation. Under such an ideal status, we need not rely on translation anymore, so we can understand each other very well. This common language could provide such efficient work that we should reach where God lives. But this is only imagination. Actually the Bible tells us the reality that innumerable different languages exist in the world. The Variation of languages is absolute. The Bible records the imagination about how the Variation of languages is produced, and it implies the reality—human beings' languages are diverse.

The immense difference between Western languages and Chinese is a typical example that the languages of human beings have diversity. As a member of the Sino-Tibetan language family, Chinese is a typical Oriental language which is different from those Occidental languages such as English, German, and French. The difference is exemplified in many aspects, such as pronunciation, grammar, and calligraphy, which affect their respective cultural construction and the manner of thinking. People have noticed the diverse factors between Western languages and Chinese since a few hundred years ago. Following this direction, we will investigate the foundation of these diverse factors and their influence on culture in the field of translation. In other words, this is a study of Variation in language and its influence in literal translation.

3.3.1 Heterogeneity Between Western Languages and Chinese and Their Equal Status

Chinese is one of the languages with the longest history and its special writing system is the focus of concern. To many Western people, Chinese and its ideographic writing system is a kind of sign of the mysterious Oriental country. In almost all Western languages, there are some sayings about Chinese. For example, when someone talks about the difficulty to do something, he or she will say “这是汉语” (“it is Chinese to me”). Probably the reason is that Westerners realize that Chinese

is far different from Western languages, and it is difficult to learn Chinese. Such sayings reflect that the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western languages is much more than the difference among Western languages.

3.3.1.1 The Language Prejudice in Western Intellectual Community Resulting from Heterogeneity

From the end of the eighteenth century and the beginning of the nineteenth century, some Western linguists had noticed the heterogeneous factors between Chinese and Western languages. The scholars of historical comparative linguistics made a comparison between Chinese and the languages of the Indo-European language family, according to the materials that the missionaries collected in the Orient. It is often believed that Chinese is one of the primeval languages, for most of those scholars could not realize there is no superiority of one over the other between two such kinds of heterogeneous languages out of the limit of time and knowledge. Though this prejudice prevents the researchers from understanding the heterogeneous factors of language, these earliest comparative language studies are full of insights for us to understand the features of Chinese and the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western languages.

With regard to grammar, some Western linguists divide all languages in the world into three types (this is the classification used most frequently at present): isolating language, inflectional language, and agglutinative language. German linguist Franz Bopp is one of the earliest scholars who engaged in this kind of systematic division, and he divides Chinese into the first type of language, while most of the Western languages are inflectional.¹ Chinese has neither etyma nor the ability of construction to form compound words nor grammar. He also thinks the compound words in Chinese are not real ones, for the so-called etyma are juxtapositions of words instead of etyma in the real sense. Therefore, the order of words is the most important method of grammar of Chinese. But most of the Western languages belong to inflectional language with etyma of single syllable, which generates compound words to get their structure and grammar only by this way [45]. The word in this kind of language can be further divided into several individual units of various grammatical functions. And between isolating language and inflectional language, there is agglutinative language.

In the nineteenth century, this classification of languages was widely considered to have sketched a route of linguistic evolution—the isolating language is primitive, the agglutinative language is progressive, and the inflectional language is most advanced. This classification of languages implied ethnic superiority of Western centralism because the so-called most advanced inflectional language only exists in

¹Bopp had not yet named these three types of languages officially. Nevertheless, he had named them as the first type, the second, and the third. On the basis of it, he had appointed the different characters among the different types. He laid the foundation of grammar classification with great influence in the field of linguistics of today.

the Indo-European language family. The obvious problem of this classification is that Chinese is often used as an example of the most primitive languages. In fact, Chinese is not a language used by primitive people. Moreover, Bopp's statement that Chinese has neither structure nor grammar is not correct either. He took Western languages' grammar as the criteria to reach that conclusion, which reflects that parochialism of his perspective—force the Western grammatical rules on the Chinese! British linguist M. A. K. Halliday pointed out, "The insistence on the absence of strict formal grammatical categories in Chinese, and thus on the wide gulf separating Chinese from European languages, was itself made inevitable in the first place by the approach of many of the writers of early textbooks on Chinese, who had tried to mould the Chinese verb into a tense-system based on or taken directly from that of Latin. This type of classification of Chinese forms without regard to their function in Chinese grammar still survives in modern works." [46] Different from those historical and comparative linguists of the nineteenth century, some linguists of the twentieth century such as Frei and Halliday have less Western centralism and a higher level of Chinese, so they point out that it is dangerous to apply the other languages' grammatical categories to Chinese. In this sense, linguists like Halliday pay more respect to different routes of the development of language and the laws of the heterogeneity.

In addition to the heterogeneity of grammar, the difference of the voice between Chinese and Western languages is also very clear—there are tones in Chinese, while Western languages are not tonal languages. Chinese is not the only language in the world that has tones, for the study shows that in Africa, Southeast Asia, Mexico in South America, and other places, there are still other tonal languages. Because most of tonal languages exist in the so-called uncivilized areas in the Western view, while Western languages are not tonal, some Western linguists think only the primitive languages are tonal; the direction of progress of human languages is the language without tone. In fact, the evolution of language is not one-way; the process of the interaction of different languages that affects each is very complex. Therefore, it is ridiculous to make tone the benchmark to judge the superiority of one language over the other.

In addition, between Western languages and Chinese, the factor of heterogeneity in script is also a popular concern. Since Western languages are phonological, many Western linguists believe that the sound is the symbol to express the thinking, and phonological script records the sound symbols. German historical comparative linguist Wilhelm von Humboldt once said, "The sounded word is like the incarnation of thought, but the script is like the embodiment of the sound. The most common role played by the word is that it firmly attached to the sound in the language as if it is a stable shelter in the memory, so that people are likely to form a completely different way of thinking in this language" [45]. Humboldt held that the text should only be firmly attached in the language as "the embodiment of sounds," rather than a direct expression of ideas and concepts. Only in this way can ideas be independent of language and script and a kind of completely different thinking about the language may be formed. Records of Western languages are only phonetic and not expressive. That makes the script completely independent of ideas and become a tool to express ideas.

While Humboldt was one of the few nineteenth-century linguists who had less bias in linguistic study in the West, he still thought that “very few people would deny that a phonetic system is superior to other types of text” [47]. With image as the upper hand, ideographic text will damage the expression of concept in the world. Humboldt has a point in his understanding on one side, but his evaluation of the merits of phonetic and ideographic languages is not necessarily correct. In the West in the nineteenth century, many historical linguists took phonograph as a starting point and held the view that a phonetic system that only records voice is the most perfect, and there are flaws in ideographic languages such as Chinese, and therefore, its development is behind that of phonography.

The view of Chinese as an underdeveloped language was very popular in the nineteenth century. German philosopher Hegel even thought that compared with Western languages, Chinese was not perfect, not suitable for the language of philosophical reflection, “It is to the advantage of a language when it possesses a wealth of logical expressions, that is, distinctive expressions specifically set aside for thought determinations...In this the Chinese language has apparently not advanced that far culturally, or at least not far enough” [48]. The bias held by Western scholars is obvious. Back in the nineteenth century, it was quite natural for Western scholars to have a linear understanding towards the Oriental languages which are distinct from them, and many scholars obtained knowledge of the Chinese language from indirect accounts. Moreover, they were very confident that their own languages are highly developed. While Westerners have long been aware of the factors of heterogeneity between languages, because of the limitations of the concept of Western-centrism, they did not realize that Chinese is far different from Western languages, but their status is equal.

3.3.1.2 The Equal Status of Chinese and Western Languages

In the nineteenth century, with China as the representative of the East as the focus of conquest, either in political and economic fields or in ideological and cultural fields, it was very difficult for Westerners to establish such a concept of equality between China and the West. Some Westerners believed that China is a very backward country, a savage land which should be “civilized” by the Western “civilization,” while others, then with the adventures of this distant vision, collected the different customs of the ancient Oriental civilization to satisfy their curiosity. In their perception, the “differences” of China, compared with the West, should be the evidence of leadership of Western knowledge systems in all aspects. Hegel’s prejudices are an embodiment of this bias in the understanding of different language systems. It was very difficult for people to recognize that the status of various languages is equal in the nineteenth-century Europe. Nevertheless, there were very few linguists, who paid attention to gathering a variety of language materials and whose understanding of Chinese is very deep. Therefore, they are able to hold a more inclusive vision that many features of Chinese are different from those of

Western languages. Therefore, they are often able to break free of the shackles of Western-centrism, gaining a deeper understanding of Chinese language.

For nineteenth-century linguists, it was not easy to penetrate the barriers of the general concept of the West in that era, tolerate the heterogeneity of Chinese, and thus gain access to different and special ideas. The German linguist Humboldt is a special scholar full of a spirit of tolerance. Humboldt's understanding of Chinese language is very complex, and his thought is also filled with all kinds of contradictions as well. For example, we have already mentioned it is questionable that he held the opinion that the phonetic system is better than ideographic languages. However, Humboldt surpasses other linguists in the nineteenth century. His analysis of grammatical structure of Chinese led to the discovery that Chinese is not in the strict sense the Syntax Notation Language; it basically has no grammatical tag. This is the maverick characteristic of Chinese: "The difference between Chinese and the third type of language lies in the purity, regularity, and consistency of its grammatical structure. These advantages will no doubt make it one of the world's most perfect languages. However, the difference between Chinese and these languages also lies in the fact that Chinese is within the scope of the general nature of human languages and consistent in a different linguistic system. Chinese should not be confused with the less-developed languages of the savage tribes, because just as Abel Remusat pointed out, these languages are often filled with too many tags and too many details. Chinese demonstrated a curious phenomenon: just because it has discarded the advantages in all other languages it obtains another kind of advantage. Chinese has given up a lot of things attached to expression, but in doing so it highlights ideological concepts. It owns and skillfully uses a kind of unique art that can tie the concepts directly with one another, making the consistency and opposition of concepts which is unconsciously perceived as in other languages. With the strength of some new spiritual touches and forces, Chinese has the spirit to grasp the pure relationship between concepts." [49]

From these expositions by Humboldt, we can see his recognition of the factors of heterogeneity between Chinese and Western languages. He did not apply the Western grammatical model to measure Chinese; thus he established a unique perspective of understanding Chinese. Instead of viewing the Chinese lack of Western-style syntax of markup languages as a drawback, he thought this is a merit that "does not appear in any other language." This view is the beginning of recognition that there is equality between Chinese and Western languages. Humboldt's ideas had a tremendous impact on the twentieth century.

In the twentieth century, some Western linguists started to correct the relationship of equality between the various languages based on the reflections to the doctrine of centralism of Western languages in the nineteenth century. US linguist Sapir had criticized the view that the standard of Western language is perfect and is the criterion to judge other languages. He explained, "Whatever conformed to the pattern of Sanskrit and Greek and Latin and German was accepted as expressive of the 'highest', whatever departed from it was frowned upon as a shortcoming or was at best an interesting aberration. Now any classification that starts with

preconceived values or that works up to sentimental satisfactions is self-condemned as unscientific” [50]. Sapir’s respect for the characteristics of different languages is based on belief in equality of all languages. He also believes that if we do not remove those stubborn standards of assessment, it is not possible to understand the real “inside story” of the language. In addition, Frei, Halliday, and other scholars also elaborate on the concept of equality of all languages.

Not only Western scholars but Chinese scholars have also expressed concern on the issue of equality between Chinese and other languages. Qian Zhongshu has refuted Hegel’s scorn of Chinese. He said, “Hegel scorned Chinese for not being appropriate for making logic analysis; at the same time he’s praised German by taking the word *Aufheben* as an example to illustrate that a German word may contain two contradictory meanings, which is more advanced than Latin.” From Qian Zhongshu’s view, Hegel’s statement is out of ignorance and complacency, for some Chinese words not only can express contradictory meanings but even contain three meanings or even more at the same time.

Thus, the phenomenon of one word possessing more than one meaning is not unique in Western languages; Chinese also has such a linguistic phenomenon; Chinese is not a language that is inappropriate to be speculative.

After Mr. Qian Zhongshu, another Chinese scholar, Zhang Longxi, further refuted the trajectory of Hegel. In his “Taoism and Logos,” he sharply pointed out, “Language as a sign system is but a system of different and mutually defining terms, and this is true in speaking as well as in writing. Therefore, there is no ground on which the superiority of speech to writing, of the phonetic to the non-phonetic, could be established. The Hegelian prejudice is exposed as philosophically untenable, based on a false conception of the nature of writing, since logos as inner speech is already implicated and traversed by *difference*.” [51] On this basis, Zhang also cited the views of Derrida that further demonstrate deep-rooted prejudice that is hidden in Hegel’s view of language in Western culture, which is what Derrida called logocentrism, “the metaphysical ‘concept’ of phonetic language.” According to Derrida’s view, the view that the Western alphabetic writing is the reproduction of live sounds reflects a logocentric bias, which gives speech more privilege, and under its influence phonetic writing will be more preferred than nonalphabetic writing.

As Zhang Longxi pointed out, “Hegelian bias” reflects the paranoia of Western logocentrism. In the twentieth century, due to the highlights of “differences,” the concept that Western languages are better than Chinese is destined to be challenged. The establishment of the concept of equality of languages is of great significance to the East–West interaction between civilizations. We should understand that to carry out equal dialogue between East and West, the equality of language is the basis, because a dialogue among civilizations with no verbal communication is inconceivable. Specific to the inter-civilization field of translation studies, the establishment of the equality of heterogeneous languages and the abandonment of the argument for superiority or inferiority should be a basic starting point.

3.3.2 Shift Between Western Languages and Chinese in Translation

3.3.2.1 Heterogeneity of Language Is a Basic Starting Point of Translation

A variety of translations are based on linguistic heterogeneity. Imagine if there is no heterogeneity of language around, the world shares the same language, namely, the return to the state of unity before the collapse of the Tower of Babel, there is no reason for the existence of translation. British linguist George Steiner once said, “Translation exists because men speak different languages” [52].

In light of social circumstance, there is the desire between people for some degree of mutual understanding. This desire exists not only among people using the same kind of language but among people of different languages. However, there was the language barrier between those who understand the activities are difficult, so the desire for understanding has become in different languages the driving force of translation activities. Some translators even believe that translation leads to understanding. As to whether humankind is able to translate between different languages to reach mutual understanding, since ancient times, there are two different attitudes. One is that mutual understanding can be achieved through an interpreter. This perspective is held by scholars engaged in specific translation. The other is that translation itself is a kind of suspicious behavior, the text cannot be translated, and therefore, it is impossible to rely on interpreters to reach understanding. These two understandings towards the nature of translation are derived from different psychological mechanisms, social and historical roots, etc., but if we think deeply we will find that the above two diametrically opposite attitudes towards translation are closely related to how people understand heterogeneity.

Those who believe that understanding could be reached through an interpreter usually recognize the heterogeneity between languages, but they believe that translation can cut across these heterogeneous factors in order to achieve mutual understanding. Those who believe that translation cannot be achieved through mutual understanding of the language exaggerate the heterogeneity of different languages. Italian esthetician Croce is one representative of this view. He believed that language arises out of instinct. Generally speaking, every word we say is without precedent and is created on the spot, because it is the use, development, and change of potential thoughts and emotions. So, strictly speaking, there is no word that can be repeated, because time is passing, while translation is only the secondhand or thirdhand information, which aggravates the unrepeatability of language. Thus, we can see that the difference has been amplified to its extreme in Croce’s statement. He not only exaggerated the differences between different languages but even held that every sentence is created on the spot and there is no precedent. He stressed that the meaning of language was “on the spot,” that is, a word with a specific context, therefore, cannot be replicated. This view indicates that the difference between

discourses is absolute and nature-oriented. Therefore, Croce denied that people can rely on interpreters to achieve possible mutual understanding.

We believe that between different languages there are surely some differences which determine the heterogeneity of a specific language. This is the departure point in the activities of translation. But Croce and other scholars exaggerated heterogeneity of languages and adhered to a negative attitude on the issue whether languages can be translated. There is a mystical tendency towards language, and he had doubts to whether we can understand human language. Croce's point of view is not so much a view of insisting on the uniqueness and heterogeneity of discourse and there is absolute heterogeneity, as it insists on artistic originality. When we refer to words, we must not forget that he speaks in terms of aesthetics. If we fully accept Croce's point of view, we would enlarge the factors of heterogeneity and challenge the importance of translation in the activities of understanding and thus turn a blind eye to human achievements in the field of translation in the past thousands of years. What is even more serious is that it will cut off the bridge between heterogeneous languages which would make mutual knowledge, mutual verification, and mutual complement among heterogeneous civilization impossible.

Therefore, understanding the correct treatment of the heterogeneity of language is crucial for us to recognize the activities of "translation—understanding." Indeed, the heterogeneity of linguistic phenomena can be found everywhere. Take Chinese and English, for example; the Chinese word "她" and the English word "she" on the surface seem to be the concepts of pairs. But once we recognize that in English there is another word "her," such equality disappears, for both words "she" or "her" in English cannot be found in Chinese. If these two sets of words are placed in the different cultural backgrounds of China and the West, for example, the meaning of "她" embodied in the context of modern Chinese and the meaning of "she" or "her" embodied in the Western context, the differences between these two words can be further expanded, which needs to be fully explained. This is just a very simple example about the complexity of the heterogeneity of two languages. In the translation, we can pursue "reciprocity," but the complete "reciprocity" of the translation does not exist, which is determined by the heterogeneity of the language. We also should recognize that although the heterogeneity of languages is ubiquitous, it is entirely possible to achieve understanding between heterogeneous language and mutual knowledge, mutual verification, and complement among heterogeneous civilizations.

3.3.2.2 The Crossing of Heterogeneity Between Chinese and Western Languages

The theory and practice of translation has proved that the nature of translation is to find commonality between heterogeneous languages for the realization of the versions and conversions across heterogeneous languages based on commonality. However, there are many scholars, especially some Western scholars, pessimistic to whether the successful translation can be achieved between the Chinese and

Western languages. They believe that if two languages or two cultures involved have common origins, translations can be acceptable. If it involves two languages far away from each other, the translation between them is completely unreliable.

This concern of Western scholars has some truth, but it also has its limitations. We believe that the possibility of complete translation is almost zero due to the existence of heterogeneity among different languages, even between the two languages of common cultural roots. This world is full of differences that exist everywhere, but we can still look for deeper things in common to find the common ground of human spiritual life and use it as the basis for establishing communication channels. The underlying structure of language is ubiquitous and common. All human languages differ mainly on the surface. Translation is possible, because every language contains in itself genetic, historical, and social aspects of the prevailing, deep, and ingrained things. Regardless of how strange the appearance of a language could be, there are always some common things at work. Through the appearance of two different languages, the purpose of the translation is to give the common things at the bottom full play.

In human history, translation and communication between heterogeneous languages have been ongoing for thousands of years. They have been proved to be entirely feasible and achieved many significant results. It is clearly very difficult to conduct translation between Chinese and Western languages. The largest and the most difficult points of concern are the two main aspects. The first is to overcome the heterogeneity of languages; the second is to overcome the heterogeneity of cultures. In a specific operation, to overcome the barriers of cultural heterogeneity is clearly more complex than simply to overcome the heterogeneity of language.

First of all, the goal is to cross the barrier of heterogeneity between Chinese and Western languages.

Translation activities in China have a long history, known as the “Xiang Ji” (crossing five directions) or “Tong Shi” (bridge issues) in ancient times. “Records of King” in *The Book of Rites* reads, “The East is called Ji, the South is called Xiang, the West is called Di, the North is called Yi.” *Origin of Chinese Characters* (Shuo Wen Jie Zi) explains “translation” as “speaking different dialects of various places.” Fa Yun, a monk in Song Dynasty, compiled *The Translation of the Names* and held the view that the translation of words is the interchange of words, using an old word to explain a different new word. *The Meaning of Words* written by Jia Gong Yan in Tang Dynasty also points out that translation is to change a foreign language to make it understandable. Obviously, the ancient Chinese were aware of the nature of translation activities, the ultimate goal of which was to make people understand and communicate with each other. Therefore, the most important issue in the translation between Chinese and Western languages is to cross the barriers of heterogeneity to successful implementation of exchange.

However, due to the very complex issue of linguistic heterogeneity between Chinese and Western languages, to achieve the right balance between the linguistic heterogeneity across the barrier is no easy task. Especially in the translation of classical works, the language barrier is more prominent, because the translations of classical works not only involve how to use the target language to translate the

original text but also are related to how the translator understands the text. The process of translation within Chinese, that is, from ancient Chinese to modern Chinese, is very important too. George Steiner, an English translator, holds that the process of interlingual translation is an indispensable precondition, the purpose of which is, from a diachronic and synchronic point of view, to restore the context of the author's "personal vocabulary." This process involves the exploration of etymology, "to explore the history of accumulation of the meaning of words beneath the surface" [53]. Every language is a temporal phenomenon. The use of a word is equivalent to opening its entire history, so we must carefully try to speculate on the "historical flow" of the semantics by frequently using various tools of books and reference materials. Ma Jianzhong, the famous Chinese linguist and translation scholar, also believes that during translation, the translator should repeatedly try to figure out the original meaning, "With a book at hand, the translator needs to read the original text repeatedly, locate the exact intention, depict the manner, and imitate the tone of voice. With a full understanding of the original text then the translator can start to translate the original texts into the new linguistic form with full fitness and color, thus benefiting the readers with no difference from the original text." [54] For example, when we do not understand the concept of "Feng Gu" in *Wen Xin Diao Long*, especially the timing and historical context of it, and simply translate it into "wind and bone," it should be regarded as a translation failure.

To sum up, in order to cross the heterogeneity of Chinese and Western languages, the first thing involved is the translators' understanding of the original language. In addition, there are a lot of other barriers between heterogeneous languages, such as how to translate a concept that can only be found in the source language, how to translate the author's unique style into the target language, etc. In the history of modern Chinese translation, these issues are particularly prominent. "Democracy" and "science"—these two words in Chinese have no equivalent vocabulary. In the process of translation, Chen Duxiu translated the two words as "De Xiansheng" (Mr. Democracy) and "Sai Xiansheng" (Mr. Science), with "De" and "Sai" as the translation of the sound of the beginning of the two words while "Xiansheng" (Mr.) as a teacher of Chinese revolution. This translation is witty, but too lively to narrow its sense; therefore, it was not easily widely accepted, thus not suitable for the general use of two concepts. "Min Zhu" and "Ke Xue" were borrowed from Japanese for "democracy" and "science" which became widely accepted translations.

Mr. Ma Jianzhong put special emphasis on the comparison of etymology and delicate distinction of the words of two languages. Only in this way can we provide a translation with higher quality. In the process of translating *Don Quixote*, Yang Jiang relied on a large number of references in French and English; therefore, some of the meanings expressed by the Spanish proverb are not accurately translated. For example, in describing Dursi Neja, the original Spanish used is "tiene pelo en pecho," literally translated as "long hair on the chest," which was adopted by Yang Jiang. However, "pelo en pecho" is slang in Spanish meaning "have the guts," different from the literal translation. Though Dursi Neja is courageous like men, the translation that she has "long hair on the chest" is not in line with women's physical characteristics. I consulted Spanish scholars many times on this issue, and they

confirmed that in this context, “pelo en pecho” cannot be translated into “long hair on the chest.” Thus, it is very important to examine the etymology and delicate difference of words of two languages.

In the actual process of translation, the difficulties we encounter are far from the simple barriers of heterogeneity in the linguistic level; there are many difficulties embodied in the cultural heterogeneity.

Secondly, the translation between Western languages and Chinese also involves the crossing of the heterogeneous elements in culture. The process of translation is not only a process of cross-language communication but also a collision of different cultures. Language is the carrier of culture, one with an unbreakable connection with the culture. It is a difficult issue to achieve communication and understanding between Chinese culture and Western culture because people usually hold the view that there is a huge difference between Chinese and Western cultures and it is almost impossible to achieve genuine communication and understanding. In fact, since the twentieth century, in the highlight and understanding of intellectuals towards “heterogeneity,” the concept of “equality of differences” has become popular, which has created dilemmas for translation—if we pay no attention to the existence of “heterogeneity” in the process of translations, the translated text would lose the original characteristics of the source language and culture; and if we overemphasize the factors of “heterogeneity,” it will inevitably result in difficulties in understanding the text. Therefore, it becomes particularly important to find a balance between “heterogeneity” and “identity” in two kinds of languages and cultures.

In the cross-language translations of Western languages and Chinese, how to deal with cultural differences embodied in two kinds of languages has always been the focus of attention for translators and theorists. In the study of Lin Shu’s (Chinese translator in the late Qing Dynasty) translation of the Western works, we find that the reason why his translation at the time was sought after by the general public lies largely in the process of translation to erase the differences between the two cultures. He engaged in translation in a manner acceptable for the general public in the context of Chinese. Lin Shu translated *The Merchant of Venice* as *A Pound of Flesh*, *David Copperfield* as *The Life of a Deserted Baby*, and *La Traviata* as *Affairs of La Traviata in Paris*, showing that he was taking into full account the feelings of Chinese readers. Most Western novels and dramas are generally titled with characters’ names and fully reflect the humanistic spirit, while the Chinese novels usually are named after the event, which reflects the focus on plot. Taking into account these cultural differences, Lin Shu selected ways of naming that Chinese readers are familiar with in Chinese culture. It is not only on the issue of the titles of a novel or drama but also in many details Lin Shu has translated in a way that Chinese readers are accustomed to dealing with, so his translation to some extent covered up the cultural “heterogeneity.”

In addition, Lu Xun’s judgment on how “Milky Way” should be translated, as “Galaxy” or “the Milky Way,” in fact involves the problem of how to seek the point of equilibrium to maintain the balance between “heterogeneity” and “identity,” among different languages and cultures. The translation of “Galaxy” actually puts more emphasis on the “identity” of cultures and pays more attention to the

understanding and acceptance of Chinese readers. Upholding to the translation as “Milky Way,” actually puts more emphasis on “heterogeneity” of cultures. At this point, a dilemma has been fully demonstrated in front of us. If we translate “Milky Way” as “Galaxy,” this can eliminate the difficulties for readers to understand but is bound to damage some of the original cultural information; if it is translated as “the Way of Milk,” it could be more faithful to the original so that readers can perceive the original culture embodied, but it is bound to cause the reader to encounter difficulties of understanding.

Therefore, the cultural differences between Chinese and Western languages pose a very complex issue. Therefore, translators have to consider the reader’s acceptance of the problem, taking into account how to convey cultural information to maintain the original features and must find a balance between the “heterogeneity” and “identity” so that the translation is ideal. The ideal translation may not exist in reality, but we must move in this direction.

In the field of translation studies, it is very important to have the concept that Chinese and Western languages are heterogeneous but equal languages. “Heterogeneity” is the starting point of the translation. At the same time, the concept of equality of languages is the basic attitude that should be taken. Chinese and Western languages are equal. There is not such a fact that one language is inferior to another. Only with this belief can we respect the heterogeneity in the translations of Chinese and Western languages and do the translation of different texts from different cultures.

3.4 The Variation Theory in Translation: Medio-translatology

3.4.1 Translation Study and Variation in Cross-Language Context

Due to the differences in language, culture, time, and space, it is unavoidable for translating as the way of communication between languages and cultures to have distortion and Variation. Therefore, compared with the source text, the translated text is doomed to have some variations not only in the form of language but also in the context. It is these variations that reflect the creativities in literature translation. The variations have not only challenged the traditional translation theories but also provided direct evidence for the construction of Translingual Variation Theory. So it is significantly valuable for people to study Variation in translated literature and particularly valuable to find out the deep reasons behind it.

It is not unusual to find Variation in both ancient and modern times in the history of translation in Chinese and Western literature. Undoubtedly, the traditional study limited on the linguistic level cannot give a reasonable explanation to it. The study of the Variation of literature, a new approach to Comparative Literature, is

a branch which studies specifically the Variation of literature, theory, and criticism in heterogeneous cultural transmission. Within the scope of literary Variation, the study of linguistic Variation refers mainly to the process in which literary phenomena are accepted in target language through translation beyond the boundary of language. That is to say, it is a field in the study of translation of Comparative Literature. What it is concerned with is how the variations are reflected by the translation in literary communication and what the variations represent. The study of literary Variation, as a new theoretical model, aims at discovering “how the literary variations happen and the inner regulations behind them” [55].

Postmodern literary theories have provided evidence for the study of linguistic Variation and furthermore discovered the social, political, and cultural connotations of it. Enlightened by them, the study of translation shifted their focus from “faith” in language itself to variations in translation and began to study the deep reasons behind variations, which is regarded as a turning point in the field.

Actually, translation is a process of interpreting. Modern hermeneutics introduced the factor of time and history into the textual translation, attaching more importance to the influence of times and cultural tradition on the interpretation of the text. Hans-Georg Gadamer put forward “subjective prejudice” which indicates that understanding is a communicating process between the interpreter and the interpreted, that the sense of a text is achieved only after the overlapping of “visual field” of the reader and the text in the communication, and that instead of being static and objective, the meaning of a text is dynamic and subjective. Based on this, problems like “it is impossible to make the translated text and the source text equivalent to each other,” which puzzle the traditional study of translation, can easily be solved here.

If we say modern hermeneutics has solved the problem of “equivalence” in traditional study of translation, we may safely believe that deconstruction has overthrown the principle of “faith.” With dispelling as its major characteristic, deconstruction upset the conception of construction and sense in structuralism. It is believed that there is no changeless meaning of a text and those different interpretations and various versions can be made by the reader and the interpreter. Venuti pointed out in the preface of his book *Rethinking Translation*, “The translation cannot always show its ‘faith’ to the original text and more or less has ‘free’ exertion. With addition or omission, it always is uncertain” [56]. The relation between the translation and the original text explained by Venuti opens a new window for us to find out the reason for linguistic Variation. The deconstructionist claim of “the death of the author” indicates that the reader is endowed with more rights of interpretation than ever before and the interpreter gets the power to construct the meaning of the original text. Therefore, literary Variation not only gets a reasonable explanation but also gradually becomes one of the most important aspects of translation study.

Moreover, “the theory of power” and postmodern feminism inspired us to carry out the study of linguistic Variation. Foucault believed that language represents the power and all power is realized by “discourse.” As a tool of the execution of power and a key to control power, language is indispensable from power. There is “discourse” in all social strata as one branch of the social and cultural activity of course

is under the control and construction of power. At the same time, the translator is inevitably under the influence and within the restraint of power. There must be impact of power in the activities of translation. The postmodern feminists even go further to interfere in the text in the practice of estrangement from the text. They try new words, new spelling, new grammatical structure, new image and metaphor, and some word games to break the restraint of patriarchy and change the traditional view towards women.

With ideology and political-cultural criticism as its foci, postcolonialism breaks the restraint on the text to extend the study with a broader view and a new strategy. It reveals the deeper cultural level behind linguistic Variation—the communication between different cultures and civilization. Therefore, the Variation of translation is the transformation on the linguistic and literary level but also the result of the interaction between ideology, politics, power, and cultural tradition.

To sum up, translation is no longer a simple transformation on a linguistic level. The contact and collision between heterogeneous languages is more complicated than what the traditional theory could offer as the explanation. In the current cultural context, the focus on the reasons behind the linguistic phenomenon is the precondition for the further development of translation studies and Comparative Literature. As an early stage of the translation study, Medio-translatology is a bridge study of the translation of literature from a cultural perspective. Though for the discipline it is not necessary to begin on the basis of this theoretical understanding, it falls into the category of Variation study with its reexamination towards literature from the perspective of Variation and conducts study that is different from the traditional methodology.

3.4.2 Birth of Medio-translatology

As a branch of Comparative Literature, Medio-translatology started in the 1930s, much later than the beginning of Comparative Literature which appeared in the late nineteenth century. It did not assume its important status until the 1950s. Recently, as an independent research field, Medio-translatology attracted more and more attention and won extensive recognition. However, it is not by accident for Medio-translatology to come forth and develop so fast. Instead, it has its historical origin—not only the cultural accumulation contributed by “school of art” lasting for hundreds of years in the history of translation studies at home and abroad but also the theoretical resources coming from cultural turning in the international translation study within the past several decades.

Translation is one of the bases of Comparative Literature. So it is not surprising that the researchers of comparative literature attach so much importance to translation study. Since its birth in Europe, Comparative Literature has concentrated on the study of communication and relations of literature between peoples and nations. But one precondition for such study is to remove the language barrier. Undoubtedly, translation plays the most important role in it. In recent years, translation has become more and more important in Comparative Literature and even in other

social sciences. Some people suggested that the relationship between translation study and Comparative Literature should be reconsidered and assumed that translation study should not be a branch of Comparative Literature anymore; contrarily, Comparative Literature should be recognized as a discipline of translation study. The reason for that is translation study, as an intercultural discipline, covers many more fields than Comparative Literature does [57]. This statement is of course exaggerated, but the change of translation study's status in Comparative Literature reflects a trend that the focus of Comparative Literature is turning from a study of literature to a study of culture.

Medio-translatology, in a broad sense, can be defined as an intercultural study on translation, particularly on literary translation. "Initially, Medio-translatology was a study on translation (particularly literary translation) and translated literature from the aspect of Mesologie, but now from the aspect of cultural comparison. Strictly speaking, Medio-translatology is a study of literature and culture instead of a study of language, because its concern is the loss, distortion, addition, and extension of the original information in language transmission instead of the transformation between foreign and native languages, and it is concerned with what is the unique value and significance of translation (literary translation) as an activity in intercultural communication." [58]

Medio-translatology is a great challenge for the limitation of Comparative Literature as well as the traditional base of Comparative Literature as a discipline. Susan Bassnett, a British expert of Comparative Literature and researcher of translation, pointed out in her *Comparative Literature* that "Cross-cultural work in women's studies, in post-colonial theory, in cultural studies has changed the face of literary studies generally. We should look upon translation studies as the principal discipline from now on, with Comparative Literature as a valued but subsidiary subject area" [59]. Although Bassnett's claim seems too exaggerated, it is true that translation study is becoming more and more important because of its cultural characteristics.

3.4.3 Difference Between Medio-translatological Study and the Traditional Study of Translation

Medio-translatology is a new term that researchers are gradually familiar with from the late 1970s when there was a rise of Comparative Literature in mainland China. Therefore, many people confused it with the traditional study of translation. Actually, in some aspects there are crucial basic differences between the research conducted by the comparatists and that of the traditional study of translation.

Generally speaking, there are three domains in the traditional study of translation. The first domain is concerned with the skills and arts of translation, focusing on understanding and expression; the second domain concerns the theoretical study, combining the theories of modern linguistics, semantics, etc., to explain the phenomena of translation from the perspective of the difference of nation, language, and culture or to propose theories to provide guidance to the practice of

translation; the third domain is the study of the history of translation. In a word, the traditional studies of translation mainly focus on the linguistic phenomenon.

On the other hand, the study of translation from the perspective of Comparative Literature, that is, Medio-translatology, includes three aspects: the translation of literature, the translated texts, and the theories of translation. For its concern is with the media in communication between two cultures, it is called Medio-translatology or the study of the media of translation. The nature of this discipline is the study of literature or culture instead of focusing on specific expressions of individual words or phrases or judging the quality of the translation. Therefore, there is no judge of the value or the quality of translation. Instead, it studies the translation from a broader perspective. It holds that the writing of literature itself is a kind of translation—the writers' "translation" towards the reality, the life, and the nature. Once published, the book is in the process of "translation" by the reader—the understanding, acceptance, and interpretation. Therefore, the translation of foreign literature is not only the transformation between two languages but also the translator's translation (understanding, acceptance, and interpretation) towards people, society, and nature that is reflected in the book. In this sense, the study of translation is a study from a cultural perspective.

Specifically, there are the following differences between the traditional study towards translation and the Medio-translatological study towards translation. First, the perspectives are different. Comparatists usually put the object (translator, translated word, and the act of translation) of their study within the scope of two or more cultures to study how these countries and cultures communicate with each other.

Secondly, the focus of the research is different. The traditional study focuses on the translation of texts or the theoretical study, while the comparatists focus on the parameters of the interaction between different cultures such as understanding and intermingling, misunderstanding and repelling, and the distortion and transformation out of misunderstanding. Comparatists seldom focus on the judgment of value of translated texts as done by the traditional study. Finally, the basic difference lies in the objective of research. The objective of the traditional study is to summarize and provide guidance for practices of translation, while comparatists treat translation as a literary phenomenon, who accept every translated text as a literary truth, on the basis of which to conduct further study of communication, influence, acceptance, and spread of literature.

3.4.4 The Core of Medio-translatological Study: Creative Treason

As one of the major subjects of Medio-translatology, the study of creative treason is significant because it concentrates on the issues of blockage, collision, misunderstanding, and distortion which occur in the communication between different cultures. In literary translation where a work is introduced to a new linguistic environment, a series of distortions occur, such as expungement, accession, and free translation.

The most essential characteristic of creative treason is that it introduces the original to an unexpected environment of acceptance and changes its form endowed by the author. Without creative treason, there is no possibility for literature to be transmitted and accepted. Beyond the category of literary acceptance, creative treason reflects the communication, collision, misunderstanding, and distorted interpretation between cultures.

Medio-translatology holds that there is a key difference between literary translation and other translations. The language used by literary translation is a language of art with aesthetic function, which can reproduce the artistic world and artistic image created by the author. Moreover, compared with other forms of art, literature is the only one within the scope of language. That is to say, historical and cultural accumulation in specific language and prolific associations triggered by a specific word endows the language with its specific visualization and vitality. Therefore, when a literary work is transplanted from one language to another one, to achieve the same artistic effect as the original, the interpreter has to find the linguistic forms which enable the recipients to have the same or similar imagination. It actually requires the translated works to be the artistic works as the original ones. In this sense, literary translation occupies the same position as the production of literature. In other words, literary translation does not simply mean the conversion of words between different languages. It is a creative work. Obviously, the creativity of literary translation guarantees a literary work is reborn in a new world of different language, people, society, and history. Compared with the creativity of the original, that of the translated is a re-creation.

On the one hand, the creativity in literary translation is within the creative efforts made by the interpreters to approach or reproduce the original. On the other hand, creative treason in literary translation reflects deviation of the original. In the process of translation, creativity and deviation are inseparable. Usually, it is believed that translators are the only contributors to creative treason, and the traditional study of translation holds the view that the research should concentrate on the translator. Actually, besides the translators, readers and the accepting environment also contribute much to it. Thus, all three factors are the objects of Medio-translatology.

In Medio-translatology, there are in total four types of creative treason: (1) individualized translation, (2) mistranslation and leaking translation, (3) partial translation and compilation, and (4) indirect translation and adaptation. One major feature of the individualized translation is naturalization which seems to express the same idea in natural and fluent target language but actually swallows up the original culture; Tian Yan Lun, translated by Yan Fu, is a good example. Dissimilation is another characteristic of the individualized translation, which represents the surrender of the target culture to the original culture. For instance, Ezra Pound, an American poet, deliberately ignored English grammatical rules when he translated Chinese ancient poems. In Medio-translatology, mistranslation is regarded as a more special creative treason because it reflects the unique trend when an individual (translator) or a group (a nation) receives and interprets a foreign culture. Mistranslation represents the translator's misunderstanding and misinterpretation of

another culture. As a block in cultural or literary communication, it typically reflects the collision, transmutation, and distortion between cultures. Both partial translation and compilation are creative treason. There are many reasons for them: to be in accordance with the customs and habits of the target country, to meet the interest of the reader, to promote transmission, or to consider moral and political requirements. The common feature of indirect translation and adaptation is to reshape the original. It is unavoidable for the translator to put in his/her own understanding and interpretation, even his/her own language style, life experience, and personality, in this type of literary translation. Therefore, it is not hard to understand reshaping in the process of translating foreign literary works. In detail, indirect translation reflects the subjective selection and the trend of acceptance of the target country, while adaptation only betrays the original in the aspects of forms and types of literature.

It is the intercultural and translanguing characteristics of translation that make the original unexpectedly distorted, and then the original text enters a new language and cultural environment after the language transformation. The recipients in literary translation include both the translators and the readers. But the role of readers in literary translation is hardly recognized. Since a reader's translation is based on a translator's works, it must be more creative and full of treason. In addition, a reader's understanding and thoughts on certain social phenomena and moral issues will influence his/her "translation" as well. The reader's treason not only comes from some subjective aspects, such as his/her view towards the world, literary concepts, and personal experience, but also comes from the objective environment—different historical environments often have effects on the way in which a reader accepts the literary works. The spread of Han Shan's poems in America is a typical example.

3.4.5 Transmission of Cultural Images and Mistranslation

In addition, loss and distortion of the original's cultural information in language transmission is another important subject studied by Medio-translatology researchers. Due to the ignorance of cultural image, the transmission of the content, artistic conception, and figures created by the original will be affected sometimes in literary translation. Generally speaking, cultural image is the combination of a nation's wisdom and its history and culture of which a major part is closely related with its legend and totem. Medio-translatology researchers believe that misunderstanding and misinterpretation of cultural image are mainly connected to the differences in geographical environment, customs, and cultural traditions between nations. Among these factors, cultural traditions are the major ones.

In fact, to point out the loss and distortion of cultural image in translation means to generalize such kinds of literary phenomena with the term "cultural image" and to concentrate on the study of cultural image's transmission in literary translation. Chinese experts mainly discussed this issue from the following three aspects: (1) to discuss it as a skill of translation, (2) to discuss the translation of the vocabulary of image in terms of psychological linguistics, and (3) to study the understanding and

expression of some cultural concepts, literary quotations, and proverbs in terms of cultural comparison. Some foreign researchers also discussed this issue. For example, Gyorgy Rado, a Hungarian translator, put forward the concept “LOGEME” referring to the component which must be decomposed from the original and recur in translated works [60]. Actually, it is what we called the cultural connotation of the cultural image. Jilek, a Czech translation theorist, emphasized the close relationship between image and specific language and believed image has entered a complicated system composed of specific literature and aesthetic traditions.

Basically, the transmission of cultural image is how to deal with the relationship between the form and content of the original text in translation. This problem, for a long time, has puzzled translators. Content instead of the form has much importance. Consequently, loss, distortion, and the addition of cultural image in transmission result in misinterpretation which includes unintended misinterpretation and intended misinterpretation. Unintended misinterpretation is not only related with neglect or language ability but also closely connected to the cultural difference between the original and the target. It is well known that language is the carrier of culture. So unavoidably any language has its cultural marking and translation as an activity to interpret another language must be a cultural phenomenon instead of a linguistic one. As to intended misinterpretation, it is more significant and valuable for Comparative Literature because intended misinterpretation means an opposed relation between the original culture and the target culture. So the translator has to make a choice: either he or she changes the language form, cultural image, and artistic conception of the original to cater to his or her cultural mentality, or he or she deliberately ignores his or her culture’s aesthetic taste and employs some unequal language means in translation to import the foreign culture. However, whether unintended or intended, misinterpretation is doomed to lose or distort the information of the original.

3.4.6 Medio-translatology and Literary Variation Theory

What Medio-translatology and literature Variation study focus on is not the homogeneity but the heterogeneity. Language Variation is not new. Particularly, Variation in translated works is a glaring fact. Translation study within the scope of literature Variation, so-called translingual Variation study, has stepped from the traditional descriptive study to cultural study of Comparative Literature. It is supposed to exceed the traditional study model and break through the limitation of the study at the language level. It aims at giving more reasonable explanation to Variation through the discussion on its broad cultural background. As one branch of Comparative Literature, Medio-translatology represents such a research trend. What Medio-translatology is concerned with is loss, distortion, addition, and extension of information in language transmission. In other words, Medio-translatology is not linguistic study but a literary study or cultural study.

As one major part of Comparative Literature, Medio-translatology is a relatively independent research field and has gained more and more outstanding achievements under the guidance of cultural study. The culture-oriented study of translation in the recent three or four decades has provided it with abundant theoretical resources and directly promoted its booming development in the field at home and abroad. Medio-translatology focuses particularly on the *deformation* of the text in the process of translation. This kind of distortion is not only the change of the language form but also the Variation of literary content. In-depth research on creative treason enables Medio-translatology to go beyond the tradition of influence study and go forward to comparative cultural studies. The loss, addition, and distortion of information in language transferring is another important subject studied by Medio-translatology researchers. Through the employment of the term *cultural image* generalizing all literary phenomena depicted with images and with the comprehensive study on mis-interpretation, Medio-translatology researchers aim at finding certain relations between language variations and heterogeneous cultures/civilizations. As a literature translation study based on the research of cultural differences, Medio-translatology is significantly important for the development of Comparative Literature because it has initiated a new field of vision and a new approach. In fact, unconsciously it becomes a study of literature variations, and its research achievements have constructed the rudiment for translingual Variation study.

Although Medio-translatology has started the discussion on cultural comparison, there are still some problems to be resolved. How do variations come into being in the process of translation? Why are there differences in the same literary category between unrelated literary works? And what are the intrinsic rules or regulations behind variations? The current study on the language variations is far from enough. Anyway, Medio-translatology has surveyed translation study from the cultural perspective, opened a new window for the translation study, and furthermore laid a solid foundation for the translingual Variation study. In a modern cultural framework, the theoretical study on translingual variations is not only significant for the reconstruction of Comparative Literature's theoretical system but also for the prosperity and development of world literature.

3.5 Case Study on Cross-Language Variation Among European Languages

Comparative Literature has stepped into a research period of cross-civilization. "Crossing" has become one of the disciplinary features which have received more attention by Comparative Literature scholars in the world, especially by scholars in China. Literary Variation study is a combination of the study of literary crossing and the study of literary aesthetics. Literary Variation study is a research which studies not only literary homogeneity but also literary Variation from dimensions of language, image, text, culture, etc., and then further explores the inner rules of literary Variation. The study of Variation in the aspect of literary language refers to a literary

phenomenon accepted by target language context when breaking through the linguistic limits with the help of translation. In other words, cross-language Variation is a subbranch in the domain of literary Variation. This study concentrates on the approaches to literary Variation through translation and the problems which literary Variation presents [61].

As a matter of fact, Comparative Literature has been in close association with translation studies since Comparative Literature came into being. The main objective of Comparative Literature is literary communication and establishing relations between different countries and different nations. Literary works in one country or nation will be accepted or affect another country or nation only if linguistic barriers have been eliminated. Due to that reason, the function of translation cannot be substituted. In 1931, French comparatist Paul Van Tieghem discussed the translated texts and translators in *La Littérature Comparée*, which opened the door for discussion on translation in the field of Comparative Literature. However, he concentrated on the integrity and accuracy of translated text compared with the original text, paying more attention to the verisimilitude of the main idea and the style of the translated text compared with the original text [62]. Paul Van Tieghem advocated that a translated text should be studied by exemplification or practical application and translators' prefaces should receive more attention. Besides, translators' background such as biography, literary life, and social status should receive more attention in order to evaluate translators' role of intermediary. Translation study is regarded as one of the branches of the field of Comparative Literature, which is known as mediology or medium study. Mediology, as a category of influence study, "mainly studies the methods, approaches and the rules of interaction between literatures of different countries." "Mediology, the same as the study of Doxologie, Crenologie, requires careful research and differentiation, deep and comprehensive exploration in order to draw conclusions and insights which are convincing and related to the facts" [63]. However, translation is different from other common media. As an intercommunication activity between different languages and cultures, translation will inevitably change the messages conveyed due to the difference. British scholar Theo Hermans in *Representation of Translation* questions the idea of translation as equivalence or transparency from a cultural perspective. He claims that translation involves not just a source text and the translator will not "only" make the translation. Translation cannot be transparent with regard to the original and must be a hybrid with added value. In translation history, a large number of dual texts as well as countless retranslations and re-workings of existing translations provide us with the firsthand evidence of the working of self-definition which is constructed by culture [64]. In Western translation history, the most typical case which represents crosslinguistic Variation is the various versions of the Bible. In 3 BC the *Septuagint* was translated by Greek Jews. That version was always the classic version for six centuries after 3 BC, and it has been the foundation of theological and exegetical thoughts. It replaced the Hebrew version and became the source of the Latin version which was used popularly by Roman Christians of the late period. In 4 AD, Roman scholar St. Jerome retranslated the "Old Testament" and the "New Testament" into Latin versions in terms of the Hebrew Bible, since he

had not been satisfied with the translation methods used in the Septuagint version. This new version was named “Editio Vulgate.” In the preface to the “New Testament” in Latin, St. Jerome guessed that anyone who began to read his version and found the contents were different from the original text would tough-lash that he was a blasphemous man and blame how he dared to add, cancel, and modify the classic text [65]. What happened later is just as St. Jerome’s anticipated, that is, after the publication of his translation, St. Jerome was criticized relentlessly for the rest of his life. However, St. Jerome’s version of the Bible has been adopted popularly by ecclesiae in his time. Later, at the end of the fourth century, the folk version of the Bible began to appear since in most of the newly established states at that time, few common people could understand Latin. In order to make the Bible accessible to those common people, it had to be translated into folk languages in different states. In the sixteenth century, German protestant reformation leader and translator Martin Luther King translated the Bible in German. His translation of the Bible helps to develop a standard version of the German language and adds several principles to the art of translation. It is of significance in Western translation history. King adopted special methods to translate the Bible in order to make the German Bible readable and understandable to those who did not know Hebrew, Greek, and Latin and were little educated. For example, he added the German word “allein” (only, alone) in the translation of “Romans 3:28,” and then his translation of “allein durch den Glauben” was criticized and opposed by his opponents. They criticized that King had added new contents into the Bible. King responded that the word “allein” had not existed in the original text; however, his translation was completely in accordance within the context of divinity, so it is appropriate to translate the Bible in this way [66]. From the above examples, we find that the cultural background and connotation represented in translation cannot be the same as that in the original text due to different times, languages, readers, etc. So in translation history, the phenomena of addition, reduction, reconstruction, and even rewriting of the original text have always existed, because the creation and acceptance of translation cannot happen in a vacuum and no translation can be possible without relevant social context. Translators are not absolutely neutral. Translators’ stance, strategy, motivation, and capability will be influenced by the factors of politics, history, economy, and culture, among many others.

3.5.1 “*Translation Is Interpretation*”

British translation theorist George Steiner points out in *After the Babel* that translation is an understanding. That is to say, translation is by nature a process of understanding and interpretation. Modern hermeneutics suggest putting time and history into text interpretation, paying attention to specific time and historical cultural tradition. Hans-Georg Gadamer, famous for his philosophical hermeneutics, suggests that all understanding is self-understanding. Subjective prejudice is inevitable in understanding: “Prejudices are not necessarily unjustified and erroneous, so that

they inevitably distort the truth. In fact, the historicity of our existence entails that prejudices...are biases of our openness to the world. They are simply conditions whereby we experience something—whereby what we encounter says something to us” [67]. In Gadamer’s statements, prejudice is the productive power of people. It represents an interpreter’s creative consciousness. Besides, understanding is always a dialogical process between the interpreter and the text. Textual meaning is a productivity which is a comprehensive horizon in which the limited horizons of text and interpreter are fused into a common view of the subject matter and understanding is an event, a movement of history in which neither interpreter nor text can be thought of as autonomous parts [68]. These ideas largely enlighten translation study. The question of why the translated text cannot be equal to the original text in traditional translation study has been easily solved. Scholars’ positive attitude to prejudice in modern hermeneutics leads people to acknowledge the Variation, pay attention to translation studies, and explore the cause of Variation.

Deconstruction is the main characteristic of deconstructionism, which criticizes and overthrows the concept of construction, meaning, and some other important concepts in constructionism and erodes from the root the ground of fidelity. The French critic Roland Barthes suggests that we had better see a text as an onion, a superimposed construction of skins whose volume contains no heart, no core... nothing but the very infinity of its envelopes [69]. That predicates the meaning of a text is not unique and invariable and interpreters can have various interpretations, as do the translators. It also predicates that the meaning of a text is not subjected to the text itself, but to the translation. Influenced by deconstructionist concepts, Venuti suggests in the preface to *Rethinking Translation*, “The translation cannot always show its ‘faith’ to the original text and more or less has ‘free’ exertion. With addition or omission, it always is uncertain, and it can never be a transparent representation but an interpretative transformation that exposes multiple and divided meanings in the foreign text and displaces it with another set of meanings, equally multiple and divided” [70]. Deconstructionism suggests that the author has died and readers have been endowed with unprecedented interpretative power. The translator, as the first reader of the original text, has cast off the service status and obtains the freedom of constructing the meaning of the original text. The translator has become a creative subject and constructs his or her own authority. Deconstruction’s nature is “keeping difference” but not “seeking likeness.” Translation study from the perspective of deconstruction has opened a new window for us to explore the cause of literary Variation.

In Western literary theories, French Michel Foucault’s theories on discourse and power enlighten translation study: “By right of the character of interdiscipline of his (Michel Foucault’s) works, each academic study [...] has been enlightened in some degree” [71]. In Foucault’s work, power is dominant. It could be visible as political systems, regulations, or laws and invisible as ideology, morality, cultural tradition, convention, thought, or religion. All these can be regarded as power, which forms a dynamic network of power relationship, and nobody will be independent of the network. Foucault’s concept of discourse is not purely a linguistic concept: “Discourse can be not only a tool of power, but also a result of power” [72]. That is

to say, discourse is a representation of power and all powers are realized by discourse. Discourse is not only the tool for administration of power but also a core of controlling power. Power is indivisible from discourse. Foucault suggests that each aspect in every society has a specific discourse, which is like a network controlling and reigning over people's thoughts and activities. As an aspect of human activities, translation cannot get rid of the restriction of discourse and also is constructed by discourse. To translators, their knowledge and their translation will be controlled and restricted by present discourse. This control and distraction work unconsciously. It penetrates into the process of the translators' understanding, interpretation, and formation of translated text. So translation will inevitably bear the brand of discourse of power.

Postmodern feminists combine Foucault's theory of discourse with a feminist political aim. Feminist translation theory, being a feminist derivative, also has close relations with politics. Feminist translation theory combines gender with translation, advocating using language to speak for women in order to give prominence to female identity and consciousness. In practice, feminists interfere with texts and make languages aberrant, estranging texts. They try to use new words, new spelling, new grammar construction, new intention, and new figures of speech as well as some "word play" in order to exceed the patriarchal linguistic rule, giving prominence to women's status and the common cognition which women impress on people [73]. Feminists redress and interpose language by translation which "aims to make the feminine visible in language, so that women are seen and heard in the world" [72]. For example, in Harwood's feminizing translation of Lise Gauvin's *Lettres d'une autre*: "The author used the generic masculine in her text; the translator 'corrects' the language, avoiding male generic terms where they appear in French and using 'Quebécois-e-s' where the original was happy with 'Quebécois' in all cases" [74]. Harwood explains in her preface that "My translation practice is a political activity aimed at making language speaking for women. So my signature on a translation means this translation has used every translation strategy to make the feminine visible in language" [75]. This translation remarkably has political aim.

As a branch of cultural theories, postcolonial theory is rooted in Foucault's theory. By right of a critique of ideology, culture, and politics, postcolonial theory breaks through the boundary of study of pure text and provides a wider perspective for translation study. Postcolonial theory discloses the struggle and movement of powers, pointing out that translation is the most effective method to study and disclose cultural hegemony and also the most energetic way to overthrow hegemony and establish equal dialogic relationship between different cultures. Professor Maria Tymoczko of America, who is a researcher of postcolonial translation, finds out by researching literary works of early times in Ireland that translation plays a key role in national cultural renaissance and political independence of Ireland. Her research shows that Cu Chulainn, the legendary hero of Ireland, was not a hero; he had lice on his hair and body and was obtrusive afield, sometimes even absquatulated for a woman. However, Cu Chulainn was described as a national hero by the Irish translator. The aim of that translation is to encourage the Irish to fight. Tymoczko uses this

case to prove that translation is closely related to ideology and political fighting and translation is an important weapon in the fight against colonialism.

From the perspective of postcolonialism, when a hegemonic culture translates works produced by the dominated culture, the process of translation becomes a fight for power. The hegemonic culture carries its power in a conqueror's gesture, treating dominated culture arbitrarily. For example, in Romans' eyes, translation is not just a simple skill, what it is related to is control and conquest. Romans admired Greek culture, but they did not fall prostrate before Greek culture. On the contrary, they appreciated Greek culture with a conqueror status. Therefore, in the process of translation, Romans replaced some historical things inessential to them with corresponding modern Roman things or canceled them completely. They even changed the content of some literary works which had appeared before the time when Christianity came into being. The German literary critic Johann Gottfried von Herder once criticized French translators for their assimilative translations which are the similar approaches that Romans used towards the Greek: "Homer must enter France a captive, clad in the French fashion, lest he offend their eye; must let them shave off his venerable beard and strip off his simple attire; must learn French customs and, whenever his peasant dignity still shines through, be ridiculed as a barbarian" [76].

When a hegemonic culture translates works produced in dominated culture, domestication is the major translation method. However, we can find in the study of translated literature that some dominated countries, such as Ireland, will also adopt extreme domesticated translation method in order to protect its own culture, especially its language. Ireland was a British colony and its culture was nearly assimilated by Britain. Irish is at the edge of extinction. Some translators intentionally adopt unadulterated Irish to translate works so that Irish people become familiar with Irish in the process of reading, which may save Irish from extinction. From these examples, we find that Variation in translation can not only overthrow the hegemonic condition of Western culture but also strengthen the dominated third-world culture. Thus, we say that translation is mediation rather than a simple transformation of languages. We should pay more attention to how the source text has been dealt with so as to create new products under a new context. From the perspective of postcolonialism, translation is regarded as a political activity. Through translation, new thoughts have been introduced. They not only impact and overthrow current power structure and ideology but also help to construct a new social system in the target culture, greatly affecting superstructure, such as politics and culture.

3.5.2 Significance of Cross-Language Variation

So far, Variation in translation under the guidance of theory of Variation has not been deeply explored. In fact, if we are able to make a differentiation between Variation and wrong translation and see Variation as a given fact, a cultural

phenomenon, then we will find the study of Variation has special and unexpected significance.

In Western translation history, there are so many examples of Variation which have made great contributions to cross-cultural communication. For example, in the late half of the sixteenth century, Thomas North translated *Parallel Lives* from French into English. It is the most famous translation work in the Elizabethan period. However, the style of North's version is different from that of the French version. He changes not only the words but also the spirit of the French version. It is an excellent creation based on the source text. North's translated *Parallel Lives* becomes North's own creative work. The language used in translation is simple and fluent, elegant and unadulterated. Without reading the story in his translation, readers would see his version as an English source text. North's translation becomes both a source for Shakespeare's literary creation and an excellent literary exemplar. Many lines in his version can be found readily in Shakespeare's play. That is a great contribution to literary creation made by Variation in translation.

In the eighteenth century, famous French writer La Place translated *English Theatre* into French, in which a number of plays by Shakespeare first appeared in French. The result was not so much a translation as an adaptation and abridgment in keeping with what the French understood to be finely wrought narrative. In a strict sense, his version can only be seen as a compilation; however, it meets the reader's requirements of his time and is of great significance.

After La Place, Ducis, who knew no English, drawing his knowledge of the play from La Place's translation, was also known for altering the text heavily in order to make it conform to French theatrical style. In his translation, he allows Claudius to be a prince of the blood, but not the brother of the murdered monarch, and makes him the father of Ophelia. Hamlet is depressed but sane, testing his mother not with a play but with an urn, inherited from Sophocles and Voltaire. It is he alone who sees the ghost and converses with him. His friend Horatio is called Norceste. Polonius is a mere confidant. Laertes, Rosencrantz, and Guildenstern have disappeared. This version is accurately reproduced and a Variation; however, it certainly makes a valuable addition to our knowledge of Shakespeare's fame on the European mainland. Without it, no one can properly study the misfortunes of *Hamlet*.

In addition, when a new national literary form appears, translation will be seen as an approach to change the powerful historical relationship. For instance, "the Fables of Lafontaine were translated into Creole of Haiti in the nineteenth century; Shakespeare was clothed in the relaxed idioms of Quebec anglicized urban slang during the twentieth. This parodization of elevated forms of writing becomes an instrument of cultural redress. The reader is provoked, forced to measure the distance between the conventional language of prestige and nascent forms of literary language." [77] Modernist writers of Brazil use creative Variation of translation to reach their political aims. For example, the de Campos brothers adopt the movement of "cultural anthropophagy" used in translation to perform practices of trans-textualization so as to radicalize the Brazilian literary idiom, involving a displacing of European literary themes into the vocabulary of Brazilian modernism. Their activity shows Brazilian diverse cultures and their cultural identity to the world [77].

Feminist Barbara Godard argues that “the feminist translator, affirming her critical difference, her delight in interminable re-reading and re-writing, flaunts the signs of her manipulation of the text” [78]. Feminist translators carry on linguistic transformation by variant method so as to transcend patriarchal linguistic norms and make female identity visible, interposing and overwriting patriarchal text, including misogyny.

In a contemporary context, translation is an activity that happened in a net which is full of tension and collision. The collision between different cultures/literatures will surely produce conflict and Variation. Thus, the standard of fidelity has to be reinterpreted. We should pay attention to not only the linguistic transformation between source and target text but also the implied conflicts of power and politics under the surface of translating, as well as the interaction between power and resistance. In the study of Comparative Literature, rethinking of Variation in translation will supply a new theoretical tool and perspective for translation study and will also be helpful to review and reorient the aim of the discipline. With the exploration of the driving forces behind the development of literature, Variation is a valuable tool for the reconstruction of the discipline and theories of Comparative Literature.

3.6 Case Study on Cross-Language Variation Between European Languages and Chinese

Language Variation has long been reflected in European literature and American literature. While in dealing with the cross-language phenomena between Chinese and Western languages, due to the long history and complex structure of Chinese, on the one hand, and the heterogeneities between Sino-Tibetan Indo-European languages and Indo-European languages, on the other hand, Variation is prominent and profound. In such a heterogeneous Variation of cross-language, the most notable are addition, omission, reconstruction, mistranslation, compilation, and so on.

3.6.1 Domestication

Since China has a long history of translation, from the translation of Buddhist Scriptures to Yan Fu’s *Evolution and Ethics* to the translation of contemporary Western literary and academic works, language Variation has never stopped. The most frequent variations, such as addition, omission, reconstruction, and misinterpretation, appear in translations of classical Chinese anthologies and later compilation and indirect translation in the early twentieth century. It is a typical example that Grimm’s *Fairy Tales* was for the first time introduced into China by Zhou Guisheng’s classical Chinese translations. Because of the very different religious

backgrounds in China and Germany, a lot of religious contents are omitted in the early translation of the book; thus, omission is unavoidable.

In Zhou Gui-sheng's version, such as those in the story "Der Fuchs und die Gänser" (Fox and Geese), the sentence that the goose requests to repent "so erzeige uns die einzige Gnade und erlaub uns noch ein Gebet, damit wir nicht in unsern Sünden sterben" and the original sentence with which the fox shows its respect and allows the confession "das ist billig, und ist eine fromme Bitte: betet, ich will so lange warten" are removed and replaced with a few words without religious overtones "prayers of sincerity" and "fox agrees." In the end of the story, there appeared both omission and addition in the translation. This episode ended with the addition that "the owner of the goose heard it, knowing there must be dangers. So he arrived with other people armed to the spot and the fox is scared to escape." And the original humor in the religious style "Und wenn sie ausgebetet haben, soll das Märchen weitererzählt werden, sie beten aber alleweile noch immer fort" (we can go on with the story only when they finish the repenting which has been ongoing till now) was omitted by the author. In fact, the translation of the title of this fairy tale has already started to contain Variation. The original title of the fairy tale "Der Fuchs und die Gänser" ("Fox and Geese") is changed to "The Fox Is Cheated by the Goose" according to the contents of the fairy tale. The removal of the sentence with strong religious tones does not mean that the translator gives up the moral reprimand. On the contrary, the moral reprimand is more intense than the original. The translator added his moral reflections at the end of each fairy tale to convey demands on people's moral behaviors according to Confucianism. By the end of "The Revenge on the Wolf" (The Wolf and the Seven Lambs), the translator added, "In this world it is not rare among people that the strong bully the weak and there are countless cases. I cannot help but regard it rather as a familiar danger." Aiming to deepen the understanding of the story, this kind of comment observes the convention of moral teaching in the Chinese literary tradition, while depriving the readers of the possibility of pluralistic interpretation.

The well-known Chinese translator Yan Fu has proposed the three standards in translation, "faithfulness, expressiveness, and elegance," but in his practice of translation, he did not comply. In fact there are multiple mutations from content to style in his translations. But Yan Fu's translation of *Evolution and Ethics* in the history of Chinese translation occupies a very important place and cannot be ignored. The Variation of "Evolution and Ethics" lies in the increase (editor's note), cut, and changes in the content. Most translations in the book are interwoven with his editor's note, which actually manifests his tendency of naturalization. Based on the purpose of salvation, Yan Fu changed the original title *Evolution and Ethics* to *Evolution* by deleting some of the ethical parts and emphasizing evolution. In the text there is a combination of the actual situation of Chinese society at that time to remove biological aspects of the original work. Instead, he focuses on the theory of evolution, by a large number of chapters to strongly praise Spencer's social Darwinism, thereby awakening the Chinese people's awareness of competition, reform, and renaissance. If Huxley is opposed to the application of the law of nature, "survival of the fittest" in the development of human society, the "survival of the

fittest” has become a theoretical weapon used by Yan Fu to warn people about the danger of extinction. The text below is intended to explain the constant change in the world of nature:

So far as that limited revelation of the nature of things, which we call scientific knowledge, has yet gone, it tends, with constantly increasing emphasis, to the belief that, not merely the world of plants, but that of animals, not merely living things, but the whole fabric of the earth; not merely our planet, but the whole solar system; not merely our star and its satellites, but the millions of similar bodies which bear witness to the order which pervades boundless space, and has endured through boundless time, are all working out their predestined courses of evolution [79].

凡兹运行之理, 乃化机所以不息之精, 苟能静观, 随在可察; 小之极于行倒生, 大之放乎日星天地, 隐之则神思知识之所以圣狂, 显之则政俗文章之所以沿革, 言其要道, 皆可一言蔽之, 曰天演是已。[80]

The original is just talking about the evolution of natural phenomena, but the translation of Yen Fu was talking about human society. Similar changes to the original content can be seen everywhere in the translation: “It can be said that the translation of *Evolution and Ethics* is a complete transformation of the original book. It is part of Yan Fu’s pursuit of a prosperous and powerful China” [81]. At the same time, in order to achieve the purpose of “the salvation and preservation of the nation,” Yan Fu used classical diction and the style of Classic Chinese in his translation. The “refined” style attracted the eyes of literati (Yan Fu’s target audience) who gave high praise towards Yan Fu’s translation of *Evolution and Ethics*. The variations in the style of language and the naturalization in the translation of the vocabulary engrained with a cultural message reflect the translator’s hope to promote the acceptance of the readers and to warn the readers about the fate of China.

The tendencies of domestication in translation are also reflected in another translator, Lin Shu, who used classical Chinese to translate Western classics as he translated two short stories of a similar background, “Wild Dream of Lee Po” (Rip van Winkle) and “Sleeping Holes” (Sleeping Beauty), which describe the anecdotes of the Dutch immigrants living in the small village of Black River in the period around the American War of Independence. In Lin Shu’s understanding, these two short stories of Owen are much the same as in ancient Chinese jokes, so he borrowed directly the names of Sung Ju Xing’s works. Lin Shu greatly exaggerated the comic effects of characters rendered in appearance and language. For example, when Rip van Winkle is forced to distinguish himself from his son standing against the tree which resembled him a great deal, Lin Shu created a sense of disorder of identity in the language used by Rip van Winkle, “I am not who I am, there is another me. He is me, I am not me. The one who is against the tree is suddenly turning to be me...” [82]. There are series of emergence of “He” and “me” in the classical phrase in different levels instead of the clause structure in original English. In addition, Lin Shu adopted Chinese ancient “Taoyuan” (an ideal dwelling place for a hermit) to explain the feeling of simplicity conveyed in Irving works located in the rural area. Owen upholds the American romantic ideas of natural simplicity to ridicule morality, reason, and industrialization. In Lin Shu’s view these became “the feeding on the dust of satiation, far away from the natural scenery” [83].

In the process of compiling the magazine of *Fairy Tales*, Sun Yuxiu and Mao Dun observe the rule “Chinese learning as the foundation while Western learning as skills.” Their deletion and addition of the original texts are typical examples of Variation. Among them, the first fairy tale in Grimm’s book *Der Froschkönig oder der eiserne Heinrich* (*The Frog Prince or Iron Henry*) was compiled into *Frog Princess* by Mao Dun; not only was iron Henry missing, but the sex of the frog is changed from male to female. In the arrangement of the plot, the male hero was completely replaced by the frog princess. In addition, the translators added other plots such as the frog dropped the tress and fell to death, the small frog princess went to the forest looking for another frog to make up her mistakes, and the king recognized the frog princess as his daughter. Moreover, there is a psychological “movement”: “the little princess thinks in this way while what is going on in the mind of the king is different—one has to keep one’s promise. The frog is no more than a reptile but still it keeps its words, while, as a person, the princess can’t keep her promise? So he asks the princess to comply with frogs everywhere and just wants to teach the girl a lesson and let her observe her words” [84].

In addition, the translator mistakenly translated the title of the original fairy tale *Die Bremer Stadtmusikanten* (*Musicians in Bremen*) as *Brother Donkey*. The original title implied a German preference and admiration for music as well as artistic and humorous style. The translation of the title into *Brother Donkey* is closer to the flavor of the agriculture-based Chinese reading public but at the same time loses the deep meaning of German culture and the basic style of the text. In translation, the German town “Die Bremer” has never been mentioned. Instead, it is replaced by the first sentence that “there is a small village in southern Italy.” This is totally contrary to the original beginning of the story: “Es hatte ein Mann einen Eselaber der Esel merkte, dass kein guter Wind wehte, lief fort und machte sich auf den Weg nach Bremer; dort, meinte er, könnte er ja Stadtmusikant warden” [85]. The survival skills of the four animals are changed from music in the original tale to “Do tricks. That’s it!” in the translation; the loss of cultural information will certainly lead to changes in style. The original narrative of artistic style full of fairy-tale language gives a humorous, romantic, and legendary ambience, while the translation in plain language aims to bring rich local flavor. Compared with the original, there are a lot of additions in the translation conducted by Mao Dun and Sun Yuxiu. For example, the original tale ends with the four animals’ driving away of the robbers and living happily in the house, while the translations added that they are also working together to make a self-reliant living: donkey and cat do tricks, rooster sings the song, and dog claims money. With the Variation in language, plot, and scene, the purpose of the whole fairy tale reflects a common distinctive theme to be strong and independent. This domestication has closely interwoven the tendencies of China in the 1920s, an era when the internal and external problems arose including growing aggressions by the Western powers. Therefore, a number of Chinese intellectuals with a strong sense of responsibility are calling for the people to be strong and independent with an urgent need to unite China. Therefore, some Chinese translators have made mistranslations and additions on purpose to give the text different intentions from the original one. In the process of compilation of other fairy tales such as

Hans Christian Andersen's *Fairy Tales* and Aesop's *Fables*, Sun Yuxiu and Mao Dun have varying degrees of domestication.

In short, there is a strong tendency for domestication or naturalization in the classical translation and initial compilation of foreign works. The so-called naturalization, also known as nationalization in translation, refers to taking the target audience into mind; emphasizing the localization of translation, authentic and vivid; and making it more in line with the target language and expression. The tools used by translators mainly involve altering, adding, substitution, etc., of the original text. The purpose is to give the target readers a better understanding and easier acceptance of the translated text. This strong tendency of naturalization is closely related to the zeitgeist at the time, the level of the readers' appreciation, and aesthetic preferences. At that time, there was an influx of Western culture. On the one hand, people were yearning for advanced Western literary concepts and literary techniques. On the other hand, people adhered to the point of view that "Chinese learning is the essence, Western learning is skill." People cannot be completely out of the traditional moral principles governing relationships at the stage of acceptance, transformation, and persistence. In addition, at that time a large number of Chinese readers had not yet come into contact with Western literature; they cannot be good at understanding Western culture, so it is reasonable for translators to adopt strong naturalization.

3.6.2 *The Variation of the Second Time*

The compilation in the new era is different from the initial compilation in the 1920s when translators had to choose the strategy of domestication or naturalization mainly because of cultural context and the readers' acceptance during that time period. In the new era, the translators choose to translate parts of original texts or compile the original books out of their own special purpose or for special readers. This particular audience is composed mainly of beginners for English, children of different age groups. In the new era, the original texts are mainly abridged or compressed. The words, phrases, or paragraphs unrelated to the main plot and characters are deleted. Sometimes the original texts are heavily thinned as is shown in some simple versions of English reading and a lot of children's readers: "In a way, the compilation is also a section of translation, as compiled by the translator with the aim to clarify the circumstances of original clues, remove words, paragraphs, even chapters having little to do with the main plot thread in order to make concise the form of the original book" [86]. This is certainly beneficial to the reader's acceptance, but the original richness, complexity, and national features disappear, and it is easy for readers to get the wrong impression. But abridgement and compilation may play a significant role on the spread of literature in a foreign country. Many simple versions of the foreign literary classics and children's books are in this category, in which descriptions of scenes, psychological descriptions, or religious rituals which are not directly related to the main plot are usually removed.

Indirect translation of literary texts, also known as retranslation, refers to the use of a foreign language (medium language) to translate a literary work written in another foreign language: “They [Indirect translations] share a common feature that the original has stood the ‘second-time distortion’” [86]. In the early twentieth century, the majority of literary works of non-English-speaking countries are transferred to the Chinese with English as well as Japanese and Russian as the media languages. As Britain and the United States exert deep cultural, political, and religious impact on China, consequently the penetration of English is wider than other foreign languages, particularly in the first two or three decades of the twentieth century and in the new era. Therefore, English as the widest medium of language makes sense, while Japanese as a medium was due to a large number of Chinese students studying in Japan and later due to Japan’s cultural aggression in China. It can be said that, from the May Fourth Movement to the 1930s and 1940s, Japanese has been one of the most important media of translation. Many non-Japanese great poets’ works were translated into Chinese by the Japanese. Besides, the change of regime will also affect the trend of the target country to study in turn. For example, the establishment of New China and the “one-sided” policy of the government was being implemented, so that a large number of students flocked to the Soviet Union to study. Then Russian became the medium of language in this period. In the early twentieth century, *Extraterritorial Collection of Short Stories* compiled and translated by Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren was the translation of Polish and Russian short stories via the media languages of Japanese and German. Although a lot of cultural information of texts was missing, the collection enabled the Chinese readers to first see the style of the foreign short story. *Collection of Grimm’s Fairy Tales* translated by Feng Huazhan published in successive turns from 1951 to 1953 is also a good example. Although the translator seeks to translate faithfully by pursuing the fluency in Chinese on the one hand and trying to keep the original meaning and style on the other, “the translation is based on an English version and a Russian partial-translation version...[and] whenever there is excision in the content in the Russian edition, the translator followed it” [87]. Because of the dual media of languages, coupled with partial translation, the Variation in the translation conducted by Feng Huazhan can be imagined. For example, the original “Der Zaunkönig und der Bär” is rendered by the translator as “Bear and Wren on the Willow Trees,” in which the “willow tree,” a unique Chinese image, appeared, while a bird “Der Zaunkönig,” an image entailed in Western culture, is translated into “Wren.” “Der Zaunkönig” in Western culture, especially in short stories, is generally considered to be a very cunning image. Grimm’s *Fairy Tales* precisely takes this layer of meaning, but Wren has not this layer of cultural implications. In addition, in the bird’s songs, “Die drei Vögelchen” has experienced a “creative treason” by the translator:

Original: “Tom Daude bereit, Up wieterm Bescheid, Tom Lilienstrus: Wacker Junge, bist du’s?”

Translation: “Good boy, you’re dead, until God put your release; your grave will be in the center of river, where white lotus blooming.”

As can be seen from the quotation, the translator has not translated the flower into a white lily but a lotus with a taste of Chinese Zen. Meanwhile, the referential meaning of the original sentence is also mutated in the target language. In the original text, the words not only give the hero a raw hope but also persuade him to change into a bouquet of lilies. The translation malpractices the hero's grave arrangements of the central white lotus and adds the religious image of God.

In fact, except for a few, most indirect translation is made because there is no other choice, especially the translation of literature of non-common language, because there can be a number of translators proficient in a common language, while it is impossible that there are a lot of experts of non-common languages: "Literary translation is so complex that translators are engaged in a re-creation. In the meantime, the nature of literary translation is that the translator inevitably involves personal style, life experience, even individual temperament into the original understanding and elaboration; therefore, it is not difficult to understand why there will be 'second-time distortion' in the translation of literary works, let alone some irresponsible abuses of translation and some translations with unique pursuit." [88]

3.6.3 *Variation in Images*

In addition to classical Chinese translations, retranslation, and compilation, there are other variations in the translation such as mistranslation and the leakage phenomenon because some cultural information contained in the words in one language is difficult to convey in the target language, for the translator cannot find the appropriate words to convey all the cultural information as in the original language. In the English sentence "You chicken, he cried, looking at Jane with contempt," if the word "chicken" is directly translated as "little chick," then the readers who do not understand English cannot realize that "chicken" in the English connotes "coward" or "prostitute." As a result, the translator might as well give up the original images and directly state the deep meaning of "chicken." In the following example, there appears another Variation of image. The original Chinese text goes like this—"with great difficulty the thief pushed his way to the rear of the bus; while he was finally at the back door, he prayed anxiously for a quick, anonymous exit before the owner of the purse discovered her loss." The original text of "prayed" (in "he prayed") is "Lao Tian Bao You" ("Heaven bless)," which cannot be translated into "God bless" for as the translator explained that, in the Christian culture, God will not bless a thief stealing things. In Grimm's *Fairy Tale*, "Der Fuchs und die Frau Gevatterin" was translated into "The Fox and the Godmother" by Wei Yixin and "The Fox and Its Bride's Mother" by Yang Wuneng, both of which are suitable for Chinese culture and customs. Through the appropriate translation of "godfather," the translator retrieves the religious information lost in the translation and compensates his mistranslation to some extent. In Young's version "Gevatter" is translated into "godfather" to meet the original intention and retain the religious practices of

Western culture that at the birth of a child, a godfather should be invited. However, in Wei's version "Gevatter" is translated as "foster father" and "Frau Gevatterin" (godmother) is translated into "foster mother," thus not only losing their religious messages but also the relationship between the fox and the wolf is different from the original text of the same generation. In Wei's version, "Der Herr Gevatter" is mistakenly translated as "godfather" and "Der Gevatter Tod" is mistakenly translated as "Death godfather." The devil in Christianity is mistakenly translated into Chinese ghosts. Some other Grimm's fairy tales are dealt with in the same way: "Der Teufel mit den drei goldenen Harren" is mistakenly translated as "there are three golden-haired ghosts", and "Der Teufel und seine Grossmutter" as "ghosts and its grandmother." These are due to different religious backgrounds between China and Germany to bring the loss and misreading of the foreign cultural images. However, the translator knows about the religious message contained in the image, but sometimes with the public as the receiving screen, the translator has to adopt a certain degree of Variation in order to cater to local readers. For example, in Shakespeare's play *Romeo and Juliet*, there are two sentences—"He made you a highway to my bed/But I, a maid, die maiden-widowed." In his translation, Zhu Shenghao translates them into "He would like to take you (ladder) to as a bridge, but I had to be the girl complaining and lonely dying." "To my bed" in the original text was deleted and "bridge" was used instead. Obviously, this is not a careless error, but something to do with the translator's ethics. China's traditional culture is reticent about "sex" and sex-related stuff. Therefore, "to my bed" appearing in the original text is inconsistent with traditional Chinese aesthetic habits. Zhu Shenghao used "bridge" instead of the symbolic image of "bed" which reflects the invisible and powerful effects of the moral values of translators and cultural background.

Chinese translations of advertisements, which are fully conscious of the psychology of audience, are even more common to encounter the example of Variation of image, for example, "Goldlion" is translated as "coming of Gold," "Maybelline" as "beautiful and precious lotus," "Poison" as "God of 100 Love," and the well-known cosmetics brand "Clean & Clear" as "Tender and Smart," which is homophonic translation into Chinese that retained the rhetoric but changed the original meaning.

"Cultural Images embody most of the crystallization of the wisdom and history and culture of all ethnic groups and is closely related with the legend as well as the early totem worship" [89]. Different ethnic groups in different geographical environments have different cultural and historical traditions and form its unique cultural image naturally, which once formed, will become a fixed sign in the cultural circle with a relatively fixed and unique cultural message containing rich associations. For example, "magpie" refers to the same kind of bird both in English and in Chinese, but the semantic connotations of the word in the two cultures are completely different. "Magpie" in Chinese means "good luck, happiness, happy events," and so on, but in English, magpie means "a nag." In the translation of the sentence "He is so fond of talking that his roommate nicknamed him magpie," if we do not understand the semantic differences between the two languages and directly translate the sentence into Chinese that "He is so fond of talking, his companions gave him a nickname 'magpie'," the meaning conveyed is different from the original text and is misleading. Instead, the sentence can be changed to "He likes to chirp and his

companions call him ‘Sparrow.’” This is more appropriate because in Chinese people often use a sparrow to describe someone who loves nagging.

Dream of Red Mansions is not only a classic in the history of Chinese literature but also a gem in the treasure house of world literature. With descriptions of a particular era and its social life and representations of profound ideological values, it is generally acknowledged to be the pinnacle of Chinese fiction. To translate it into English, one is inevitably beset by obstacles. There are two English translations of the whole novel currently accepted, namely, Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang’s translation and the translation of David Hawkes and Ming Fader. In the translation of the poems in the novel, there are different levels of language Variation, for all the translators wanted to better convey the original message. Such as in Chap. 27, there is a poem “Burying the Flowers” in which there are two allusions. The first is “sprinkled over the sticks and left the bloodstain.” According to the legend, Xiang Fei’s tears in her crying for Shun changed to blood and stained the bamboo. Yang Hsien-yi translated it as “Falling like drops of blood on each bare bough,” while David Hawkes translated as “Which on the boughs as bloody drops appear.” The other allusion is “When cuckoo is silent, it is the dusk.” Yang Hsien-yi translated it as “Dusk fall and the cuckoo is silent,” while David Hawkes translated it as “At twilight, when the cuckoo sings no more.” The allusion is that the soul of the emperor of Shu had transformed into a bird whose blood stained a flower that is called azalea and who rhythmically sang. Often appearing in ancient Chinese poems, the two allusions in the poetry are very familiar to Chinese readers, but Western readers are not necessarily fully aware of them. Therefore, both the two kinds of translation chose to simplify the translation. The translator neither added an endorsement nor explained in the verse to ensure the accessibility and flow of the novel. However, Variation appeared due to simplification of the translation. Yang Hsien-yi translated “bloodstain” as “drops of blood”; David Hawkes translated it as “bloody drops.” The word “bloody” gives people a feeling of dripping blood and communicates more effectively the “tears of blood.” “Cuckoo silent” refers to the cuckoo weeping until the tears are dry and then remains silent. Yang Hsien-yi’s translation of “the cuckoo is silent” is a static description, but David Hawkes’ translation of “the cuckoo sings no more” then contains a dynamic process.

3.6.4 Variation in Translation of Idioms

Due to different geographical environments, historical backgrounds, social customs, and values, various ethnic groups in the long history have formed its own unique cultural background to use different ways to describe the same thing out of different cultural formulation. As idioms are concise, vivid, and full of rich cultural heritage, their translation depends on the specific circumstances of the corresponding variations. For example, in Europe and the United States, people often quote from the Bible, the “Old Testament.” For example, the expression “the apple of someone’s eye” is used to describe a person’s favorite thing, but the corresponding Chinese idiom would become “the pearl on someone’s palm.” The English equivalent

of the Chinese expression “play the lute to a cow” is “casting pearls before swine.” Similarly, the Chinese saying “It’s always the other mountain that looks higher” can be equal to a phrase used in English “The grass is always greener on the other side of the fence.” Another Chinese saying “Where there is no tiger, monkey is king” is translated as “While the cat’s away, the mice will play.”

A successful translation of poetry is inseparable from an appropriate application of Variation, which can be found in many cases. For example, *The Prelude* written by the British nineteenth-century Romantic poet William Wordsworth has been translated as *Aeolian Harp*, because the translator compares the prelude to the musical instrument that will send a harmonious tone once in contact with wind. The beginning lines of another poem “Daffodils,” written by Wordsworth, are as follows: “I wandered lonely as a cloud,/That floats on high over vales and hills./When all at once I saw a crowd,/A host, of golden daffodils.” Its Chinese translation is “That alone, roaming like floating clouds, drift above green mountain and valley: the moment a glimpse of clumps, a cluster of golden daffodils.” It is about one of the experiences of the poet’s roaming: suddenly found beside the lake were golden daffodils swaying in the breeze, dancing; the wonderful beauty of nature enabled the poet to be relaxed and happy not only at that moment, but it also has become good memories that give him the comfort and happiness when he is lonely or bored. In the translation of this verse, the translator also used the beautiful rhyming poem to depict the beauty of nature blending with the beautiful scenery, showing the vitality of nature that never fades. The translator used language with typical features of Chinese on the basis of imitation of the original characteristics of English poetry; therefore, the translation of poetry meets the appetite of Chinese readers. There is a combination of Chinese and foreign features adding to the meaning of some words, making a perfectly fluent translation and saving the Chinese features. Take the following sentence as an example: “The man had never believed in mere utility. Having had no useful work, he indulged in mad whims.” The first sentence has been translated into Chinese: “This person has never had a practical interest.” The translation of the second sentence is “He didn’t do any decent job and always aspires to the impossible.”

In addition, the translation of literary works is not as stringent as the translation of scientific and technological works. It is not necessary to translate everything close to the original. There is more flexibility to adopt Variation—using forms, styles, moods, and cultural images specific to the target language—to express their counterparts in the original language. If a novel set in Scotland described that a tall man entered the room and he wore a tweed coat and a pair of hobnails, here the term “tweed coat” originally referred to a Scottish tweed raw material; it is usually dyed two colors and most of the local farmers wear this material. In the translation of the novel, keeping Variation in mind, the sentence can be translated as “a tall man walked into the room, and he wore a short ordinary jacket and a pair of shoes pinned tack.” Another example is if the author emphasized that the weather is cold and wet, then the translator can vary the meaning of the word “tweed” into “warmth”; therefore, “tweed coat” became “warm coat.”

References

1. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1969. *La Littérature Comparée*, 4. Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.
2. Zhang Longxi. 1981. Qian Zhongshu's talk on Comparative Literature and the comparison of literatures. *Du Shu* 10: 56.
3. Fu Lei. 2004. *Letters for son*, 146. Shenyang: Liaoning Educational Press.
4. Ma Xinguo. 2002. *Western history of literary theory*, 575. Beijing: High Education Press.
5. Fu Lei. 1979. On translation. *Du Shu* 3: 119.
6. Ku Hung-Ming. 1906. Preface. In *The universal order or conduct of life*, ii. Shanghai: The Shanghai Mercury, Ltd.
7. Tang Zaixi. 1991. *A short history of translation in the West*, 23. Beijing: The Commercial Press.
8. Xu Yuanhong. 2006. *The arts of translation*, 27. Beijing: Wuzhou Spreading Press.
9. Lu Xun. 1973. Er Xin Ji. In *The Complete Works of Lu Xun*, vol. 4, 332. Beijing: Renmin Wenxu.
10. Song Xuezhi. 2006. *The influence and reception of classics in translation*, 255–256. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Press.
11. Zheng Hailing. 2000. *On translation of literature*, 39. Zheng Zhou: Wen Xin Press.
12. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 225. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
13. Qian Zhongshu. 1979. *Four old essays*, 63. Shanghai: Shanghai Guji Publishing House.
14. Stephen Owen. 1992. *Readings in Chinese literary thought*, 80. Cambridge, MA: Council of East Asian Studies, Harvard University/Harvard University Press.
15. Zhu Guangqian. 1999. *Comments about aesthetics*, 60. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Arts Press.
16. Heidegger, Martin. 2002. The origin of the work of art. In *Off the Beaten Track*, ed. & trans. Julian Young and Kenneth Haynes, 46. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
17. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 2004. *Truth and Method*, 2nd rev ed. Trans. Joel Weinsheimer and Donald G. Marshall, 446–447. New York: Continuum.
18. Heidegger, Martin. 1982. *On the Way to Language*, 73. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. New York: Harper & Row.
19. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *The course of comparative literature*, 97. Beijing: High Education Press.
20. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 1. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
21. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *The course of comparative literature*, 112. Beijing: High Education Press.
22. Qian Zhongshu. 1997. On “Bu Ge”. In *Qian Zhongshu's Selected Essays*, 496. Hangzhou: Zhejiang Wenyi Publishing House.
23. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 141. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Educational Press.
24. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 130. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Educational Press.
25. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 131. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Educational Press.
26. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 140. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
27. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 168. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
28. Heidegger, Martin. 1996. *Being and Time*, 141. Trans. Joan Stambaugh. Albany: State University of New York Press.
29. Alighieri, Dante. 1998. *The convivio*. Trans. Richard Lansing. <http://dante.ilt.columbia.edu/books/convivi/>.

30. Quoted from Tan Zaixi. 2004. *A short history of translation in the West*, 109. Beijing: Commercial Press.
31. Quoted from Tan Zaixi. 2004. *A short history of translation in the West*, 147. Beijing: Commercial Press.
32. Ma Zuyi. 2004. *A brief history of Chinese translation*, 42. Beijing: China Translation & Publishing Corporation.
33. Wolfram Wiss. 1982. *The science of translation: problems and methods*, 49. Tübingen: Gunter Narr Verlag.
34. de Saussure, Ferdinand. 1966. *Course in General Linguistics*, 117. Trans. Wade Baskin. New York: McGraw-Hill
35. Lun Jun. 2003. The guiding role of the philosophical turn from the theoretical to the practical in translation studies. *Journal of Foreign Languages* 69(5): 67–74.
36. De Raquel, Pedro. 1999. The translatability of texts: A historical overview. *Meta* XLIV(4): 546–559.
37. Heidegger, Martin. 1971. *On the Way to Language*, 56. Trans. Peter D. Hertz. San Francisco: Harper & Row.
38. Foucault, Michel. 1994. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Science*, 385. Trans. Anonymous. New York: Vintage Books.
39. Foucault, Michel. 1994. *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Science*, 98. Trans. Anonymous. New York: Vintage Books.
40. Wang Bin. 2004. Aspects of non-translatability. *Journal of Modern Philosophy* 1: 87.
41. Wang Wei. 2003. *Relativism: From the perspective of paradigm, language and rationalism*, 4. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press.
42. Benjamin, Walter. 2000. The task of the translator: An introduction to the translation of Baudelaire's *Tableaux Parisiens*. In *The translation studies reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 18. London/New York: Routledge.
43. Wang Bin. 2004. Aspects of non-translatability. *Journal of Modern Philosophy* 1: 85.
44. Kant, Immanuel. 2007. *Critique of Judgment*, 4. Trans. James Creed Meredith. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
45. Bopp, Franz. 1857. Vergleichende Grammatik des Sanskrit, Zend, Griechischen, Lateinischen, Lithauischen, Altslawischen ab, Gothischen und Deutschen. Berlin, 201–203. Quoted from Zhao Shikai. 1990. *Linguistics abroad: Schools and Representative Figures*, 98–99. Beijing: Beijing Language College Press.
46. Halliday, M.A.K. 2007. *Studies in Chinese language*, 162. Beijing: Peking University Press.
47. von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 2001. On the alphabetic writing and its language structure of the relationship. In *Humboldt's Philosophy of Language Collected Works*, 80. Trans. Yao Xiaoping. Changsha: Hunan Education Press.
48. Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. 2010. *The Science of Logic*, 12. Trans. George Di Giovanni. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
49. von Humboldt, Wilhelm. 2001. On the Chinese grammar structure. In *Humboldt's Philosophy of Language Collected Works*, Trans. Yao Xiaoping, 118. Changsha: Hunan Education Press.
50. Sapir, Edward. 1921. *Language: An introduction to the study of speech*, 58. New York: Harcourt, Brace.
51. ZhangLongxi. 1992. *The Tao and the Logos: Literary hermeneutics, East and West*, 31. Durham: Duke University Press.
52. Steiner, George. 1975. *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation*, 51. New York/London: Oxford University Press.
53. Fu Yonglin. 1994. Etymology, interpretation and translation. In *Chinese Translation of 100 Theories*, Du Chengnan parts, 202. Chongqing: Chongqing University Press.
54. Ma Jianzhong. 1999. The proposed translation of college discussion. In *Translation and criticism*, ed. Zhou Yi and Luo Ping, 10. Changsha: Hubei Education Press.
55. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *The study of comparative literature*, 30. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.

56. Venuti, L. 1992. *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity. Ideology*, 4. London/New York: Routledge.
57. Bassnet, Susan. 1993. *Comparative literature: A critical introduction*, 160. Oxford: Blackwell.
58. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 1. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Languages Education Press.
59. Bassnet, Susan. 1993. *Comparative literature: A critical introduction*, 161. Oxford: Blackwell.
60. Rado, Gyorgy. 1979. Outline of a systematic translatology. *Babel* 4: 187.
61. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *The study of comparative literature*, 194. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
62. van Tieghem, Philippe. 1995. *Litterature Comparee*, 164. Trans. Dai Wangshu. Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Press.
63. Jingyao, Sun. 2003. *Introduction to comparative literature*, 168. Beijing: China Youth Publishing House.
64. Hermans, Theo. 2002. Translation's representations. In *Teaching translation and interpreting 4*, ed. Eva Hung, 3–18. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing.
65. Tan Zaixi. 1991. *A brief translational history of West*, 34. Beijing: Commercial Press.
66. Tan Zaixi. 1991. *A brief translational history of West*, 83. Beijing: Commercial Press.
67. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1976. *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, 9. Trans. David E. Linge. University of California Press.
68. Gadamer, Hans-Georg. 1976. *Philosophical Hermeneutics*, xiv–xxviii. Trans. David E. Linge. University of California Press.
69. Barthes, Roland. 1986. *The Rustle of Language*, 99. Trans. Richard Howard. New York: Farrar, Straus & Giroux.
70. Venuti, Lawrence. 1992. *Rethinking translation: Discourse, subjectivity, ideology*, 8. London/New York: Routledge.
71. Xu Hui. 1996. *Towards postmodernism and postcolonialism*, 156. Beijing: Social Scientific Publishing House.
72. Zhu Liyuan, and Zhang Dexing. 1999. *History of Western aesthetics*, vol. 7, 381. Shanghai: Shanghai Literature and Arts Publishing House.
73. von Flotow, Luise. 1997. *Translation and gender-translating in the era of feminism*, 44. Manchester: St Jerome Publishing.
74. Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in translation*, 20. London/New York: Routledge.
75. Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in translation*, 15. London/New York: Routledge.
76. Robinson, Douglas. 1997. *Western translation theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*, 208. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
77. Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in translation*, 14–15. London/New York: Routledge.
78. Simon, Sherry. 1996. *Gender in translation*, 13. London/New York: Routledge.
79. Paradis, James, and George C. Williams. 1989. *Evolution and ethics: T.H. Huxley's evolution and ethics with new essays on its Victorian and sociobiological context*, 65. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
80. Huxley, T. H. 1998. *Evolution and Ethics*, 57. Trans. Yan Fu. Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou Ancient Books Press.
81. Huang Kewu. 2000. *The Raison d'etre of freedom: Yan Fu's understanding and critique of John Stuart Mill's liberalism*, 90. Shanghai: Shanghai Bookstore Publishing House.
82. Irving, Washington. 1981. *The Sketch Book (Fu Zhang Lu)*, 12. Trans. Lin Shu and Wei Yi. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
83. Irving, Washington. 1981. *The Sketch Book (Fu Zhang Lu)*, 59. Trans. Lin Shu and Wei Yi. Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
84. Mao Dun. 1984. In *Mao Dun and children literature*, ed. Kong Haizhu, 105. Shanghai: Shao Nian Er Tong Publishing House.
85. Grimm, Brüder. 1989. *Märchen*, 72. Stuttgart: Thienemann.
86. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 156. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

87. Jacob, Grimm and Grimm Wilhelm. 1952. *Water of Life*, 3. Trans. Feng Huazhan. Shanghai: Cultural Life Press.
88. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 157. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
89. Xie Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology*, 180. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Chapter 4

Cross-Cultural Variation Theory

In recent years, cross-culture has been a hot topic in many teaching materials and monographs in Comparative Literature, which makes cross-culture another footstone of Comparative Literature. However, there are different understandings of cross-culture in different teaching materials. Cross-culture is sometimes referred to in reference to homogeneous civilizations, while it is cross-heterogeneous-culture between heterogeneous civilizations in other cases. It is very important to distinguish the two kinds of cross-culture. Therefore, this book expounds cross-culture and cross-civilization, respectively.

This chapter mainly expounds the cross-culture Variation studies in homogeneous civilization. However, it is essential to emphasize that the cross-cultural Variation studies in homogeneous civilization and the cross-civilization Variation studies between heterogeneous civilizations are usually mixed together in practical research in Comparative Literature. To elaborate the theory clearly and expediently, it is necessary for this book to discuss cross-culture and cross-civilization separately.

What's more, I have pointed out that in 1995 cross-culture is the basic feature of the Chinese school of Comparative Literature: "While the French School conducted the study on the influence among different countries by crossing the borderlines of countries, and the American School further crossed the borderline of subjects and conducted the studies on the literature of different countries which didn't have any connections before, then the rising Chinese School will certainly connect eastern and western literature and reconstruct the concept of 'world literature' by crossing the huge wall between eastern culture and western culture, as well as break through the thick barrier formed by different cultures in the history of thousands of years." [1] Since the concept of "cross-culture" of Comparative Literature was presented, it has received much attention. However, because the connotation of the word "culture" is too broad, it is unavoidable to come across misunderstandings. It is not right for some people to interpret cross-heterogeneous-culture as common research on cross-culture—the cross-culture research in homogeneous civilization. In fact, the "cross-heterogeneous-culture" research and the "cross-culture" research are not the same. The research in this book emphasizes the heterogeneity between Chinese and

Western cultural systems, which is referred to as cross-civilization research. As a result, I came up with the “cross-civilization” research afterwards, which better corresponds with my original intention.

4.1 Cultural Filtering and Literary Variation

Cultural filtering exists in transnational, translinguistic, cross-cultural, and cross-civilization process at the same time. This part mainly expounds cultural filtering and literary Variation in the process of cross-culture.

The traditional influence studies in Comparative Literature have the tendency of valuing influencers while neglecting the roles played by the receivers. “Influence” is considered to be an invariable and supreme fact which reflects the absolute authority of influencers. As for the receivers, they always play the passive and negative role. It seems that literary communication is a one-dimensional process from senders to receivers. From a modern perspective, which under the background of modern thoughts advocates cultural relativism and cultural pluralism and respects individual value, the tendency of neglecting receivers as active individuals in traditional influence studies has shown its limitations. After the 1960s, the rising of the reception of aesthetics refreshed the traditional influence studies. It affirms the subjectivity, selectivity, and creativity of receivers in literary communicating activities, which enables the modern transition of traditional influence studies. Before that, phenomenology and hermeneutics had established the philosophical foundation of highlighting the impact of readers and negating the central role of writers. The emphasis of “Vorstruktur” by Heidegger and “Vorsicht” by Gadamer highlighted the participation and creative impact of readers with respect to the ontological nature of comprehension.

One important manifestation of the subjectivity, selectivity, and creativity of receivers in literary communicating activities is cultural filtering. Cultural filtering is the selection, transplantation, transformation, and reconstruction of communicating information by receivers according to their cultural tradition, realistic context, value standard, and aesthetic habits, whose result is the Variation of the original communicating information within an indigenous context. The studies on cultural filtering help to discover the mechanism and rules of literary Variation and to perform the active effect of weak culture in cultural communication.

Cultural filtering is the precondition of every literary communication, because every culture has had certain independence, stability, and cohesiveness since it was formed. When faced with foreign culture, resistance and exclusion are sure to appear. There are two situations when local culture meets with foreign culture: One is foreign culture’s compulsory cultural inculcation or unconscious cultural percolation towards local culture as dominant culture and the other is the receivers’ initiative grasp of beneficial factors from foreign culture to satisfy the need of developing itself. There is cultural filtering on both situations. In the first situation, the receiver may adopt cultural conservatism and receive it after cultural filtering and use the

weapon of its cultural tradition and cultural habits to defend the invasion of foreign culture, which sets certain limitations on the spread of foreign culture. In the second situation, the receiver distinguishes, selects, and remolds foreign culture according to its own condition and absorbs the parts which are beneficial to its development while filtering out the parts which do not go with its development. In this situation, the function of cultural filtering is especially outstanding. Sometimes, after the active selection, filtering, and transformation of the receivers, the New Culture is totally different from the original one. Weisstein pointed out, "in most cases, influence are not directly borrowed or loaned. Examples of imitating word by word hardly exist, most influence is creative transformation to some degree" [2]. "Creative transformation" refers to the selection, analysis, transformation, and reconstruction of communicating information by receivers' cultural filtering in the process of communication. The initiative of receivers has always existed in cultural communication history, but it is a neglected fact in literary studies history for a long time. Now researchers have gradually realized that the most important factor which determines whether the influencing origin can influence the receivers significantly in cultural communication may not be the influencing origin itself, but is the social environment, demand of the times, historical tradition, etc.: "Once entering the local context, every foreign factor, instead of existing independently and self-sufficiently, is in communication with local culture. To some extent, the destiny and effects of the influence are determined by receivers" [3].

The existence of cultural filtering and cultural Variation prompts the incommensurable parts of two different cultures and highlights their respective cultural features. The underlying reason of cultural filtering is due to the differences among cultural molds. There is superimposition and non-superimposition between two different cultural molds. The superimposition reflects the universals of human thinking, which is the foundation of literary communication. The non-superimposition reflects the unique features and incommensurability of different cultures, which is the reason for cultural filtering. Different cultural molds have different aesthetic assumptions, value assumptions, and different construction patterns of meaning. Literature shuttles among different cultural molds. People recognize, judge, and incise the information of other cultural molds according to their culture essence, mode of thinking, and aesthetic experience in their own cultural molds which have been accumulated from history and have existed unconsciously as a group. As a result, the distortion and Variation of the original information are inevitable. In general, the more differences there are in different cultures, the more cultural filtering there will be, which leads to more creative reception of the original information by receivers, as well as more Variation of the original information.

Karl Jaspers, a German philosopher, raised the concept of the "Axial Age" of human civilization. Around the fifth century BC, China, India, Persia, Palestine, and Greece formed their original civilizations independently almost at the same time, which established people's basic perception and value system in their civilization systems. When literature spread among several heterogeneous circles of civilization, cultural filtering and Variation were very obvious to a great extent. As for different nations in the same circle of civilization, for example, Britain, France, Germany,

and Russia which belong to Christian civilization, because they had formed different nation-states and established their nations' cultures, when literature spread among different nation-states' cultures, cultural filtering and Variation were also inevitable. Although cultural filtering in homogeneous civilization is not as obvious as that of cross-civilization, the studies of it can further reveal their respective features and differences among different nations' cultures in the same circle of civilization.

In sum, faced with cultural filtering, the receivers have established a multilevel and multidimensional net of cultural filtering based on their own nation's standpoint, which includes the following factors.

4.1.1 *Social Context*

The occurrence of foreign influence is by no means an isolated and occasional phenomenon in history. However, it comes from the underlying internal need for another literature by the receivers' social condition and the environment of the times. The receivers filter the elements of foreign literature according to their needs, which leads to Variation suited to their needs. From this aspect, the selection and reception of foreign literature by a nation's literature is not only an event in the history of literature but also an event of sociology and history. Therefore, as Weisstein pointed out, "the research of literary 'reception' refers to sociological and psychological study of literature" [2]. And he emphasizes that we should "do some intensive discussion on the effect of political and social elements in the process of forming literary principles" [2].

Prometheus, in ancient Greek myth, is written and molded by many writers throughout history as an archetypal character. Brandes pointed out that since the beginning of human ideological emancipation, the typical image of Prometheus has existed in every great writer's works. From Hesiod and Aeschylus in ancient Greece to Goethe in the eighteenth century and Byron and Shelley in the nineteenth century, they all created stories of Prometheus with different characters in different plots. The creation of these writers based on the realistic and historical context is the important reason for restricting the filtering of some plots and causing the Variation of its image. According to *Theogony* written by Hesiod, in ancient Greek myth, Prometheus killed a bull and kept the good meat for himself when paying tribute. Then he camouflaged the fat meat and bones as a tribute to Zeus. After being deceived, Zeus hid away fire as revenge. Prometheus stole the fire and gave it to human beings. To punish Prometheus for the new mistake, Zeus tied Prometheus to a cliff and assigned an eagle to peck at his liver. So the image of Prometheus in ancient Greek myth has dual natures, which are creator and humanitarian, as well as conspirator and insurgent. Aeschylus, a playwright in the zenith period of Athenian democracy in ancient Greece, adopted the topic of Prometheus. When Aeschylus was writing the play, the struggle against tyrannical autocracy by Athenian democrats was in a perfervid period. In "Prometheus Bound," Zeus was tyrannical, cruel, and brutal, which actually was the image of the tyrant in Athens' authoritarian period.

Prometheus defied brutal force by fighting against autocracy even at the cost of personal sacrifice, which was the embodiment of the Athenian democrats fighting for democratic politics. Aeschylus' work placed stress on eulogizing the lofty spirit and majestic courage of Prometheus to fight for democracy and justice, but it totally filtered out Prometheus' insidious side in the original myth. In the first transformation of Prometheus' image from the original myth to literature, the Variation of his character reflected the demand of the realistic context at that time. Aeschylus did not approve of the dark side of Prometheus as a fraud and conspirator when he was faced with the struggle against tyrant's autocracy by Athenian democrats. The spirit of that time demands Prometheus' determination in fighting against Zeus' autocracy as an insurgent. As a creator of Prometheus' brand-new image, Aeschylus was restricted by the spirit of that time and the realistic context when he brought filtering and Variation to bear in his fairy tales and in the depiction of his characters.

However, in Aeschylus' play, Prometheus ended the conflict against Zeus with a reconciliatory attitude. It showed that Prometheus held a certain delusion towards Zeus which made him believe that there were possibilities of reconciliation. The tragic ending also showed Aeschylus' aspiration to mediate the conflict between proletariat and the nobility because he was born in a slaveholder's family but was democratic in politics. Since Aeschylus's play has such great influence, Shelley, a British romantic poet of Romanticism, picked the topic of Prometheus again. In his poetic drama "Prometheus Unbound," Shelley changed the ending of Aeschylus' play in which Prometheus made a compromise with Zeus. No matter how Mercury, who was ordered to persuade Prometheus, intimidated and induced him, Prometheus did not agree to submit. The ending was that Jupiter was overthrown by Hades, and Prometheus was set free. With brightness and happiness all around the universe, a new world full of freedom and love instead of violence and slavery was established. When Shelley was writing the drama, the French Revolution failed, and the Holy Alliance was trying to stage a comeback of autocracy. Even if Shelley admired Aeschylus' fine art, it was difficult for him to approve the ending of "Prometheus Bound." As a result, the poetic drama eulogized the uncompromising spirit of Prometheus to fight against the oppression of the tyrant and autocracy and showed the bright future of victory, which encouraged the peoples' will to fight to end the dark ages.

For both Aeschylus and Shelley, their selective reception of the influence of foreign literature, their filtering of Prometheus' character, and the Variation process of their endings are all connected to the realistic context while they were being written. Their works could satisfy practical need, as well as solve the actual problem of that time. As an original character in myth, Prometheus was both old and young because he showed new energy whenever and wherever new problems were in a new context of new time.

In some cases, when the realistic context changes, the connotations of literary works also change. *Gulliver's Travels* by Swift was a seriously sarcastic novel against the politics at that time. Swift exposed every kind of social illness in Britain in the eighteenth century by writing Gulliver's fictional travels, including the fighting between the Tory Party and the Whig Party, frequent warfare towards other countries,

and pseudoscience. It showed the writer's sarcasm and introspection of some problems in the Enlightenment. But when the novel was translated and introduced to other countries, because of the change of the context, what aroused people's interest was only the strange and uncanny experience of Gulliver in Brobdingnag and Lilliput. It even turned into a relaxing and interesting children's book.

4.1.2 *Linguistic Translation*

It is translation, a special intermediary, that allows mutual influence to happen among different national literatures. Every language is a system that carries special national cultural connotations, so the transformation among languages cannot be totally equivalent. The code-switching process is sure to cause some addition, Variation, distortion, and transformation. Meanwhile, the translator cannot be totally faithful to the original work in understanding because of his or her "Vorstruktur" or "Vorsicht." As a result, the cultural filtering caused by translation is not a dispensable element but the primary issue which must be considered when literature spreads between two languages.

Translation has been beyond the scope of linguistics in the background of current cultural studies, which has some features of hermeneutics, ideology, discourse power, etc. Steiner, a British scholar, pointed out the viewpoint that "understanding is translation" in his book *After Babel: Aspects of Language and Translation*, and he indicated that "the reason we could maintain our civilization is that we have learned to translate thing in the past" [4]. It means that translation is not merely transformation between languages. Translation first refers to understanding and explanation, which are the understanding and explanation of one nation of its history as well as the understanding and explanation of a translator on another nation's life, status, and value system reflected in original literature.

According to hermeneutics, it is impossible to be absolutely "faithful and accurate" towards the original work in the process of understanding and translation. Meanwhile, Variation is inevitable. Hermeneutics originated from traditional exegetics, whose goal is to understand the original work accurately and objectively by eliminating misunderstanding. But according to Heidegger's point of view, the so-called accurate and objective understanding does not exist. He looked on understanding from the standpoint of ontology rather than methodology. He thought understanding is the basic mode of the existence of "Dasein," which means the basic mode of human existence. As a result, understanding is not an issue of methodology but an issue with the ontological nature of "Dasein." The historicity of human existence determines that understanding is a historical activity, which is always restricted by "Vorstruktur." The so-called purely objective understanding which is beyond time and history does not exist. Gadamer also pointed out that the meaning of the text was not the original meaning given by the author, but was "always codetermined by the historical environment of the interpreter and even all of the objective historical processes" [5]. Because of the historicity of understanding, the translator, as the

first reader of the original work, cannot get rid of the influence of “Vorsicht” or “Vorstruktur” to gain an accurate and objective understanding of the original work. Roland Barthes claimed that “the writer is dead,” and the readers and translators have gained unprecedented autonomy, which makes filtering and Variation inevitable in the translation process.

The translation theory of deconstruction, represented by Venuti, Gentzler, Paul de Man, and Eugene Eoyang, further denies the existence of the ultimate meaning of text and thoroughly clears up the principles of “fidelity” and “accuracy” in traditional translation theory. Derrida interpreted linguistic notation as “trace.” He thought that every linguistic notation is not self-sufficient. They are inevitably carrying the trace of other notations and display meanings through comparison and difference from other notations. Kristeva further raised the concept of “intertextuality.” She thought no text is genuinely original; they have to be connected and interacted with other texts, which is the absorption and transformation of other texts. As a result, they are all intertextual. So the meaning of literary text is always beyond the scope of the text itself and is constantly changing and varying in the process with other texts. The translation theory of deconstruction denies there is any certain ultimate meaning of text. The meaning of text is always in the process of transmission and Variation, which spreads in intertexts and notations, so there is no “faithful understanding” of the meaning of the original work, which makes the filtering and Variation in translation inevitable.

The restriction of ideology is an important reason for cultural filtering and Variation of foreign text by a translator. Ideology determines the content and pattern of translation. Lefevere, an American translator, systematically described the two reasons which control the translating process: Ideology and poetics. Lefevere thought that there were one external factor and one internal factor that control literary translation. The internal factor is the professional which consists of literati, translators, and critics, and the external factor is the people or institution that has the authority to “promote and organize” literary translation, which is also called “patronage.” What literati focus on is poetics, and what patronage focuses on is ideology. Patronage, as the spokesman of ideology, uses his or her discourse power to directly intervene in the translating process. However, a translator observes the ideology of one society to exercise the poetics within its boundary [6]. The translation of foreign literary work is always restricted by ideology from the selection of versions and the application of specific translating strategy. In Roman times, the playwrights, represented by Plautus, translated many comedies of ancient Greece, and most of them were new comedies represented by Menander. But the old comedy with high achievement was neglected, represented by Aristophanes, the “Father of Comedy.” This is because the political authorities in Roman times could not tolerate the grotesque style of old comedy which attacked the politics at that time. Meanwhile, comedy of manners (new comedy) based on people’s daily life were widely translated and introduced. Liu He, a Chinese scholar residing in the United States, investigated how individualism, as a discourse strategy, was translated into “Ge Ren Zhu Yi” which participates in the creation of Chinese modern national state theory and challenges the authority of previous “collectivism.” Pierre Brunel pointed out

that the study of translation is the study of the history of reception [7]. The receiver's environment, especially political ideology, is often the "invisible hand" restricting translation.

As a result, cultural filtering and Variation caused by translation express ideology, discourse, and the power behind it. Bell Hooks, a contemporary young American feminist, calls translation "the language of oppressor" and "battlefield." Translation is a kind of "cultural political practice" (said by Venuti) whose collusive relations with imperialism should be paid attention to. Based on that, some Western scholars raised the issue of "linguistic imperialism" in recent years. But in the context of postcolonialism, the travel of the original linguistic culture towards the target language is no longer treated as pureness and naïveté. According to postcolonial translation theory, translation constructs an "asymmetric" power relation between "colonist" and "the colonized" in the postcolonial context, which breeds some colonial words in the original work, such as "rewriting," "violence," "addition," and "diversion." It causes torsion of the identity construction of the colonial subject, as well as the "resistant history" named by Benjamin. Indian English writers do not translate too much Hindi text into English, but they take different measures to make their texts look like translated works. This intentional "stress" or "strangeness" of English language makes reading more difficult, and it clearly shows the colonial texts' resistance against powerful language, as well as writing its cultural identity through this book [8]. So Liu He claims that "Translation is not a neutral activity which is far away from politics, ideological struggle, and conflict of interests. But, it has become the battlefield of these conflicts" [9].

What's more, cultural filtering and Variation are caused by the process of pure code-switching. Russian formalism claims that "form is meaning." The connotative meaning of literary work is always combined with its specific external form, and the external form of literary work itself even has independent meaning. Especially in the postmodern literary creation in Europe and America, the tendency of formalism has reached its limit. Because of language difference, Nida pointed out that translation can only refer to the translation of content, and it is almost impossible to reproduce the shape of the original work in translation. For example, the creation of artistic conception, the exquisite emotion, and the inexpressible charm of the Chinese classical poem "Qi Jue" (a four-line poem with seven characters to a line) and "Qi Lv" (an eight-line poem with seven characters to a line) are strictly connected with their orderly form, resonant rhythm, and the harmony between level and oblique tones. Once they are translated into English, even if the original content can be reproduced, the perfect combination of the natural original content and form cannot present itself. What is lost in the process of code-switching is what really shows the emotion and flavor of a poem. So Robert Frost said, "a poem is what is lost in the process of translation."

As for the conveying of content regardless of form, the transition between "equivalent words" is certain to cause some loss and distortion of content. This is because the cultural information and emotional information of "equivalent words" in the respective national language system and the cultural system are totally different. In this sense, they cannot be entirely corresponding in meaning, and sometimes

their underlying meanings are even completely opposite, which is especially reflected in the loss and distortion of cultural image and the special cultural information it carries in the process of language transformation. Different nations form some special cultural images due to their special geographical environment, cultural traditions, myth and fairy tales, historical events, aesthetic psychology, etc. They are constantly repeated in people's daily language and literary works and form a kind of cultural notation which includes specific cultural meaning and unique emotional atmosphere to arouse people's abundant association. In the same circle of civilization, the specific national history and national emotion behind some cultural images are also lost in translation. Gyogy Rado, a Hungarian translator, gave an example: There is a poem in Hungary called *We Need Mohcs*, but the English translator translated it into *We Need Failure*. Mohcs is a city's name, in which Hungarians came across a disastrous defeat in 1526 and were ruled by Turks since then. So the name "Mohcs" for Hungarians implies the humiliating national history and the feeling of grief of losing their country. The English translator directly translated its original meaning, but the national history and cultural connotation behind these cultural images are lost [10]. Because of the difference of the cultural system and national history, cultural images, and the special emotional information formed by it, we are certain to come across filtering and Variation in translation. From this aspect, code-switching equates to cultural filtering.

4.1.3 *Traditional Culture*

Jin Siyan indicated that "Reception itself is criticism. The receiver selects intentionally or unwittingly in every reception, and cultural framework silently plays the role of filtering in literary reception" [11]. The most important aspect of "cultural framework" is the strong traditional culture of every nation. Traditional culture refers to the worldview, thinking modes, customs and habits, ethics and moral principles, religious beliefs, philosophical ideas, literary types, etc., formed in the long historical development of one nation. As for the literary reception of cross-culture, the traditional culture of the receiver and the nation's collective unconsciousness are playing the role of "Vorsicht" or "Vorstruktur," which restricts the receiving perspective and anticipating view of the receiver. People always interpret another culture according to their own cultural tradition, thinking mode, and everything they know well: "When contacting with another culture, people's original 'field of vision' determines their 'insight' and 'blind point', which determines how they select and incise another culture, as well as how to learn and interpret it" [12]. In general, the homogeneous element of foreign culture which is consistent with their traditional culture can be quickly absorbed, but the heterogeneous element from traditional culture is often shielded or filtered out. The net of traditional culture for standardizing and filtering foreign culture includes national psychology, religious idea, ethics and morality, and literary tradition.

Even in homogeneous civilization, every nation has its special traditional culture, which leads to different kinds of filtering and Variation in cross-cultural literary reception. It becomes very obvious when homogeneous literary type, image, topic, theme, and motif are spreading in different nations.

Genealogy is an important field of Comparative Literature, which research literary categories, the transnational circulation, and evolution of literary genre, as well as the different specialty of homogeneous literary genre in different nations. Every national literature has its own literary type and form, which is called literary genre. Some literary genres are international, which exist in different national literature all around the world. But they have different developing history and characteristics, such as Chinese and Western operas. Some literary genres reflect the factual connection of mutual influence and loan between nations, which have transnational occurrence, development, circulation, and Variation, such as the European sonnet. Some literary genres exist in certain nations' literature, but not in other's, which is called "lack of genre." The difference of literary genres is not merely a literary issue, whose underlying reason is in the traditional culture of every nation. The reason is the development of literary genre is closely connected with its cultural tradition, genealogy, and historical background which breed and cultivate it. The diversities of different nation's cultural tradition not only can cause different Variation of literary genre in the circulation from one nation to another but also can produce the different forms of expression of homogeneous literary genre generated independently in different nations. In the "lack of genre" situation, the difference of cultural tradition is more obvious.

The Western countries all belong to Christian civilization, whose development of literature share the same cultural background and even the same literary process. The literary trend and literary movement since the Renaissance had showed the common development of European literature in every European country. As a result, Western countries' literary form and type often goes beyond the boundary of nations and spreads all around Europe. In the process of transmission, because of different language backgrounds, different cultural backgrounds, and different literary traditions, the homogeneous literary genres often demonstrate different features. Some scholars like Ji Yan researched on the "picaresque novel" which was created in Spain in the sixteenth century since its birth. Its spreading and development in countries like Germany, France, Britain, and America show its development and evolution over the course of hundreds of years, as well as how the foreign influence was filtered and restrained by national traditions and fused together with traditional culture in the evolution of its form and content. The emergence, spreading, development, evolution, and rising and declining of sonnets are a typical example of studies on comparative literary genre. Francois Jost wrote a chapter entitled "Sonnet in Europe" in his book *Introduction to Comparative Literature*, which discusses the development of the sonnet in different European countries and their differences. Jost pointed out that the sonnet was "one of the few terms with a fixed definition" in the history of literature. What he wanted to know is "if the sonnet can be defined without the regard of the nationality and individuality?" [13]. The sonnet was first created in Sicilia in the thirteenth century. It was very popular in Renaissance Italy. Petrarch is

one of the most famous sonnet writers who makes sonnet “achieve artistic perfection and become an important poetic style in European poetry” [14]. The sonnets created by him consist of 14 lines of iambic pentameter, and its rhyme scheme is abba/abba/cde/cde. So this form of sonnet is called “Petrarchan.” In the sixteenth century when the sonnet was spreading to Britain, British writers like Shakespeare changed the strophic structure and rhyming style of the Italian sonnet. Shakespeare’s sonnets consist of three “quatrains” and a couplet, which form the arrangement of “4442.” The last pair of couplet is usually used for revealing the theme, so it is often the aphorism of the whole sonnet. Its rhyming style is abab/cdcd/efef/gg. This kind of sonnet is called “Shakespearean.” The reason why the British changed the strophic structure and rhyming style (increasing the number of tail vowel from 5 to 7) of the Italian sonnet is closely related to their national language and literary traditions. English has more divisive vowels than romance language, which gives more rhymes to English sonnet. If writing sonnets according to Italian style, people will face extra obstacles in writing due to a lack of abundant rhymes. As for the transformation of strophic structure which turns two three-lined stanzas into quatrains and a couplet like satirical poem, it is related to the situation that the British mixed up sonnets with epigrams 100 years after Petrarch. When the sonnet was spreading in European countries, its strophic structure and rhyming style were changing with the national languages and literary traditions of different nations. The Variation of literary genre is also closely related to the cultural traditions of different nations. France, Germany, Russia, and America also have sonnets with their respective characteristics. Therefore, Jost had to come to this conclusion: In consideration of the spread of sonnets in various countries, there is one point for sure, that is, there are 14 lines in one of them [13].

Thematology in the studies of Comparative Literature refers to the transnational spreading and evolution of homogeneous topic, motif, and theme. The essence of the French school traces the origin and influence of theme, and the American school does purely aesthetic comparison without restricting to the relations between facts and influence. And its purpose is to research both the management and reasons of Variation of homogeneous topic, motif, and theme by different writers from different nations and countries. The traditional culture, in which the writers live, is often the important reason for Variation.

Chinese Yuan drama *Das Waisenkind* came to Europe in the eighteenth century, which aroused a strong response in European cultural circles of different countries. There were both strong praise and intense objection, and even several kinds of adaptations appeared in European countries, which brought forth huge influence on European culture. The differentiation of receiving *Das Waisenkind* by different European countries provides evidence for researching the traditional cultures and national psychology of different nations. French critic Marquis D’Argens first criticized *Das Waisenkind* in detail. He criticized it by claiming that it was against the basic principle of neoclassicism—“the three unities.” The setting of the play extends over 20 years, and there are several transitions of places, which was entirely against the principle of “the unities of action, time, and place.” Secondly, he claimed *Das Waisenkind* is against the pure style of classical opera and “the tradition of

appropriate wording” because there are violent and disturbing scenes which are not suitable on stage, but can only be recounted afterwards. Voltaire’s adaptation “Chinese Orphan” changed the time span of the original opera from more than 20 years to one night, to make it correspond to “the three unities.” He also added a love story based on the original opera. In the opera, Genghis Khan is a king with supreme power who is cruel to the Hans. He is also an amorous knight who cannot forget a romance years ago, and his love for Shang De’s wife finally sublimates into the admiration of Chinese traditional morality and civilization represented by her. Contrary to the negative and critical attitudes of French critics, English critic Herder positively reviewed “Das Waisenkind.” He thought “Das Waisenkind” was similar to the ancient Greek tragedy *Electra* in plot, emotion, structure, and layout. English playwright Murphy also recomposed *Chinese Orphan*. He criticized that the plot of Genghis Khan’s proposing to Shang De’s wife in Voltaire’s adaptation is very abrupt, because it changes a wild and heroic Tartar king into a French knight who is only concerned with love, which is not corresponding with the whole opera. In Murphy’s adaptation, Genghis Khan is a truculent conqueror from the beginning to the end. It ends with the victory of the Hans after their persevere fighting against the Tartar’s invasion.

The reason for different responses and different adaptations of *Das Waisenkind* by Britain and France is their different national traditional culture. France is the center of neoclassicism, which has great influence on French culture. *Das Waisenkind* was severely criticized in France because it was not corresponding to “the three unities” and the pure style of classical opera. France has been the homeland of chivalric literature since the middle ages, and the free expression of love between men and women by Provençal medieval lyric poetry in feudal times has been lauded by Engels. Therefore, Genghis Khan in the adaptation of Voltaire has dual characteristics of a barbaric conqueror and an amorous knight in France where chivalric culture is very popular with prominent Romanticism in national culture. But in Britain, the influence of classicism and the tendency of Romanticism in national culture are comparably feeble. Therefore, “*Das Waisenkind*” has not received severe criticism in Britain, and Genghis Khan has always been an invader without the appearance of the amorous knight. The spirit of fighting against invasion and the seeking for freedom in the background of the war between Britain and France have influenced Murphy’s opera, which eulogizes the persistent fighting of the Hans against the wildling attack led by Genghis Khan.

4.1.4 Recipient’s Individual Acceptance Screen

From the aspect of reception aesthetics, literary text is a “response-inviting structure” which is full of “blanks” and “uncertain points.” Only when readers fill these blanks and unfixed points according to their understanding and imagination to make them “materialized” can the art works be finally completed. As Eagleton pointed out, “readers are not innocent and never contact with previous literature and society as a

cultural virgin to a work. A reader is not the justified spirit or a piece of blank paper to let work carve its inscription" [15]. The "expectation horizon" and "acceptance screen" preexistent in a reader's mind play the role of restriction and filtering in the understanding and filling process of the uncertain points of text. The expectation horizon refers to a kind of "cultural prestructure," which is *Vorhabe*, *Vorsicht*, and *Vorgriff*, preexistent in a reader's mind before he or she reads the text. In fact, it is the preexisting standpoint, view, aesthetic standard, and selecting standard of translator that exist before reading the work. The "acceptance screen" based on it determines which foreign text would be accepted and which text would be rejected by the reader.

The receiver's individual acceptance screen is closely related to his or her traditional culture, which is the specific and miniature expression of "prestructure" of national acceptance formed by traditional culture. In the writing process, the writer always has "ideal readers" in his mind who he or she writes for and who understands his work's connotation. His work provides potential expectation horizon. When the text arrives in another nation after cultural travel, it is brought into a totally different cultural value system which is not expected by the writer in the first place. When receiving foreign works, the receiving subject always recreates the works according to the cultural psychological structure and appreciative habits and gives new cultural connotation to the works. The receiver's traditional culture applies influence on receiver's expectation horizon and acceptance screen as collective unconsciousness. It is obvious that the more cultural difference among different nations, the much easier to see the restriction of acceptance screen and the misplacement of expectation horizon, as well as to cause cultural filtering and national Variation in the artistic receiving process, which is especially obvious in the cultural receiving process between Eastern and Western heterogeneous civilization.

Even in the homogeneous circle of civilization with common cultural traditions and national cultural psychology, the differences of readers' view of life, value system, cultural accomplishment, knowledge background, and aesthetic interest formed by different life experiences can also cause different acceptance screens, which produce different cultural filtering and literary Variation of the text's artistic image and aesthetic connotation in different readers' mind.

Pierre Brunel said, "in the same period, classical Voltaire and romantic Le Tourneur may not have the same attitude towards Shakespeare" [7]. Facing the same Shakespeare, Voltaire and Le Tourneur—both readers and interpreters of Shakespeare's work—reflected, filtered, and altered Shakespeare's work differently according to their different aesthetic interests, artistic accomplishment, and value standpoints. It is well known that Shakespeare is a romanticist in spirit. The passionate emotion and the mixed and unrestrained artistic expression embody the core of romantic aesthetics. The Romanticists in the nineteenth century used Shakespeare as a weapon to fight against classicism. But Voltaire was a faithful follower of classicism, whose aesthetic standpoint was totally against Romanism. Facing the horrifying and bloody spectacles of Shakespeare's works and the use of some vulgar and coarse words, Voltaire could not accept them because of his pure classical aesthetic interest. Because ancient Greek tragedy always avoids horrifying and bloody spectacles and

uses lofty and majestic language, in Voltaire's opinion, Shakespeare is "a ridiculous writer of slapstick comedy." What's more, with the superiority of French national culture, Voltaire had a great preconception of British people who were thought to be vulgar and coarse and lack education, and he thought French people were "gentle, cultivated, and well-behaved." This preconception is obviously revealed in his book *Letters Concerning the English Nation* which describes his life in Britain when he was exiled there. Voltaire described Shakespeare as a "drunken savage" whose works are full of "broad and strange thoughts." His translation of Shakespeare's works in which he wanted to "reveal the rudeness of Shakespeare in spontaneously great anger" emphasizes the horrifying and vulgar side of Shakespeare's works, while the lofty and poetic side was neglected or shielded. The effect of translation is self-evident. On the contrary, as a Romanticist, Le Tourneur's aesthetic interest completely corresponded to Shakespeare's artistic style, so he had underlying affection for Shakespeare. He translated Shakespeare's works and claimed that "he wanted to share Shakespeare's works with people of his time to make them love him." Shakespeare's translated works with his emotion, understanding, and artistic recreation are totally different from Voltaire's translation, which creates a well-known saying in the French literary circle: "A world ended with Voltaire, and another world started with Le Tourneur" [10]. It is obvious that the acceptance screen formed by a reader's artistic interest and aesthetic standpoint can have an underlying influence on their reception, filtering, and Variation of foreign literary works.

A reader's worldview, value of life, and the strong personal understanding of social phenomenon and moral issues formed by them often help to form a specific acceptance screen, which restricts a reader's filtering and Variation of literary works. Russian writer Turgenev created the famous character Luoting who is a "fifth wheel" according to his thorough understanding of the important issue that noble intellectuals separated themselves from people in the Russian Liberation Movement. These intellectuals were influenced by the advanced thinking of Western European Enlightenment, but they could not completely get rid of the ingrained bad habits of noblesse. They would not take sides with the government, nor could they integrate with common people, so they became the "fifth wheel" without any belonging. When the Russian writer with underlying understanding and experience of the "fifth wheel" came across Shakespeare's *Hamlet*, his specific acceptance screen completely filtered out the advanced connotation of Hamlet as a humanist but projected his strong social views on Hamlet as a receiver. He compared Hamlet with the "fifth wheel" of Russian society and came to the conclusion that "Hamlet is a self-centered egoist who is not a useful person to the public, and he is a lecher who doesn't love Ophelia and represents 'negativism' just like Mephisto" [16]. Turgenev's filtering and Variation of Hamlet's image according to his specific acceptance screen were obviously unanticipated for Shakespeare, the creator of the image.

In sum, cultural filtering is the primary and necessary process as for cross-cultural literary reception. It is the instinct of self-protection in different nations' cultural environment, as well as the initiative result of selection by the receiving subject based on the underlying internal needs. Cultural filtering has a complex mechanism of filtering, in which realistic context, linguistic factors, traditional

culture, and the receiver's individual acceptance screen are the main elements, as well as the control of publishing market, governmental policy, etc. These elements that cause cultural filtering are inalienable, which often act as a whole. It is essential to study cultural filtering to research the features of national culture in every nation, to research the different characteristics and historical needs of different times, as well as to reveal the Variation mechanism in cross-cultural literary reception.

4.2 Literary Misreading and Literary Variation

The theory of literary misreading comes from the West, which is an influential literary theory in the West, and is applied in Comparative Literature. Therefore, the theory of literary misreading is an academic theory and a theory of Comparative Literature in homogeneous civilizations.

Literary misreading and literary Variation are not contemporary phenomena. However, this phenomenon is full of specialty of the times when it is discussed with the issues of cultural communication and cultural consilience. The historical evolution of studies on literary misreading and literary Variation, the underlying reason for the occurrence of literary misreading and literary Variation, and their possible constructive value and significance are all starting points of studies on literary misreading and literary Variation. The most important point which should not be neglected is the possible value anomie and cultural crisis on mutual trust caused by literary misreading and Variation when studying on the constructing process of creative significance brought by literary misreading and Variation. As a result, the maintenance and promotion of cultural environment should also be the key points in literary studies.

4.2.1 Conceptual Generation and Research Diversion of Literary Misreading and Literary Variation

Studies on literary misreading and literary Variation have experienced the developing process from a ubiquitous literary phenomenon to an emphasis in the field of Comparative Literature and then to the construction of related literary theoretical system.

With the active promotion of a series of postmodern critical theories in the twentieth century, the phenomenon of literary misreading started to step into the field of literary text studies and became the focus of discussion driven by the critical upsurge of literary hermeneutics and reception theories. Harold Bloom, an American art and literature theorist, used and interpreted the concept of "misreading" for the first time in his work *The Anxiety of Influence* in 1975. He emphasized that there would be no creative achievement in poetic art if there is no history of the functions of misreading. Although Bloom's "misreading" emphasizes the creation and deduction

of text meaning in the vertical level of history, it is still obvious to see that the phenomenon has changed people's tendency to pursue unilateral objectification of text meaning in the past, which reflects the transformation among literary texts from influencing each other one-dimensionally into highlighting multidimensional Variation.

Similarly, studies on literary Variation also start from researching it as a ubiquitous literary phenomenon. Variation is first a biological concept which refers to one of the attributes of organisms, showing the difference between parental generation and filial generation. Because the difference in genetic relationship gives great conceptual reference to studies on Variation phenomenon in the process of literary heritage, people use the concept to interpret the transformation of difference between influence-related literary texts originating in the process of literary development. For example, the modern Variation of traditional aesthetic consciousness, the spread and Variation of folktales, and the heritage and Variation of literary forms are all hot topics to discuss and research for a long term in academic fields. It is clear to see that studies on literary misreading and literary Variation have certain similarities from the aspect of conceptual origination. In the two fields of studies, it is realized that there are certain differences among literary texts with broad influencing relations. The formation of differences sometimes is caused by unintentional transformation and grafting and sometimes by intentional innovation and creation. The formation of differences releases the constituent space of the original text's meaning to some extent, which facilitates more abundant and multiplex fields and promotes the derivation and development of literature.

The communication and conversation of global culture in the twentieth century have entered a brand-new phase. With the rise and development of Comparative Literature, the discussion about literary misreading and literary Variation also is gradually developing in the cross-cultural sight from the end of the twentieth century. Yue Daiyun said, "Because of cultural difference, misreading is inevitable when two kinds of culture contact. Misreading is reading and understanding certain culture according to people's cultural tradition, mode of thinking, and all the things they know well of. In general, people can only know the world according to their own mode of thinking. When connecting with another culture, people's original 'field of vision' determines their 'insight' and 'blind point', which determines how they select and incise another culture, as well as how they learn and interpret it. Therefore, it is wrong to demand foreigners to understand Chinese culture as 'authentically' as Chinese people, vice versa. It is also wrong to condemn misreading as 'misunderstanding', 'distortion' or 'intolerableness.'" [17] Literary misreading based on cultural communication and collision has more force of impact, because the boundary of culture is broken down, and different cultural forms and the spiritual core are reinspected and rediscussed in today's historical context of globalization. The opposition between strong culture and weak culture is involved in the collision of different cultures, especially between cultures which are full of essential differences, which cause profound and complex conversation in cross-cultural communication. From this aspect, literary misreading is indeed "the inevitable result of the collision of different national cultures, and a common and outstanding phenomenon

after world culture develops from closeness to communication and conversation” [18]. Literary misreading is inevitable, but the influence caused by literary misreading also has a different intersection in different situations. On the one hand, cultural centralism in the process of globalization anticipates a universal cultural view which is broadly influential. On the other hand, some marginalized cultures expect to regain their vitality and energy in the process of opening further. As a result, different cultural forces project their thinking of value in a series of cultural conversations, which leads to different forms of literary misreading among different cultures. As for the effect and significance of literary misreading, even if the function of literary misreading may cause some idealistic deviations and fallacies because of the existence of some prejudice of values and cultural conflicting factors, it must be observed that “misreading often promotes cultural development. [...] Misreading is inevitable when the subjective culture absorbs new ideas from the objective culture, as well as when the subjective culture reflects itself from the standpoint of the objective culture” [17]. So literary misreading is always related to the key issues about how to promote the rational development of the cultural environment since it enters the field of cross-cultural comparison.

The same as literary misreading, studies on literary Variation are also gradually turning to Comparative Literature in the field of cross-culture in recent years, which emphasize the fact of Variation in studies of literary communication based on cultural interaction. In *The Study of Comparative Literature* published in 2005, the author proposed the concept of Variation studies in China for the first time: “the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature explores the internal regularity of literary phenomenon of Variation by researching the situation about Variation in the communication among different nations’ literary phenomena, which uses Variation and literariness as its subject fulcrum” [19]. Studies on Variation include the underlying realization of the cultural traits contained in the original text as well as the active research of the cultural motivation, historical context, and ideological background hidden in the transformed text in the practical process of the filtering and Variation of the original text by the text-importing country. In this way, the platform of interaction and conversation is built in the text studying process, which enables participation in the text construction of both sides in the text communication process. In cross-cultural literary communication, it is not only necessary to investigate the culture and historical context based on how the receiver creatively understands the original text but also necessary to investigate the cultural traits behind the original text. The chance for fusion of horizons can only be achieved in the perspective of knowing themselves and each other. Because literary Variation is a new research direction in the field of Comparative Literature, the “new” posture of literary Variation may also cause deviation after the Variation of cultural value. Therefore, the purpose of reflection on literary Variation is the same as studies on literary misreading. It tries to amplify the specific process of communication and influence in cross-cultural literary conversation, as well as to analyze a series of new thinking on value in literary transplantation by realizing the literary receiving mentality in different cultural backgrounds in different times, in order to promote mutual trust of literary communication and to promote the creative development of literature.

4.2.2 The Reason for Literary Misreading and Literary Variation

The studies on literary misreading and literary Variation both refer to the resultant force of the selection, recreation, transplantation and infiltration, and transformation of literary text in the process of cross-cultural literary transmission and reception. They both highlight cultural visage and the subjective position of the receiver and seek the genuinely open conversation and creative textual construction among different cultures. To thoroughly and entirely observe the specific process of the formation of literary misreading and literary Variation, it is necessary to research the main reasons for their formation. The construction of the meaning of literary text consists of four parts: The writer, the text, the reader, and the medium. Specific to cross-cultural literary misreading and literary Variation, what is also closely related to these four parts are the irreplicability and irreducibility of authorial intention, the openness and aesthetics of literary text, the individual subjectivity and cultural dominancy of literary reception, and the specialty of historical context in literary transmission. As for the first aspect, the meaning of literary text is a breakthrough in writer-centered theory. In the past, people used authorial intention as standard when they were pursuing the objective value of the text. In fact, many thinkers throughout history have realized that once the literary text is produced, the one-dimensional meaning of the writer faces the reality of deconstruction.

One of the founders of New Criticism, W. K. Wimsatt also has raised the concept of “intentional fallacy.” In his opinion, “the writer’s meditation or intention is neither an applicative standard, nor an ideal standard to measure whether a literary work is successful or not” [20]. The writer’s intention is not the final work. There is a great distance between the intention and the realization of it. A majestic intention is not always leading to a majestic work, and an accidental intention may produce a monumental work. On the other hand, the experience and intention of the writer cannot be totally reflected in his work. In other words, it is not necessary to copy and restore the writer’s intention when facing a work, because the meaning of the work itself is far beyond the writer’s original intention. Even if Chuang-Tzu and W. K. Wimsatt’s points of view are totally different, it is not difficult to find that they both raised an underlying query of writer-centered theory. As for text reading in cross-cultural context, literary misreading and literary Variation receive benefits from receiver’s conscious avoiding of the closed view of writer-centered theory to some extent, which tries to give understanding itself transcendent pursuit of value.

Second, the literary text itself is a huge field of meaning. As the linguistic system of aesthetics, it often creates more sensitive space for realization, which is impossible and unnecessary to build absolute objectivity of value. Because of the specific diversity of value aesthetics conveyed by literary works, Jonathan Culler held that it is impossible to restore the objectivity of the original text in the literary receiving and reading process. What’s more, the literary text has to be translated in the process of cross-cultural literary transmission, and the process of translation makes the original text go through value transformation. French scholar Robert Escarpit

thought translation is a kind of “creative rebellion” in his work *Sociology of Literature* in 1987. Therefore, the aesthetic diversity of literary text is certain to bring enormous space to literary misreading and literary Variation.

Third, the existing value and meaning of literary text are not only determined by the text’s preexisting objectivity. The participation and construction of the receiver’s subjectivity become the explorer and pioneer to discover the potential value of literary text, which directly causes literary misreading and literary Variation. The upsurge of literary hermeneutics, which was started by Heidegger and Gadamer in the twentieth century, has changed people’s habitual mode of understanding. They emphasize that understanding is not to master the unchangeable fact and meaning of the text but to understand and approach the potentiality and possibility of human existence, to reveal the possibility of existence which the text presents. Gadamer considers hermeneutics as a vertical extension of historical meanings, as well as a synchronic conversation and collision in his theory of fusion of horizons which refers to the mutual exploration and inspiration among the subjects in hermeneutic activities. Hermeneutics has provided an excellent perspective to think of the meaning of cross-cultural text interpretation. The text receiver’s subjective value reconstructs the meaning of text in two aspects: One is the receiver’s personal experience, interest, accomplishment, ideality, etc., which come together as a potential aesthetic expectation influencing the formation of textual meanings, as well as an appreciative demand and ability of literary works. The other aspect is the value system, religion, and thinking habits of the cross-cultural receiver which are hidden in the process of text interpretation as a kind of cultural gene and form the specific “cultural prestructure” of the receiving field which directly influence the formation of literary misreading and literary Variation.

Fourth, the element of transmission, which exists as a medium, is an important and indispensable element between literary text and literary receivers. Every literary text is facing corresponding ideological challenges and is tested by certain social values in a certain historical background in the cross-cultural process of transmission. These constitute the specific historical context of literary transmission, which influence the formation of literary misreading and literary Variation to some extent.

4.2.3 The Value and Dynamic Formation of Studies on Literary Misreading and Literary Variation

It is a derivation process of gradually releasing value extension throughout philosophical cognizant beings from premodern logocentrism to postmodern multiple deconstructionism. The construction process of literary text in an open meaning is synchronous with this process. At first people emphasized the restraining relations of literary meaning by the writer, proposed to give back the central position to the original text, and restored the original context when the text was created, in order to explore the historical condition for the formation of the text, as well as to reproduce the original intention of the writer when he was creating the text. However, the

proposition of “the writer is dead” started to change the formation system of traditional textual meanings just like the proposition of “God is dead.” The receiver’s subjectivity and the dominance of propagating context disrupt the dualistic antagonistic relations between the writer and the reader in traditional aspect. What’s more, the translinguistic and cross-cultural transmission of the text further amplifies the difference of the existing conditions among different cultures in the process of globalization. Historical vertical evolution and cultural horizontal comparison have both strengthened the cultural gene and historical context caused by literary misreading and literary Variation. Therefore, to some extent, the inevitability of literary misreading and literary Variation in textual transmission among different cultures has been gradually realized. More and more scholars promote the active constructing function of literary misreading and literary Variation to the development of literature led by “creative rebellion.” But too much is as bad as too little when the subjective value of cross-cultural textual transmission is paid attention to; whether literary misreading and literary Variation would become a formalized flub dub is another cultural reflective question to be born in people’s mind, as well as whether the excessive release of literary textual meanings would turn the reception of text into absolute freedom without discernible boundaries. A more important question is how to promote the integration and communication among heterogeneous cultures by the transformation and creation of the textual value in cross-cultural context without destroying the original value of civilizations. These questions refer to the hidden crisis of literary misreading and literary Variation, whose key point is to eliminate the possible value animus and conflicts among civilizations caused by literary misreading and literary Variation.

From the view of cross-culture, literary misreading and literary Variation are hoped to release their creative value and meaning to enhance mutual understanding in cross-cultural communication and conversation, to fulfill their cultural needs, as well as to sublimate meaning in a current context. To achieve these goals, first, cultural bias must be eliminated. In the process of cross-cultural literary transmission, the conversation between different cultures often faces a complex state of mind in which cultural pessimism and cultural optimism are self-contradictory. On one hand, with the emergence of economic globalization which is once labeled as “universalism,” the status of national traditional culture is thought to be in danger, which may be marginalized at any time. On the other hand, cultural globalization promotes the communication among different nations and regions and enters a broader view of cultural communication. Therefore, the proposal of an overarching renaissance of different national culture begins to reveal the tendency of cultural egocentrism with the active support of cultural relativism. In fact, the same cultural crux is hidden behind the two cultural mentalities that seem contradictory, which is the cultural complex of “monism.” People show concern about the fact that “universalism” may drag them to the deadlock of cultural colonialism, while they cannot help themselves to fall into the mire of conservatism driven by the motive to protect their national culture. These two tendencies might both become a great obstacle affecting the achievements of cultural communication. Just as some scholars have pointed out, “one of the core issues of the interpretation of literary text which is necessary

to work out is the issue of the relations of self and the other, which refers to how the self communicates with the other. If self-examination is to ensure self-identity, the introspection of the common criterion between self and the other is to designate the difference between self-criticism and the other. The relation between self and the other is not a simple and thorough discrepancy, but the unification of identity and diversity. It is the diversity based on identity as well as the identity based on diversity. It refers to not only self and the other, but also the entire human society.” [21] Therefore, it is necessary to abandon the polarized mentality of monistic centrism when thinking about the issues of how to construct an equal bridge of utterance in cultural communication, how to step into the cultural future of value sharing in cross-cultural conversation, as well as how to promote the balanced development of cultural ecosystem while maintaining cultural diversity. In this way, it is applicable to eliminate the false and retain the true between creatively promoting new features of literature and producing cultural conflicts to rationally construct the textual meaning of literary misreading and literary Variation.

On the other hand, studies on literary misreading and literary Variation from a cross-cultural perspective use dynamic historical dimensionality as a coordinate of textual meanings in order to further promote self-examination and universal acknowledgment. Therefore, fundamentally, the value of original text should not be measured according to an objective standard, and the actual performance after misreading and Variation should not be admired as a sacred achievement, because any self-realization of value may lead to self-captivity. Just as some scholars say when analyzing the transplanting process of cross-cultural literature, “the important question is not whether we have ‘misread’ others’ theories, but is the historical motive, specific pertinence, historical connotation (the loss, emphasis, and paraphrase of the original theories) and historical effect of ‘taking in’ some theories. In a word, it is important to inspect the things that are different from the ‘original’ ones after ‘taking them in’” [22]. From this aspect, literary misreading and literary Variation of different culture mutually refer to each other as a mirror to reflect themselves by tracing back to the historical context of transformation and development, as well as by revealing the collision of the culture essence of difference in textual receiving process, in order to achieve real cultural development and the benign cultural ecological balance. This dynamic view of cultural generation is the essence of meanings in studies on literary misreading and literary Variation.

4.3 The First Establishment of Cross-Cultural Variation Theory: The Theory of Imagology of Comparative Literature

Many people hold misunderstandings towards the concept of Imagology as is the case for the concepts of Comparative Literature. Generally speaking, readers consider Imagology as the study of personal images, public images, corporate images, etc. Actually, they have confused Imagology with the related content of public relations.

Some people mistakenly believe that Imagology is the analysis of the characters in literary works, which confuses the content of literary theories and literary criticism with Comparative Literature. Imagology—or more accurately the Imagology of Comparative Literature—is a study of foreign images in a nation's literature, including foreign and exotic characters, objects, and natural scenery in historical documents and literary works. Since the day when it was founded, Imagology has failed to solve the problems of some fundamental issues. For instance, the foreign images of textual meaning are sometimes far away from their history in reality and historical documents. Moreover, the foreign images accepted and restored by readers during the reading process also differ from those created by the writers. But these problems cannot be reasonably interpreted according to traditional theories of Imagology. The explanations concerning the authenticity of images presented by contemporary Imagology are also unconvincing. From creation to acceptance, the communication process of foreign images consists of a series of variations, mainly referring to the variations of textual images compared with those in reality during the literarization of images, followed by the variations of images during socialization and interpretation compared with those in literary works. It is believed that the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature should be resorted to when one tries to scientifically illustrate the authenticity and Variation of foreign images.

4.3.1 *Definition and Characteristics*

Imagology is an important branch of Comparative Literature, which mainly focuses on the creation process and principles of foreign images in a nation's literary works and analyzes the social psychology, periodical background, and underlying cultural meanings presented during the communication process. Alongside Comparative Literature during the whole establishment and development procedures, Imagology was founded by the French Comparative Literature master Jean-Marie Carré and then received further development under the efforts from Guyard, Pageaux, Moura, Dyserink, and Brunel, and now it has reached the stage of the emerging frontier of Comparative Literature. These pioneers expressed in their works the interpretations and illustrations of Imagology, which also reflected the trajectory of the formation of this subject, such as Pageaux's *Formes et imaginaire du roman: perspectives sur le roman antique, médiéval, classique, moderne et contemporain*, *Images du Portugal dans les lettres françaises*, *La littérature générale et comparée*, and Moura's *L' image du Tiers Monde dans le roman français contemporain*. Afterwards, along with the unlimited expansion of the research field, narrow-minded nationalism strengthened national literature, which is contrary to the overall goals of world literature; therefore, this phenomenon received criticism from scholars such as the French scholar Etiemble. Ever since the 1980s, Imagology has been reinvigorated by new ideas, new methods, and theories of modernist and postmodernist literary criticism from the field of the social science in the humanities, which has aroused the interests of many people to renew their understandings towards Imagology. Thus, this subject has even become a hot topic within the field of Comparative Literature.

Traditional Imagology only concerns the textual criticism of documents that have the factual influence relationship. It is primarily concerned with whether the textual images are faithful or not compared with the history or realities of the targeting country. However, due to the limits of psychological factors, images themselves are just trivial, messy, and unsystematic fragments. “Images” refer to “something imagined,” which can also be called “mirages” or “collective imaginations.” These subjective mirages have already endured a series of variations, influenced by the composition of writers and the subjective factors of readers while reading them; thus, it is not easy to apply to empirical study. The studies of traditional Imagology are essentially seeking common ground, with the purpose of exploring to what extent literary works reflect history and realities. During the communication process, foreign images experience “dual variations” as comparing the typical with the prototype and the restored images and the textual images. For instance, the angry birds with staring eyes under the brushes of Bada Shanren (pseudonym of Zhu Da, a famous painter of the Ming Dynasty of China) are variations from birds in nature; the phenomena of “There are a thousand Hamlets in a thousand people’s eyes” are the variations as the readers accept it. As it is concerned, the production of images is the process of reoccurrence, reflection, and even presentation. It is not necessary to seek for traces of the differences between literary images and their prototype and between foreign images and realities, because variations are inevitable. It is the writers that should be paid attention to, especially how these composing subjects literalize foreign images—how to watch, create, and shape foreign images. At the same time, the interactions between the images of “self” and “the other” should be of concentration as well as highlight and reflect issues of the “self” by the “otherness.” The importance of examining the relationship between “otherness” images and “otherness” reality lies in the watcher, his/her cultural patterns, and the exploration towards the influential factors of the creation, development, and dissemination of such cultural patterns.

French scholar Moura once pointed out that images can be interpreted in three ways: “All the images studied by literary Imagology are those in three different senses: the exotic image, the national (social, cultural) image and the image created by a certain writer with his special feelings” [23]. In short, images are the understandings and descriptions towards the social and cultural realities of foreign countries and also the mixture of emotions and thoughts. The study of Imagology tries to understand to what extent and for what reasons have images deviated the original “otherness.” Since images are related to imagination, it does not matter whether they refer to the reality or not. As has been pointed out by Pageaux, “The image in terms of Comparative Literature, which is not the exact copy of reality (or analogue), is restructured and rewritten on the basis of observers’ accepting procedures in their culture. These models and programs are pre-stored before the image is formed.” The notions of “reorganization” and “rewriting” actually imply the meaning and results of “changing” and “transforming.” Then how exactly have such “changing” and “transforming” happened? As is mentioned above, images are the mixture of knowledge and imagination, as well as the mixture of emotions and thoughts. With a writer as the medium, images project collective imagination towards foreign

countries onto certain objects. And then images help express the desire of such collective imaginations in the form of visualization, which concerns the desire for the ideal paradigm of certain society, culture, and ideology.

Currently, the study of Imagology inclines to put writers into the status of researching subject, not the authenticity of related objects. Such changes in direction benefit from the theory of the imagination initiated by Paul Ricoeur. Moura once illustrated the authenticity of images on the research achievements of the theory of imagination. Hume attributed imagined objects to traces of sensations, which Ricoeur called “reproductive imagination” in his work *Du Texte A L'action*. Sartre considered the imagined objects as “basically conceived according to the absence” [23], which Ricoeur called “creative imagination.” Being put under the background of Imagology, “reproductive imagination” illustrates foreign images as the replica of that country perceived by the general public, whereas “creative imagination” supposes that foreign images in literary works are not primarily being understood or perceived but being presented or created. While Ricoeur believed that foreign images can be summarized into two categories—the ideologized and the utopianized—in most cases, they are at the point between these two extremes. Indeed, the images of “otherness” are not entirely representations but the mixture of subjectivity and objectivity or the mixture of emotions and thoughts. The process of the production of these images of “otherness,” which deviate from objective existence, is the Variation process of the historical and cultural realities of “otherness” based on the cultural conceptions and models of the producers or observers. Pageaux suggests that the images of “otherness” are “the total interpretation of exotic not only in the process of literaturizing, but also in the process of socializing” [23]. By saying “literaturizing,” Pageaux refers to the issues of the imagination and creation of images. By saying “socializing,” Pageaux refers to the issues of the reception and collective imagination of images. By saying “totality,” Pageaux refers to the issues of the comprehensive factors of image formation.

Foreign images are generated during the interactions between literature and culture. Therefore, to thoroughly understand and illustrate the characteristics of the images of “otherness,” it is a must to place them back to the formative context of their social, historical, and cultural background. This expanded “new perspective requires researchers to not only consider literary text and its production and dissemination conditions, but also take into account all the cultural materials people use while writing, thinking, and living” [23]. Thus, text analysis, which considers images as fully self-sufficient research objects, is questioned, because images are not only writers’ personal observation and interpretation of foreign culture but also the acceptance, selection, filtering, and illustration based on different cultures. That is to say, while examining the issue of images, there should not be limitations in terms of text, rhetoric, or discourse, but put the images of “otherness” into an overall analytical framework, which examines both the images of “otherness” out of literary text and the production, dissemination, and reception conditions of those images. In this way, more substantial material and evidence will be added to the realm of literary research, which will further initiate the intersections between literary research and the research of other fields within the humanities and social sciences.

Images can be connected with their generation conditions via interdisciplinary studies; moreover, through the studies towards such connections, all those close but complex relationships between writers and collective imagination can be found.

The focus of the studies on the images of “otherness” lies in the observers and their cultural patterns and also lies in the exploration for the reasons of the generation, development, dissemination, and influence of such patterns. The heroine in *Turandot*, created by Schiller, holds ideas towards the concepts of freedom, oppression, and self-value, which are already bold enough to men in the authoritarian China at that time, not to mention to women. Thus, “the historical background while understanding *Turandot* should be with respect to the European intellectual history instead of historical China” [24]. Therefore, it is not so much the realistic needs formed during the historical and cultural development of the Western world rather than China’s reality that exert influence on the Chinese character in *Turandot*.

As mentioned earlier, since images are involved, variations are inevitable. That is to say, Imagology should be concerned with the conditions, procedures, and influence of variations. The Orient presented in the literary works of Europe and the United States is not the objective Orient that existed in history but cultural imagination of the Westerners and also the constructed “otherness” to confirm the Westerners themselves. Said has analyzed that from the literary works of ancient Greece to contemporary English and American literature, it is obvious that the Orient is always alienated. According to the Westerners, the Orientals are always vilified, weakened, and even barbarized. The Western understandings towards the Orient are filled with the characteristics of binary opposition: The West is advanced and civilized, whereas the East is barbarized and savage; the Westerners are noble, rational, normal, and strong, whereas the Orientals are inferior, irrational, and abnormal. As a result, Orientalism is actually filled with discrimination and distortion towards the East, which was the created myth of superior West and inferior East, based on the Western needs of colonial expansion. The purpose is to provide a theoretical basis for Western colonial expansion and the conquest of the East, which helps rationalize the aggression of the West. To a large extent, the Indian images shaped by English writers such as Thomas De Quincey and Kipling and the Chinese images shaped by Maugham and Defoe are created based on such needs of the Western world.

4.3.2 *Past and Present*

French scholars have made great contributions ever since the emergence of traditional Imagology till the establishment of contemporary Imagology. The master of Comparative Literature, Carré, first proposed the concept of Imagology, who stated that the studies of images are actually “interpretation of various ethnic groups, travels, and imaginations” [25]. Marius-Francois Guyard, the student of Carré, once considered the studies of Imagology: “the overall impact are no longer pursued which may produce some illusions, but seek to better understand that in the individual and collective consciousness, how the national myth was produced and survived” [25]. In the last

chapter of Guyard's *Comparative Literature*, the studies of Imagology are specially pointed out as "other countries in native people's eyes," which is the first recognition of Imagology in the monograph of Comparative Literature. Guyard indicates that "it is a new perspective of Comparative Literature." Another French scholar Pageaux illustrates Imagology in *Introduction to Comparative Literature* and raises the notion of "otherness." According to Pageaux, "otherness" exists as the desirable target of the image creator, who projects the concealed self-desire to the "otherness." The shaping process of the images of the "otherness" is actually the process of demonstration of self-desire. Because of different desires of image creators, three different basic attitudes are formed during creation—fanaticism, hatred, and goodwill.

With the discipline development, traditional Imagology has gradually exposed its inherent limitations. The research scope of the French school is limited by influence and acceptance; so to speak from methodology, it only concerns the factual connections of the surface rather than the underlying reasons of image construction. That is to say, it regards the function of the discipline as factual recording and textual research. But facts are very much likely to be presented by chance. In this regard, the French school has already realized that it is rather difficult and unreliable to advance the studies of influence; the history—composed by the experiences of certain writers, the fate of someone important, the mutual understanding among different peoples, and the information collected from travel—is relatively more reliable. In terms of the limitations of the studies of influence, Guyard has pointed out that "some influence research related is often disappointing" [25], and he has criticized the tendency of "pursuit of abstract overall influence." "One should try to understand how the national myth and legend formed and survived in the consciousness of individuals or groups" [25]. If a writer too rigidly adheres to empirical methods and historical perspective and if a writer emphasizes factual connections while neglecting the inherent nature and aesthetic value of literary works, literary research will lose its vitality.

Other scholars have also discussed the nature of the studies of Imagology. "Imagology and Psychology" is involved in Chap. 2 "International Culture Exchange" of *What Is Comparative Literature* which is coauthored by French scholars Brunel and some others. According to the book, image is the individual or collective performance with inclusion of culture and emotion, objective, and subjective factors. And images are the myths and illusions created by observers. The determination of images "is in the intersection of literature, sociology, political history, and ethnic anthropology." Another French scholar, Yves Chevrel, briefly indicates the nature, content, and methods of Imagology in *Comparative Literature*, which places literary Imagology in the realm of literary works and roughly introduces the documentation of Imagology.

The philosophical reflection of phenomenology and hermeneutics by French philosophers Sartre and Paul Ricoeur, especially their "imagination" theories, has enlightened the methodology of Imagology, which has turned the focus of the studies—senders—to the creative thinking of the receivers. In terms of the research object of Imagology, they particularly emphasize the creator of imagination, whose core lies in the differentiation between the consciousness of the imagination subject and the

reference. Thus, diversities can be generated out of individual experiences, which is actually the focus of Imagology. The formulation of this theory puts too much emphasis on the role of social imagination imposed on image production and thereby weakens the role of foreign reality and the creating methods of Realism. Observer culture is a broader and more noteworthy influential factor than social imagination. Social imagination is just limited within the factors of a culture that are related to a foreign country, but those factors that seem to not to be directly related are actually working as well. In most of the cases, those factors may be in the minor position, but to a researcher, who would like to dig into the cultural factors that influence image generation, those factors are indispensable. All in all, French scholars have made great contributions to the establishment and development of Imagology.

The studies of Imagology in China can be traced back to the 1930s. In 1929, Chinese famous writer and scholar Zheng Zhenduo published the article, "The East in the Eyes of Westerners" in *Short Story Monthly* under the pen name of Xi Di, in which he analyzes the reasons of all those misunderstandings and distortions of the Western perceptions towards the East; he also exclaims that "the east, far from the west, and is indeed wrapped in the heavy mist created by them" [26]. Zheng's article can be considered the origin of the studies of Imagology in China. And after that, many other scholars have discussed the issue of China's images in literary and art works of the Western world, such as Chen Shouyi's European literature in the eighteenth century, "Orphan of the Zhao Family" and "Chinese Garden in 18th-Century Europe," Fang Zhong's "British Literature and China in the 18th Century," Chen Quan's "Research on Sino-German Literature," and Chien Chung-shu's English paper, "China in 17th and 18th-Century British Literature."

Before reform and opening up, Imagology was an unfamiliar notion to China's Comparative Literature, and the consciousness of such studies did not emerge until the previous 10 years. Under great support from the scholars of the older generation and the unremitting efforts of the younger generation, the studies of Imagology in China have made preferable achievement. The quantity and quality of the monographs and papers of Imagology have been fairly considerable in terms of theoretical analysis and case studies.

In the field of Comparative Literature in China, Meng Hua is one of the pioneers in translating and introducing the theories and methodologies of Imagology from foreign countries. She was the chief editor of *Imagology in Comparative Literature*, which was published in 2001. The book includes and translates altogether 23 papers written by French scholars, mainly discussing the theories, methodologies, and case studies of Imagology. Although the book is only a copy of collected translated works, it has been undoubtedly playing the role of the primer and textbook of the teaching and research of Imagology in China. The content of the long preface includes not only the researching experiences of the author herself but also the general introduction of the papers written by foreign scholars. To Chinese readers, the preface has played the role of introducing the subject of Imagology, which has made it even more meaningful and valuable than the body part. In 2006, *The Images of Westerners in Chinese Literature*, coauthored by Meng Hua and her graduate

students and training teachers, was published. The book contains 18 papers concerning research of Imagology, which mainly discusses Western images in Chinese literary works of the modern times. Guided by theories of Imagology, the book primarily uses the method of case study and tries to demonstrate the description of Western images in Chinese literature; moreover, it also tries to reveal the insightful historical and cultural significance of foreign images, which has helped provide a template for reference in the concrete application of China's literary domain.

Research of Zhou Ning concentrates upon China's images in Western literary works. Starting from *Eternal Utopia*, which was published in 2000, Zhou has completed a series of research findings in terms of China's images in the Western world. *China's Images in Western Legend and Doctrine*, published in 2004, has altogether eight volumes: *The Legend of Khitan*, *The Great Chinese Empire*, *The Chinese Tide of the Century*, *The Empire of Opium*, *The Historical Shipwrecks*, *The Utopia of Confucianism*, *The Second Human Being*, and *The Mirage of Dragon*. All works have explained from a historical and cultural perspective the discourse deduction of China's images within a Western context, which is quite refreshing. In 2006, Zhou published *Western Images of China*, which can be viewed as a narration of the development of China's images in the previous seven centuries of the Western world and also can be seen as a summary of the Western self-cultural expression via China's images.

Zhang Zhejun is a scholar engaged in the studies of literary relations between China and Japan, China, and Korea and even China and Central Asia. He has done a considerable amount of research on work concerning the literary exchange of those regions. *Japan's Images in Ancient Chinese Literature*, published in 2004, is a monograph concerning the evolution and development of Japanese images. The book adopts the methodology of justifying history with poetry and vice versa, which contains both Japan's illusion born from the imagination of Chinese scholars and the description of the society, nature, and objects of Japan. The book systematizes the literature of East Asia based on the basic principles of Imagology of Comparative Literature; moreover, based on the time span of 2,000 years, the book analyzes China's "otherness"—Japan—from the perspective of Imagology. The preface summarizes Sino-Japanese relations and Japan's images under the context of Chinese culture. And the main body of the book contains six chapters: the first chapter describes Japan's images before the Tang Dynasty, whose content refers to the records concerning ancient Japan in such documents as *Shih Chi*, *Book of the Later Han*, *The Records of the Three Kingdoms*, and *Book of Mountains and Seas*; Chap. 2 describes Japan's images contained in the poems of the Tang Dynasty; Chap. 3 explores Japan's images in the Song Dynasty, whose content consists of the delicate objects, poetry, and paintings of Japan; Chap. 4 describes the transformation of Japan's images in the Yuan Dynasty from Japanese pirates to the ideal state of human images; Chap. 5 depicts the heterogeneous and rich images of Japan in the Ming Dynasty; and Chap. 6 analyzes the images of Japanese pirates in the novels of the Qing Dynasty, the descriptions of Japanese specialties in Qing literary works, and the Japanese swords and the heroine image in *The Tale of Heroes and Heroines*.

The studies of Zhou have made it clear that the images of East Asia are an important sphere to Imagology, which belong to the circle of Chinese characters. Therefore, Chinese scholars will have a promising prospect in this field of research. *An Introduction to Comparative Literature of East Asia*, another monograph written by Zhou Ning, also refers to the images of South Korea in Chinese literary works.

Literary Imagination and Cultural Resources: Images of China in English Literature, written by Jiang Zhiqin, was published in 2005. The book explores different types of Chinese images in English literature in the context of cultural exchange in the previous century since the modern times. Five chapters are included: Chap. 1 discusses the definition, scope, and methodology of Imagology of Comparative Literature and depicts an overview of the Sino-English cultural exchange and the Chinese images in English literary works. Chapters 2–4 respectively describe the three layers of Chinese images in English literary works—the imagined Utopia and the beauty of an exotic land, the “otherness” in the vision of progress and aesthetics, and “the otherness” in the consciousness of stagnation and terror. The last chapter addresses the misreading of images based on cultural differences and exchanges and some other issues. From the perspective of Imagology of Comparative Literature and with the help of aesthetics, neo-historicism, and postcolonialism, the book systematically organizes and analyzes Chinese images in English literature, based on literary imagination and literary usage of foreign images. Through English writers’ imaginations, exaggerations, and distortions of Chinese images, the book explores the formation and principles of Chinese concepts in English literary works and further analyzes and discusses their social psychology and in-depth culture.

In recent years, Chinese scholars have published quantities of research papers concerning Imagology, of which the content consists of theoretical research, case studies, review studies, and so on. Generally speaking, the studies of Imagology in China lack theoretical depth, and its case studies also have many aspects to enrich. A large number of “foreign images” have emerged in modern Chinese literary works, such as the “foreign images” described by overseas Chinese students in Japan, Europe, the United States, Russia (USSR), etc. However, the research of this aspect is relatively weak. Because of the characteristics of cross-culture, interdiscipline, and openness, Imagology is multi-angled and multidimensional. Therefore, the research of Imagology should be based on self-interests and self-qualifications to avoid weaknesses and make full use of the existing resources, such as the travel notes and diaries written by officials of the late Qing Dynasty, overseas students, and writers of modern times. For instance, the collection in the library of Sichuan University consists of 30 volumes of China’s Modern Literature Series, 60 volumes of China’s Contemporary Literature Series, and 6 volumes of *Literary Works by Chinese Overseas Students*, respectively. These are valuable resources to study Western images in China’s modern literary works. The studies of Imagology in China can promote the development of the related fields, while the research achievement can provide reference for the scholars of related subjects, such as Comparative Literature, anthropology, sociology, and history of Sino-foreign relations.

4.3.3 *Theories and Methods*

The creation, dissemination, and reception of foreign images constitute a fairly complex procedure. In terms of creation, writers impose their influence of images based on their different observational perspectives, cultural identities, and stand points; in terms of reception, readers may misread or misunderstand images due to individual differences of time, history, and social psychology; medium has also played a significant role—during translation, the preference of translators may influence the choice of text and even the language that will be used. Studies of Imagology examine how writers create foreign images based on their own understandings and, meanwhile, also examine how those images are selected, filtered, and misread during the process of reception and restoration. Moreover, studies of Imagology explore the reasons for the occurrence of such cultural filtering and cultural misreading and also explore how the receivers transform, transplant, infiltrate, and even counterinfluence those cultural factors. Image is only the tip of the iceberg. When facing foreign images, one needs to carefully examine the historical and cultural factors that constrain image variations.

Traditional Imagology imposes historical longitudinal studies on foreign images, mainly based on documentary resources such as travel notes and diaries and mainly using empirical and textual approaches. It may also explore the durations of different images in different periods and research the relations among international literatures by describing those foreign images. Many methodologies of humanities and social sciences have been introduced into contemporary Imagology due to its increasing openness, adding to the vitality of the development of this subject.

4.3.3.1 **Textual Studies**

As the tip of an iceberg, literary images are constrained due to underlying cultural factors. Literary criticism of the twentieth century has held the tendency of pan-culture; therefore, it has separated from literary text. The research subjects of that literary criticism are rambling, which dilutes the essence of traditional subjects. However, speaking from an academic perspective, textual studies are, after all, the cornerstone of all literary studies including Imagology. Within the realm of Imagology, textual studies mainly include the studies of vocabulary and narrative patterns.

The first layer of textual studies is vocabulary. The basic unit of language expression is a sentence, which consists of vocabulary. And vocabulary is the basic unit that constitutes the images of “otherness.” In the text, the vocabulary, which refers to the images of “otherness,” contains rich cultural messages, altogether generating the conceptual and emotional lexical field and constructs the images of “otherness.” Ever since the opening up to the outside world of the Han and Tang Dynasties, there have emerged a large number of borrowed words in China, many of which originated from India. With the introduction of Buddhism, such words as “Buddha” and “Buddhist Arhat” were also followed. Till the periods of Wei, Jin, Sui, and Tang Dynasties,

words originated from Sanskrit were numerous, such as “Bodhi,” “Prajñā,” and “Kshana.” With the modern movement of “Western Cultures Spreading in the Orient,” abundant foreign words have integrated into Chinese vocabulary—there are words originating from French, such as “ballet,” “champagne,” and “salon”; there are words originating from English, such as “coffee,” “beer,” “jeep,” and “marathon”; and there are also words originating from Japanese, such as “革命 Kakumei,” “政党 seitō,” “経済 keizai,” “幹部は kanbu wa,” “社会主義 shakai shugi,” and “資本主義のように shihon shugi no yō ni.” China and Japan share a long history of cultural exchange, and mutual borrowing is commonly seen in their vocabulary. There are also some Chinese words which have integrated into foreign languages without even being translated, such as *Yi*, *Tao*, and kung fu (martial arts). These borrowed words do not only have certain cultural metaphorical meaning but also demonstrate the cultural messages of self-dissimilar “otherness.” Therefore, one can know the evolution of images by exploring the evolution of vocabulary.

The second layer of textual studies is verbalism. The so-called verbalism refers to those conventional terms with underlying cultural metaphorical significance that repeatedly turn up in oral or textual expressions. Verbalism is the general expression of a certain culture; thus, it is the symbol and microcosm of that culture. As a carrier of “otherness,” verbalism is the minimum unit of stating the images of “otherness.” Verbalism is characterized by high condensation, fixed meaning, metaphorical methodology, and certain timing. For instance, unlike the notion of “Chinese people,” the verbalism of “foreigner (*Yang Ren* in Chinese)” denominates people from other countries but with the implications of mysteriousness and aggressiveness. There are usually two models for the generation of verbalism. One is the overlapping of predicate and subject in a sentence. For instance, as we all know, Peking University is the best academic institution in China. Harvard University is the best academic institution in the United States. The predicate and subject of these two sentences are overlapping. While visiting Peking University, the US President referred to “Peking University as the counterpart of Harvard University in the States,” and the students from Peking University answered that “Harvard is another Peking University in the States.” Under such a particular circumstance, both Peking University and Harvard University were endowed the metaphorical meaning of “the best academic institution.” Sometimes, when the predicate of a sentence surpasses the subject and becomes the main part, the predicate becomes a verbalism. For instance, in the sentence “Qianlong was quite open-minded (*hen kai ming*),” the subject “Qianlong” descends to a minor part under certain circumstances and “quite open-minded” extends from an individual case to a general case—that is to say, the notion of “quite open-minded” not only specializes Qianlong but also refers to the general Chinese emperors and therefore becomes a verbalism. The other is the overlapping of natural attributive and cultural attributive. In literary text, the natural attributives of “otherness” are usually used to explain and refer to the cultural attributives of “otherness,” and the existence of “otherness” is usually used to explain and refer to the behavior of “otherness.” All these vocabularies, used to describe the natural attributives and existence of “otherness,” have gradually become verbalism. For instance, in the modern history of China, all these words such as “Hairy Men (*Lao Maozi*),” “Big Noses (*Da Bizi*),”

and “Foreign Devils (*Yang Guizi*)” were originally used to describe the appearance of Westerners. These words, used to describe the natural attributes of the Europeans and the Americans, have been endowed with certain cultural meanings, given long-term usage. In China’s modern history, world powers carved up China and implemented a series of wars against China, during which they did burning, killing, and pillaging on China and implemented military, economic invasion and cultural, religious infiltration. They also forced China to sign numerous unequal treaties, which aroused the indignation of the Chinese people. Therefore, after a long-term usage, their vocabulary has gradually been fixed in explaining the behavioral characteristics of Westerners, which mainly consist of aggressiveness and colonialism. Scholars such as Meng Hua and Peng Zhaorong have done the research in this field by exploring the verbalisms such as “Foreign Devils (*Yang Guizi*)” and “Red-hair Foreigners (*Hong Maofan*),” respectively.

The third layer is the narrative model, also known as the plot. The studies of narrative model aim to examine how the text constructs foreign images by procedural and modular means. For instance, in such literary works and movies as *Tunnel Warfare* (Di Dao Zhan), *Mine Warfare* (Di Lei Zhan), and *Steel Meets Fire* (Lie Huo Jin Gang), the Japanese images originate from the habitual narrative model: The first stage usually contains the industrious and kindhearted Chinese people living and working in peace and contentment; the next stage contains the brutal invasion of Japanese troops and their implementation of the policy of “Burn All, Kill All, Loot All”; during the third stage, the brutal invasion of the Japanese encounters the general resistance of the outrageous Chinese people; and during the last stage, after the bloody battles, the Chinese people finally defeat the Japanese intruders and achieve the victory over the war against Japanese invaders. In such a relatively fixed plot model, the images of Japanese invaders have been made like a cartoon, such as the plaster-like Japanese national flag, hysterical Japanese officers, brutal Japanese soldiers, and Japanese-style beard (Ren Dan Hu). All these images have become the synonyms for those cruel and barbaric intruders.

4.3.3.2 Author Studies

Although images are the imagination of “otherness” and foreign cultures by “self,” they have inseparable relations with the outside world that they have generated. First of all, it is the authors who have created images. Thus, it is important to know the sources of the author’s foreign knowledge—from direct personal experiences in foreign countries or from indirect textual materials concerning those foreign countries—and, second, various factors that are related to authors that may influence the creation of the images of “otherness,” such as the different experiences of the authors, their perspectives, and their viewpoint. During the creation process, different emotional and mental state may influence the existing state of the images of “otherness,” as well as foreign images which are the projective objects of authors’ desires. Take Japanese female images as an example. Those in the poem of “Chailland Nora” written by Xu Zhimo are positive, whereas those in “Chen Lun” written by

Yu Dafu are negative. That is the result of different compositional situations of the two authors. As an assistant of the famous poet Rabindranath Tagore, Xu enjoyed high status and therefore held pride in his heart. On the contrary, as a poor Chinese student studying abroad in Japan, Yu was depressed by all the pressure from living and sex. And he even suffered from the indifference of his Japanese peers and the discrimination of Japanese prostitutes. His loneliness and depression almost made him commit suicide. Therefore, his creation of Japanese female images implicates his complicated emotions towards Japan. That is the reason why they differ from those of Xu's.

4.3.3.3 Culture Studies

The images of otherness belong to the realm of cultural description, so one must examine the underlying historical and cultural factors if he/she wants to understand the essential characteristics of those images. First of all, one needs to examine how foreign images are described in a country's literature. Take Chinese images from Western literature as an example. They are not the same from the ancient times till now: Marco Polo once shaped the image of "mysterious China"; Voltaire, the French Enlightenment thinker, shaped the image of "civilized China"; and those Western missionaries of the modern times shaped the image of "barbarous and ignorant China." All these changes have demonstrated the development of Western perceptions towards China. In Western novels of modern times, the images of Chinese people mainly contain men with pigtailed, smoking of opium, foot-binding of women, drowning of infants, craftiness of Chinese people, etc. Then why have the Westerners soiled and demonized Chinese people? The following part tries to summarize "what" are images and the characteristics of images. In different periods of time, Westerners have indicated different characteristics of China—mysterious, ignorant, barbarous, and lagging behind—as if China were a "little girl" to be dressed up. Why did they do so? Last but not least, "why" images have become what they are? For those missionaries, they portrayed China as ignorant and barbarous with the purpose to prove the justification and sanctity of their missionary activities. They did so to save the savage China by using the divine Christianity. They did so to help the noble Westerners conquer the ignorant Chinese. But sometimes, the negative images of China were just made up by uninformed writers. For instance, in Daniel Defoe's novel of *The Adventures of Robinson Crusoe*, he subjectively identifies "Chinese" as "dishonest," and he even described Chinese people as "a group of ignorant rogues with a mentally retarded government" [27]. But actually, he knows nothing about China. In the eighteenth century, the French Enlightenment thinker Voltaire and the German literary giant Goethe both highly praised Chinese culture. They even composed the fictitious and idealized images of China with the purpose of saving the anomic Western world. Although Wolfgang Kubin says in his *Studies on Differences* that most European intellectuals began to despise China in the nineteenth century, more and more attention was paid to China by Goethe. Any form of China's images in Western literature is to promote the author's own perceptions.

That is to say, the image of China is like a carnival mirror, sometimes made ugly and sometimes beautified. The mirror reflects only the mentality of Westerners, not the true color of China.

4.3.3.4 Variation Studies

As mentioned above, image is the mixture of emotion and thought, not the analogue and replica of the reality. Image is created according to the cultural model of the viewer. Therefore, image study is actually the study of "Variation." In this way, how can one examine the complicated Variation of an image? First, the characteristics of "difference" should be described, which means to explore the difference of the textual images compared with the prototype. Second, the circumstances on which "change" and "difference" should be explained. What has initiated such Variation, the factor of the author, the factor of collective imagination, or the factor of the acceptance of the readers? Third, the underlying reasons of Variation should be investigated. Besides, the Variation of images may also be constrained by historical, periodical, and sociopsychological factors and some others.

Due to its openness and being wide ranging, Imagology are bound to be multidirectional and multidimensional. The useful methodologies of Imagology can also be borrowed by the studies of Imagology in China, which can therefore be broadened in its research perspective and extended to other fields.

4.3.4 Issues and Reflections

The studies of Imagology started late in China and did not develop quickly. There are some issues that deserve the reflection of the academic community. The first one is to work on the localization of this subject. The French focus on the connections between Imagology and facts. Most of the time, Westerners study the Chinese images in European and American literature. These are their strengths and advantages. However, Chinese scholars should not just blindly follow their lead and deliver whatever they say into China. A country should have its own literature and literary studies. That is to say, Chinese people should study the issues of China's images based on its own documents. Their advantages lie in the Western images in Chinese literary works, which should be the major concern. The success of Meng Hua and Zhou Ning is the best example. Meanwhile, Chinese people can also research the "self-constructed images" initiated by foreigners, such as the English people in Kipling's novels and the American people in the novels written by American writers. In terms of the theoretical studies of Imagology, Chinese people should not follow the lead of the Westerners; they should be courageous enough to be innovative. It is the Chinese people who first raised the Variation Theory of Comparative Literature in order to serve as a modest spur to induce someone to come forward with his/her valuable contributions. In terms of the characteristics of

Variation Theory, first of all, it has stronger explanatory effects compared with traditional positivism. For instance, if we consider the process of image creation as “changing” and consider the result of composition as “differentiating,” the challenging problem of determining the truth and falseness of images can be solved. Second, compared with contemporary humanities and social sciences, it has stronger operability. The analysis of the variations of foreign images can be examined from both the internal and the external parts of the text. From the internal part of the text, one can discuss “dual variations” starting from the image creation and image acceptance. From the external part of the text, one can interpret based on such historical and sociopsychological cultural factors.

The interpretation of otherness is closely related to the understanding of oneself. No matter out of what kind of motive and desire and no matter having shaped what kind of foreign image, a writer of a country considers a foreign country as “otherness,” which is a mirror to reflect the “self.” Therefore, the analysis of “otherness” is actually a way to inspect, discover, construct, and complete oneself. That is to say, Imagology study is also the process of communicating and understanding among different nations and different civilizations, which has surpassed the trials and efforts for mutual justification, mutual recognition, mutual participation, and mutual completion.

References

1. Shunqing Cao. 1995. Comparative Literature Chinese school system of the basic theory and its methodology. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 1: 19.
2. Weisstein, U. 1987. *Comparative literature and literary theories*. Shenyang: Liaoning People's Publications.
3. Yue Daiyun. 1998. *The principle of Comparative Literature*. Beijing: Beijing University Press.
4. Steiner, George. 1987. *After Babel: Aspects of language and translation*. Beijing: China International Publications.
5. Zhang Longxi. 1986. *A review on the twentieth Western literary criticism*. Beijing: Sanlian.
6. Lefevere, A. 1992. *Translation, rewriting, and the manipulation of literary fame*. London/New York: Routledge.
7. Brunel, P. 1989. *What is comparative literature?* Beijing: Beijing University Press.
8. Fei Xiaoping. 2003. Postcolonial translation theory—power and resistance. *China Comparative Literature* 4: 122.
9. Liu He. 1999. *Trans-linguistic writing—the outline for cotemporary social science*. Shanghai: Sanlian Publishing House.
10. Xie Tianzhen. 2003. *Transmediology*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language and Education Press.
11. Jin Siyan. 1994. *Literary reception and cultural filtering: The reception of the French symbolism in China*. Beijing: Chinese Renmin University Press.
12. Yue Daiyun. 1994. Cultural difference and cultural misreading. *Chinese Cultural Research* 4: 18.
13. Jost, Francis. 1974. *Introduction to comparative literature*. Indianapolis: Pegasus.
14. Yang Zhouhan. 1979. *European literary history*. Beijing: People's Literary Publishing House.
15. Eagleton, Terry. 1996. *Literary theory: An introduction*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
16. Yang Zhouhan. 1979. *Stone carved can be turned into jade*. Beijing: People's Literary Publishing House.

17. Yue Daiyun, and Le Pichon (eds.). 1995. *Misreading in searching the dialogues between China and the West*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
18. Yang Janping. 1996. Misreading and aesthetic. *Journal of Literary Criticism* 1: 47.
19. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *Studies of Comparative Literature*. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
20. Zhu Tongbo (ed.). 1991. *Selection of contemporary literary theories of Britain and America*. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Press.
21. Cao Weidong. 2001. *Communicative reason and poetics discourse*. Tianjin: Tianjin Social Science Press.
22. Wu Xingming. 2006. Theoretic travel and variation. *Journal of Jiangnan Forum* 7: 117.
23. Meng Hua (ed.). 2001. *Imagology of Comparative Literature*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
24. Kubin, Wolfgang. 1997. *Exotism and salvation*. Beijing: Beijing University Press.
25. Guyard, Marius-Francois. 1951. *Comparative Literature*. Paris: French University Press.
26. Xidi (Zheng Zhenduo 1898–1958, modern Chinese writer). The East in the eyes of Westerners. *Short Story Monthly* 20(1).
27. Dawson, Raymond. 1967. *The Chinese chameleon: An analysis of European concepts of Chinese civilization*. London: Oxford University Press.

Chapter 5

Cross-Civilization Variation Theory

Cross-cultural Variation lies not only in the studies of Comparative Literature among homogeneous civilizations but also among heterogeneous civilizations. This chapter will mainly illustrate the studies on the Variation of cross-civilizations.

5.1 The Emergence of the Clash of Civilizations and Cross-Civilization Variation

At the 7th Annual Congress and International Academic Conference of CCLA, I first brought forward the idea of the formation of cross-civilization theories, which should be based on the reality of studies of Comparative Literature in China as well as be adapted upon the requests of the current context.

In the speech entitled “The Cross-civilization Comparative Literature Studies: The Turning Point and Construction of Theories in Comparative Literature Studies,” I pointed out that almost all Chinese comparative literary studies in the past 100 years could not avoid the convergences of eastern and western cultures, and they have also been struggling with challenges of the clashes, communications, misunderstandings and comparisons between the two cultures, and the influences the two cultures have been imposing on each other: “However, the lack of careful reevaluation of our cross-civilization background, together with the truth that we haven’t formed any theoretic institutions in this field and haven’t found the rules of cross-civilization studies in Comparative Literature, has caused some serious academic problems” [1]. In the speech I also mentioned, “The reality of current studies of Comparative Literature in China is that we did borrow dozens of theories from the West while we have been lacking theories of our own. We admit that theories of Marius-François Guyard, Paul Van Tieghem, Henry H. H. Remak, as well as Stanly Weinstein are of great theoretic importance, and they have greatly promoted the development of the world’s comparative literature studies. However, we need to bear in mind that those theories come from western culture and literature. To imply

these theories to studies of Comparative Literature in China directly, we will meet the biggest problem, that is, the Variation from eastern civilization to western civilization. Western theories of Comparative Literature have never really dealt with the comparison between Chinese civilization and western civilization, which as a matter of fact are very different ones. However, this lack of comparison becomes a serious problem for Chinese comparative literature studies" [1]. Therefore, a set of theories that fit China's realities are badly needed. I think that studies of Comparative Literature in China are now at a turning point and in an important developing phase: "This is another vital adjustment and turning point since the International Conference of Comparative Literature held in Chapel Hill in the U.S. A. in 1958. The ongoing adjustment, which has achieved remarkable breakthroughs, is based on the experiences of studies on western and eastern cultures with cross-civilization as main features. I believe that the ongoing adjustment and development in our field should be called 'Cross-civilization Comparative Literature Studies' (Cross-Civilization Studies for short in comparison with that 'influence studies' in France and 'parallel studies' in U.S.)" [1].

I have published a series of articles concerning the above topic on "Chinese Comparative Literature," "Academic Monthly," "Seeker," as well as "Foreign Comparative Literature," which has further promoted these ideas and to a certain extent influenced China's academic field.

After bringing forward the concept of cross-civilization studies, I carefully compared and studied concepts in Comparative Literature from both western and eastern academic fields, and on the basis of such comparisons and studies, I offered the following as the definition on the studies of cross-civilization in Comparative Literature: "Comparative literature is literary studies crossing various countries, various civilizations, as well as various disciplines with a global vision. It mainly studies homogeneity, similarity, heterogeneity, as well as the complementarities among various cultures with the basic methods of influence studies, parallel studies, interdisciplinary studies, and cross-civilization studies. The academic purpose of Comparative Literature is to discover rules and features of different literatures, to promote the understandings and integrations of world literature, and finally to promote the development of it. The difference of my definition from those of French school as well as American school is that I added cross-civilization studies and paid particular attention to heterogeneity and complementarities among various cultures. My definition emphasizes the three elements, the basic features of the third phase of Comparative Literature" [1].

How does the cross-civilization study become such an important school of thought in the world? In other words, why does cross-civilization study emerge in the third phase of Comparative Literature? To answer the question, I first illustrated the enlightening meanings of the ideas about the relations between the west and the east of Samuel P. Huntington's clash of civilization theory and Edward Said's post-colonial literary theory on China's cross-culture studies in my article entitled "The Farming of Cross-culture Studies Paradigm" [2]. I actually have already shown us my theoretic way to future study of the social-cultural context, underpinning which we will analyze with respect to cross-civilization Variation. According to my

research, we notice that the theories of Neo-Confucianism, represented by Mr. Tu Weiming, and the humanitarian ideas and cross-civilization communication of Neo-Confucianism also are great sources for us to learn from.

5.1.1 Samuel Huntington: The Clash of Civilization and Cross-Civilization Studies

The theory of clash of civilization was brought forward by the Harvard professor Samuel Huntington, and it is a new international political theory proposed to the American government to deal with the world's new pattern in the post-Cold War era. Huntington first raised the idea of "clash of civilization" in his two articles released in the journal of *Foreign Affairs*, "The Clash of Civilization" and "If not Civilization, What?" In 1997, Huntington enriched the above two articles and elaborated his theory with full details in the famous book *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*.

Formed in a global context, the theory of Huntington rests on the theoretic foundation of defining the differences among civilizations and their respective values. According to his articles and books, we can summarize Huntington's basic ideas as the following ones: During the Cold War period, the world had been separated into two confronting camps based on political ideologies. The collapse of the former USSR and the drastic changes in Eastern Europe brought an end to the Cold War, and "in the world's political history, for the first time, it has formed a multi-polar world with a multicultural features" [3]. The dominant factor shaping the world's setting picture in the post-Cold War time is no longer political ideology or economy but civilization: "In the post cold war world, the major differences among peoples do not lie in their ideological, political or economic differences, but in their cultural differences" [3]. Besides, cultural differences nowadays are showing themselves in an obvious way, which will replace ideology as the factor causing confrontations. The clash of civilization will determine the world's future confrontation—people will not "confront each other because of the ideological or economic factors"; "the major confrontation comes from their difference in cultures" [3].

According to Huntington, the major existing civilizations can be grouped into six poles—the Western civilization built upon Catholicism and Protestantism (Western Europe and North America), the civilization built upon the Orthodox Church (Russia and Eastern Europe), the Islamic civilization, the Hindu civilization, the Chinese civilization, and the Japanese civilization, while South America and sub-Saharan Africa exist as "candidates for civilization," with implications that they do have a potential to become distinct civilizations of their own: "The similarities and diversities of respective cultures have been shaping the national interests of countries, and the confrontations and coalitions among them." The landscape of "the West versus the Non-West" has been formed in the post-Cold War world: "When the West attempts to extend its values and tries to protect its own interests, the non-western societies are bound to make their choices [...]. When some of the Confucian

and Islamic societies are intending to ‘balance the West by means of equilibrium’, the post cold war international political arena is dominated by the interactions between the West and the Non-West cultures and states” [3]. The dominant confrontation in the future world is that among civilizations, the major challenges for the Western civilization are Islamic and Chinese civilizations.

After he raised the theory of “the clash of civilization,” Huntington triggered a big argument among the world. Chinese academic field, from the standpoint of national interests, treats the theory with skeptical and critical attitudes. All in all, there are the following views in China towards the theory of “the clash of civilization.”

The first view pays much attention to analyzing and criticizing the theory. For those who hold this view argue that the theory of “the clash of civilization” is a political proposal for the American government. It is not an academic argument, but a disguised version of the China threat idea initiated by blind Western centralism. According to this school, the premise of Huntington’s theory lies in that the international confrontation in the future world will happen between the western and non-western civilizations, especially between that of the West and Islam as well as Confucianism. To solidify the coalition between Western Europe and North America, the United States needs to seek an alliance with Japan, Eastern Europe, as well as the Latin American countries, with the aim to stop the union between the Islamic and Confucianism civilizations. The separation of the world into “the foes, the friends, and we” is the American version of Longzhong Conversation [4].

The second view seeks to focus on the theoretical flaws and biases of the theory of “the clash of civilization.” Many critics from various perspectives start from this point of view, and the most detailed one is that from Su Han’s work entitled “The Confrontations and Cooperation between Civilizations in International Arena.” According to this article, Samuel Huntington’s definition of civilization is too vague, and the way he divided the world’s civilizations into seven groups according to their regions is not accurate enough; the theory itself failed in adopting the Cold War mind-set. It treated civilization as the major source of confrontation and in this way, it ignored the ideological differences, border disputes, battles for resources, geopolitics, and economic and trade fractions which are still triggering international confrontations. The author criticized that the way the theory defined the major confrontation between Western countries and the Islamic–Confucian countries is actually a disguised version of the Western Containment Strategy in the Cold War. It revealed Western centralism [5].

For the third school, the properness of civilization as the source of international confrontation has been examined. According to Wang Tianxi, civilizations are great powers promoting the advances of human society. Civilizations have great influences on international relations, but to isolate them from the factors of politics, economy, and military and to exaggerate the power of civilizations are biased actions. By examining today’s international confrontations, we can see the influences of civilizations; however, the deeper triggers are still national interests. The most obvious example would be the economic factions among countries [6].

If we can just put aside the standpoints of nations and states to understand and examine Huntington's theory from a social-cultural perspective, then we will see its contribution to the studies on cross-civilization Variation. According to his theory, the clash of civilization is inevitable. Furthermore, under the global context, a world with multi-cultures is inevitable. "The theory of Huntington's and the '9·11' incident have literally attracted the world's attention concerning the heterogeneity and confrontational natures among civilizations and their co-existences theoretically and practically. Almost at the same time, scholars in different fields started their considerations on the confrontations and co-existences of different civilizations and helped to form the academic trend of cross-civilization studies" [1].

5.1.2 Edward Said: The West and East in the Field of Postcolonial Literary Theory

Postcolonial literary theory has combined multicultural political theory and critical methodology: "It mainly studies the culture and discourse power between the suzerain and the former colonized country, and other new issues including racialism, cultural imperialism, nation states' culture, cultural power and identity" [7]. As for the exact time when postcolonialism emerged, there are lots of different opinions existing in the academic field. However, there is a common acknowledgment that it first emerged in the late nineteenth century and became a new ideology and theory after the independence of India in 1947. In 1978, the Palestinian-American scholar Edward Said released his book, *The Orientalism*, which signifies that postcolonialism finally stepped into its mature period as a theory.

In his book, Said had already given the identification of the word "Orientalism": "I have put multiple meanings on this word, and I think these meanings are relative." According to Said, the most acceptable meaning the word "Orientalism" has is its academic meaning as a course to study, which contains the meaning that "anyone who teaches knowledge about the Orient, write books about the Orient or those who study the Orient--no matter they are anthropologists, socialists, historians, or linguists. The subjects facing them can be general and specific. All those who demonstrate the above qualities can be called Orientalists, and the subject he/she deals with is the study of Orientalism" [8].

A broader meaning of this word is that "Orientalism is a mindset. In most of the cases, the Orient is the place that is geographically and culturally opposite to the Occident, and in this context, the mindset of Orientalism is based on the ontological and epistemological differences that the Orient has from those of the Occident." The third meaning of Orientalism forms arises from a historical perspective: "If the late 18th century can be perceived as the beginning of this word's definition, we can treat Orientalism as related descriptions, the authoritative affirmations on views about the Orient, and the mechanism which deals with the Orient in forms of describing, teaching, colonizing, as well as controlling. In short, Orientalism in

this circumstance refers to a way that the Occident used to control, rebuild, and dominate the Orient” [8].

As for the studies of Said’s Orientalism, he drew support from the theories of Michel Foucault and Antonio Gramsci. With his detailed and powerful analysis of cultural hegemony–submission relations between the West and the East, Said tried to explain how the process of rebuilding the Orient happened and also how Western culture obtained its strength and self-identity from Eastern culture, which was a substitution and sometimes even a potential self-oriented culture: “I found that the discourses in *The Archaeology of Knowledge* and *Discipline and Punishment* of Michel Foucault are of great use for us to identify the identification of the word ‘Orientalism’” [8].

According to Said, “In the post-Enlightenment period, it’s Orientalism that European culture used to deal with even to rebuild the Orient in ways of political, sociological, military, ideological, scientific and even with the method of imagining. The orient never was and still isn’t an independent subject in the aspects of ideology and action” [8]. In his opinion, the Orient in the discourse of Western culture was not the real east existing in history, but an imaginary cultural product in the minds of the Occident, and this was a discourse practice with the sense of cultural hegemony. It is this kind of culturally fictional image (the image of “the other”) of the Orient that has solidified the Westerners’ sense of superiority. They made use of such a practice to safeguard their interests and colonial expansion. According to Said, the European colonists surely believed that they could precisely describe the Eastern citizens they had conquered. Ever since the nineteenth century, all that the Europeans had done was to justify their invasion. The Orientalists had been emphasizing the idea that “the Easterners” were lazy, empty-minded, indulgent, unreliable, and crazy.

The first reason behind such an action was that the Western colonists did not and would not realize that all kinds of knowledge could be examined from multiple perspectives of politics, culture, and methodology and no theories, no matter political or literary, could be objective. The second reason was that “The standpoint the Orientalism (as a school of thoughts) seeks to deal with the multivariate, ever-changing and complex human reality which was essentialism without any sense of criticism. Such a standpoint implied that there existed an immutable Eastern essence, which in turn could posit an immutable Western essence. The immutable Western essence observed and overlooked the East from an authoritarian position” [8].

The relationship between the West and the East in the studies of Said shows strong senses of ideology and political critique according to the theory itself. It sees through the hegemony that power politics have been underpinning the relationship. The “other” image of the Orient revealed and demonstrated by the Orientalism criticized “European Centralism” (or “Western Centralism”). As for the studies in cross-civilization Variation in Comparative Literature, Orientalism can be of great enlightenment and theoretical importance. Specifically, the Orientalism provides a new theoretical perspective for interdisciplinary studies: “It stretches into the long-ignored and intentionally marginalized academic field—the Orient or the third world. Geographically speaking, it refers to the side on the earth opposite to the

West. However, ‘the Orient’ also contains profound political and cultural meanings other than that” [9]. Furthermore, the positive effect of the “decentralizing” and “deconstructing” strategies in Said’s Orientalism theory “tells us that in cross-civilization studies, we have to shake the western-centralized mindset, step out of the shadow of once single-dimensioned ‘Orientalism’, and therefore re-study the characteristics of Oriental civilization. And that should be the foundation of cross-civilization studies.”

5.1.3 Tu Weiming: The Discourse Between Neo-Confucianism and Civilizations

Tu Weiming, the Harvard University Professor as well as the dean of the Harvard–Yenching Institute, is regarded as the representative of contemporary Neo-Confucianism. He has been consciously focusing on the study of traditional Confucianism and its cultural value from a modern perspective since the 1960s. His academic focus has been on how to make a smooth connection between the traditional culture and China’s socialist modernization ever since the 1980s, and since then there have been opinions that the modernization of Confucianism studies of Tu Weiming has great importance and influences: “Tu’s studies have been inspired by the philosophical anthropology, cultural anthropology, comparative cultural studies, comparative religion and knowledge of sociology. Such an interdisciplinary methodology is very remarkable and has discovered the modern importance of Confucianism, showed the future direction of the third phase of development for Confucianism and laid the theoretic framework for modern neo-Confucianism. Tu’s studies have great influence on East Asia and the Western world” [10]. Facing the academic challenge of the modernization of Confucianism, Tu Weiming adopted the strategy of “discourse between civilizations.”

“Traditions from both the west and non-west are equally complicated as those of the local, and every one of them has great potential for comprehension.” The diversity and richness of cultures have laid the foundation for cross-civilization discourse. Therefore, “By overcoming the boundaries between tradition and modernity, the east and the west as well as ‘us’ and ‘the other’, we can try on one hand to understand the dilemma of mankind, and on the other hand discover the rich and diversified spiritual resources, which are commonly shared by the whole world” [11]. According to Tu Weiming, “it’s sure that there is potential for different civilizations to clash, and there are potential clashes everywhere between different races, languages, gender, age as well as regions. If we believe clashes are dangerous, then we need dialogue among civilizations” [12]. In his opinion, the potential for clash between different civilizations has actually provided preconditions for the discourses between them. The theory of Huntington focuses on the clashes and conflicts among civilizations; however, the dialogue suggestion raised by Tu Weiming on one hand admits the clashes among civilizations, and it on the other hand

emphasizes the diversity of civilizations. We can say that the opinion of Tu Weiming has academically surpassed that of Huntington's. Why is it necessary for civilizations to have dialogue with each other? According to Mr. Tu Weiming, the diversity of civilization lays the foundation for dialogue among them, and there are two things deserving our attention: Firstly, "the tendencies for extreme freedom, rationality, human rights and individualism have been contained because of the development of eco-environment awareness, feminism, as well as multi-religions, we started to realize the existence of other universal values including common wealth, equality, sympathy, rituals, responsibilities, as well as community, and these are the things we need to pay attentions to." Secondly, globalization and diversity have become the background of dialogue among civilizations: "The process of globalization is not a process for homogenizing because the concept of convergence, which means that the whole world will end up in a homogeneous pattern of development, is too simple to understand the complicated situations in the trend of globalization. It's true that the worsening of our environment, the spread of disease, the deluge of drugs, as well as the rise of crime have been equally globalized as science, technology, finance, travel and immigration. Other than the above changes, countries and regions had never been as connected and interdependent as they are today. However, the emerging global village is far more than an organic whole. It's only formed on the basis of an interdependent pattern, and has obtained the characteristic of diversity" [11]. As for how to further realize the importance of the diversity of civilization in a global language context, Tu Weiming wrote, "The understanding of our rich and diversified spiritual resources as a whole will help us to overcome self-dominance and exclusive arrogance. Only by looking for advice, guidance, and wisdom can we fully understand the dangers of clashes among different religions and even within a religion. These dangers will normally threaten the stability of local, national and regional communities, and will bring challenges for the nurturing of peaceful world culture. In this sense, dialogues are obviously needed" [11].

On promoting the dialogue among civilizations, Tu Weiming studied the inner values and ideas of Confucianism and conducted the modernization of Confucian traditions: "Since the beginning of the 1980s, (especially in the summer of 1982 in Singapore and in 1985 in mainland China) he talked more about the practical values of Confucianism on a modern society and the prospect of its third phase of development. Mr. Tu's academic influences in China also centered in the above area. Within Neo-Confucianism, different scholars (senior ones and younger ones, professional ones, and amateurish ones) are discussing these issues under various situations. We can say that, these issues are major features of Mr. Tu Weiming's academic thoughts" [13].

Ever since the May Fourth Movement in 1919, the academic arguments among Chinese scholars have triggered the trend of westernization movement of Chinese traditional cultures. To make up for the deficiencies and disadvantages of such a trend, Mr. Tu Weiming suggested a strategy of the modernization of Confucian culture—the cultural identity. According to him, the modern features of western culture have impacted Chinese traditional culture since China entered the modern times. The conflicts of the two cultures have triggered various reflections from the

Chinese academic field: “There exist two contradictory arguments. One of them believes that Chinese traditional culture cannot rejuvenate China. According to such an argument, Chinese traditional culture can’t promote China’s development; it can only be the obstacle for the country’s rejuvenation. Therefore, Chinese traditional culture has to be destroyed thoroughly in order to create a friendly environment for the embrace of western culture. The other argument, on the other hand, believes that China has to resist the influences of Western culture and civilization and treat Westernization as the source of moral decline in our society. Therefore, they promote the quintessence of traditional culture and devote themselves in maintaining it. There are many compromising and reconciling arguments in existence besides the above two extreme Westernization ideas and self-standard ontology. However, as we examine the history, we can see that in the academic field of China, Westernization has been on the upwind though the ontology also dominated the field for some short periods. As for compromising and reconciling arguments, they are just doing their own wishful thinking, which makes them weak in convincing others” [14].

Westernization has been the mainstream in Chinese intellectual circles since China entered modern times. What deficiencies there have been in such a trend? This was the first question facing Tu Weiming, and he analyzed the deficiencies underlying Westernization from both methodological and epistemological perspectives. Those who preferred Westernization, according to the methodological analysis of Tu Weiming, adopted the “superior policies” in comparative literature, which means to pick up the quintessence in one’s own culture, and compared them with those dross of the counter culture with the purpose to highlight the superiority of their own culture. However, the proponents of Westernization adopted the opposite procedures of the “superior policy,” or we can say it was an “inferior policy,” which in practice was to compare the dross of Chinese culture with the quintessence of Western culture with the purpose of highlighting “the inferiority of Chinese culture” [14]. What are the limits of the proponents of Westernization under the scope of epistemology? Mr. Tu Weiming put himself into history and made sharp analysis. According to him, “there was no such concept of ‘modernization’, therefore the mistake of confusing modernization and westernization was inevitable. The common idea was that, westernization was ‘modernization’ in the May Fourth Movement era. The modernity in the West was considered the model for China to catch up with.” From such a standpoint, the proponents of Westernization believed that “any forces that try to stop them in reaching their goals with certain fixed methods were conservative, outdated, as well as reactionary. For those retro forces, their attempt to restore the dark and rotten value system of feudalism was reactionary; for those self-standard ontology proponents, their attempt to adopt western science and technology into the traditional system was outdated; and for those guardians of the quintessence, their hesitance to cut out the connection with our glorious past was conservative” [14].

Besides, the proponents of Westernization only stuck to the cultural holistic concept and rejected any dialogue among different civilizations: “They couldn’t accept any reason to reconcile or compromise their ideas in any way to any extent. From their standpoint of cultural holistic ideas, the proponents of Westernization would

have to stick to their holistic view, which meant that you can't judge if you want to embrace the West. The so-called 'picking up the good qualities and giving away the flaws', 'keeping the quintessence and dropping the dross,' and the idea of 'converging the East and the West' were all just looking for a bargain." It was undeniable that these proponents of Westernization were quite cynical to Chinese traditional culture; they even held a completely negative attitude towards it. Regarding this point, Tu Weiming pointed out that such a denial was a "reflection of patriotic sadness and had some healthy and positive meaning." However, he also wrote that "the new page of traditional culture couldn't turn from the desperation of grief and indignation" [14].

Considering that there have been flaws and shortages of different kinds, we would ask about how to adjust them. Mr. Tu Weiming has already found the answer, which is "cultural identity." The strategy of cultural identity is not only to realize but also to fully realize the specialties and the concreteness of every single culture, and more important is to learn commonality or consistency—the value orientation within a culture: "If we try to find out the basic value orientation of a specific culture, then we have actually touched upon the core identity of the culture... The concept of 'cultural identity' emphasizes the uniqueness and concreteness of a culture. There is no such thing as universal and abstract cultures in the world" [14]. As to how to identify a culture, Tu Weiming suggested, "From the perspective of culture, cultural identity can only be achieved through conscious efforts. Cultural identity means necessary consciousness and popular criticism as well as inherence and creation of traditions. As for feudalism ideology, conscious and popular criticism as well as inherence and creation are still needed" [14]. The purpose of identifying a culture is not yet fully achieved if we only make the first step above. Therefore, Tu Weiming further pointed out, "We can't either adopt the 'superior policy' or the 'inferior policy' to smear the once influential spiritual resources in modeling our national character, nurturing our social mentality, as well as set value orientation; we can't treat the modern western culture models as our models; we can't treat our traditional culture as a dead history, nor can we oppose our tradition blindly." Moreover, we have to "introspect comprehensively and deeply about traditional culture in order to learn its personality, its connotation, as well as its sources. Only when we fully understand the causes and contexts of our traditional culture can we be qualified to reevaluate it and therefore can conduct the inherence and critic causes of it" [14].

Secondly, in his studies of the third phase development of Confucianism, Tu Weiming comprehensively examined Confucianism from the perspective of cultural identity with the purpose to discover the humanist connotations of the culture. Based on that, he then actively promoted the dialogue between Confucianism and other civilizations in the world, which was part of his efforts to modernize Confucianism.

According to the bibliography of Mr. Tu Weiming, the reason why he conducted the studies of the third phase development of Confucianism was because he did not agree with the conclusions Joseph Richmond Levenson's made in his book, *Confucian China and Its Modern Fate*, which was that Confucian traditions have already been dead. In the opinion of Levenson, Confucian thoughts "became a

piece of shadow after the collapse of the society starting and nurturing it. It has been curling up in the minds of some people, and been cherished by them as antiques" [14]. Because of such a viewpoint, Levenson concluded that Confucianism had been waning since the beginning of the twentieth century and died off in the middle and late twentieth century. Tu Weiming, however, believed such an opinion was just a description of phenomena rather than a viewpoint penetrating the essence of Confucianism: "His judgment about the decline of Confucianism in China was true. However, Levenson seemed to ignore the incomparable power of Confucianism underlying the cultural psychological structure of Chinese nationality." To further prove the existing vitality of Confucianism, Tu Weiming quoted the concept of "Axial Civilizations" brought forward by the German philosopher Karl Jaspers: "Supposing that there was lasting vigor and vitality for multiplex 'Axial Civilizations' at the end of twentieth century (even when we examined the 21st century, 'Axial Civilizations' are still very active), then it seemed that Levenson's worries over Confucianism were too pessimistic" [14]. Additionally, Tu Weiming demonstrated the issue from two separate concepts, and they were Confucian China and Confucian traditions: "We have to realize that Confucian China and Confucian traditions are different historical phenomena and they belong to different levels of value systems. Confucian China lost its past form along with the collapse of China's autocratic political system and its feudalism society." As for how to understand the concept of Confucian China, Tu Weiming explained that Confucian China can be comprehended as the traditional feudalism ideology dominated by Confucian moral principles and their various flexural expressions in modern culture, which is now deemed the evil legacy of feudalism inside China [14]. Compared with the concept of Confucian China, the concept of Confucian tradition should be understood from the perspective of culture. It contains the ultimate concern of humanitarianism: "The basic spiritual orientation of Confucianism is for human beings, and it is representing a comprehensive humanitarianism... which is greatly different from the western humanitarianism opposing nature and theology. Confucian humanitarianism advocates that man is an integral part of nature and the world is an organic whole. Such humanitarianism is worldly oriented. It advocates an involvement in real politics yet itself is not one part of the real political power, which endows the Confucian humanitarianism with the spirit of criticism. With such a spirit, Confucian humanitarianism has been devoting itself into adjusting the real politics with its moral ideas, which is called the thoughts of the 'sage ruler'. It's the key spirit for a sage to become a king" [15]. The essence of the "sage ruler" idea in Confucianism lies in that it emphasizes individuals' inner cultivation (transcendence): "The deeper you look into your heart, the more you can achieve." Besides, unlike the Christian pursuit of a Heaven in another world, Confucian inner cultivation shows a realistic and worldly character.

Among studies of the third phase of development of Confucianism, many were conducted from the perspectives of reconsiderations and reconstructions. The former Confucians like Xiong Shili, Mou Zongsan, as well as Xu Fuguan would normally reconsider and reconstruct the tradition from the perspective of comparing Chinese and Western cultures. However, the Confucian studies of Tu Weiming were

to “put it under the global context and discover new scopes by using multiple angles and methods in studies along with the trend of the current academic achievements in international political economics. Then we can learn its modern meanings” [16]. Tu Weiming believes that “if we want to start the new phase of Confucian development, then we have to face directly the Western culture. In other words, whether it is possible or not for the third phase of the development to come depends on whether Confucianism can constructively respond to the challenges of Western culture or not.” To efficiently respond to the challenges from Western culture, the basic move is to deeply explore the cultural course of Confucian traditions and then conduct the dialogue with Western culture. As for how to or in what level speak to the Western culture, Tu Weiming has already shown the exact way for practicing, which advocated a dialogue between the two cultures in three levels. The first level is transcendence, which means to respond to the Christian religious rituals with Confucian cultural traditions. Tu Weiming believes that Confucian traditions have both transcendent and inner levels, which can respond to the questions raised by Christianity. The second level is that of social political economies, and the most important task is to conduct the communications between Confucianism and Marxism with the purpose of finding the potential connections between them. The third level is the theoretical perspective of profound psychology, which starts from the darkness of humanity. It promotes the dialogue among Confucianism, the theory of Freud’s existentialism [17].

The theories and practices of Tu Weiming’s modern convergence had certain enlightened meanings for studies in cross-civilization Variation. The meaning is that to conduct the studies, we have to discover the potential aspects in respective culture and combine them effectively. In this way can we establish the discourse system for our own literary theory.

5.2 Cross-Civilization: From Blind Spot to Focal Point

5.2.1 The Neglect and Contempt of the Early Western Civilization to the Oriental Civilization

The history of human beings is also the history of civilization, which has multiple connotations. First of all, there are two sorts of civilizations—single civilization and multiple civilizations. However, it is actually rather non-civilizational if the single civilization is talked about based on the multiple ones. Second, the content that civilization contains is extremely far-ranging. Only when civilization is interpreted as a comprehensive one can the various elements that constitute civilization be fully understood. Civilization itself is a “whole” which is the highest cultural classification of human beings and also one of the bases that differentiates human beings from other species. Third, in terms of the definition of civilization, scholars have mainly started with the aspects of subjectivity and objectivity—the subjective

factors consist of language, history, religion, custom, institution, etc.; the objective factor is the self-identity of people. But still, people have never come up with a clear definition of civilization because it does not have a definite boundary, origin, or destination. Fourth, the connotation and extension of civilization change in accordance with the changes of time and space. In general, scholars view civilization from diverse perspectives. Throughout history, scholars have held different opinions towards the studies of different civilization. But overall, the civilizations among various nations are both interacting and transcending. Although the boundaries among them are not clarified enough, those boundaries are truly in existence. Finally, it should be noted that the existence of civilization is long-lasting but civilization is also constantly being evolved and adjusted. The uniqueness of civilization lies in its historical continuity, which makes it the longest historical story in all history of human beings.

Various civilizations are interacting. And the most striking contacts among civilizations are still the defeat, destruction, or conquest of one civilization of another. The intermittent contacts or extensive collisions among various civilizations have gradually been replaced by the irresistible and single-directional clash imposed by western civilizations towards the others. In other words, in the previous 400 years of the structures of the world civilizations, western civilizations have always been in the dominant position and the others in the subordinate position. The western world first mastered advanced science and technology and therefore owned enough military strength to conquer other civilizations. Actually, the west did not win the world through the superiority of its thoughts, values, or religions, but by using violent approaches, which all the non-westerners have never forgotten. However, in the twentieth century, with the independence of more nations one by one, the structure of world civilization is no longer the single-directional control or dominance of one civilization of another; the whole system of world civilization entered the stage of intensified interactions among diverse civilizations. At this stage, the western civilization and other civilizations are mutually conditioned. Under the world civilization system composed of diverse civilizations, western civilization was always considered the center of the world; therefore, it was regarded as the major dramatic scene in human history to write about. However, in the contemporary world, in which the fusion and coexistence of diverse civilizations are advocated, such a perspective of single civilization is obviously outdated. But such a narrow-minded standpoint as Euro-centrism—the value of universalism of western civilizations—still exists.

The conflicts among various civilizations can be divided into two levels—speaking from the micro level, the most intense conflict happens between Eastern Orthodox and Western Christian countries; speaking from the macro level, the severe conflict happens between western civilizations and non-western civilizations with the Islamic world as one side and with western civilizations as the other. Western civilizations once exerted a significant impact on other civilizations; therefore, the relations between the strength of western culture and that of other civilizations have become the most popular feature of the civilized world. People from western societies always believe that people from non-western countries should agree with

western values. In fact, in non-western countries, there is only a minority of people who endorse and advocate these values; most non-westerners resist or even oppose the dominant western civilizations. The west spread its own civilizations through various channels to all parts of the world. And meanwhile, other civilizations are also stepping up to promote their own cultures. As a result, the relations between the west and non-west are generally complicated. The two sides are mutually restricted.

Among the understandings towards Eastern and Western civilizations, the attitudes of the West towards the East have always been neglectful and disparaging, among which the attitudes of some of the scholars are quite obvious. The Russian liberal writer Nicholas Dani Foschi and the famous German sociologist and economic geographer Alfred Weber were living in the nineteenth century, when China was suffering from the invasion by other countries. Those intruders imposed their own civilizations onto China. Therefore, China was under the deterioration process while the intruders' civilizations were eroding that of China's. Under such circumstances, Foschi and Weber believed that the European civilizations were holding sufficient advantages, whereas Chinese civilization was being sunk into the whirlpool of capitalism and colonialism. The perspective of the superiority of western civilizations, especially that of the European civilizations, can be seen everywhere.

Nevertheless, not all scholars believe so. The American historian Edwin Reischauer holds the perspective of western self-criticism; his attitude towards western civilizations is skeptical and even a little bit critical. When speaking of Eastern civilizations, Reischauer pays special attention to Chinese civilization. He once used "All—Self-Contention—Domination" to summarize the basic characteristics of Western civilizations; he used "tolerance and friendship" "Tolerance—Friendship" to summarize the basic characteristics of Chinese civilization. Reischauer believes that in terms of the understanding and practice of science, Western civilizations occupy distinct advantages; but in terms of questioning, probing, and speculating the ultimate meaning and goals of life, Chinese civilization is even better. Speaking of the knowledge of science and technology, Reischauer's perspectives were inherited by the famous British biochemist and scientific historian Joseph Needham. In an article entitled "The Dialogue between Europe and Asia," Needham compared Western civilizations with non-Western ones and pointed out the mistakes made by Western-centrism. He believes that the reason why Western universalism has emerged is that modern science and technology have helped establish the dominant position of the West, which has led to the "arrogance" of Western civilizations. But people cannot therefore ignore the contributions made by non-Western civilizations in the history of science and technology. In his monumental work *Science and Civilization in China*, Needham explored multidimensional aspects of China's science and technology from a historical and social perspective.

Besides, in terms of the understanding towards Chinese civilization, British historian Arnold Toynbee holds the same view as that of Reischauer's. Toynbee believes that among all civilizations ever since the ancient times, the Chinese civilization has a high degree of stability and continuity; therefore, it is an extremely stable civilization. Reischauer, when referring to such aspect, says in his book: "...

if the West insisted on the ignorance of the East and the former could not learn the latter, the development of Western civilization would bring about the extinction of mankind.” And he says continually, “. . . in all aspects of the well-being of mankind, Chinese civilization is beyond European civilization” [18]. As it is concerned, there are some scholars who do not agree with Western-centrism; they have been objectively and calmly reassessing the strength of Chinese civilization.

5.2.2 *Ulrich Weisstein’s Hesitation of Exceeding the Limits of Civilization*

5.2.2.1 The Historical Background of the Eastern and Western Civilizations

The contemporary world is a stage where diverse civilizations are co-existing and mutually integrating. But it should not be ignored that although the boundaries among these civilizations are not clear enough, they are truly in existence. The historical process of those civilizations also completely differs from each other. Take the Chinese civilization and the Western civilization, for example; the historical process of those two civilizations is completely different. “Historical process” mentioned here mainly refers to the history before the two civilizations even met. Before the nineteenth century when the Chinese civilization and that of the West met, both of the two were proceeding along their own paths.

The history of old China is the history of dynasties and its civilization has shown the state of “self-cycling.” But there are distinct historical stages in European history, such as the ancient Greek and Roman, the Medieval, the Renaissance, the Reformation, the Industrial Revolution, etc. With one stage followed by another, European society has been pushed forward.

The different historical process of Chinese society and Western society has led to the differences in characteristics of the two civilizations. Oswald Spengler once regarded the Western civilization as an extravert civilization, which appeared to have forward momentum and outward extension; on the contrary, the Eastern civilization is an introvert civilization whose posture is naturally inward.

The different characteristics of the Chinese civilization and the Western civilization have determined the different ways of thinking between the two cultures. The way of thinking of the Western civilization calls for “rationalism.” Even since ancient Greece, the westerners have believed in rationalism. They have been focusing on scientific knowledge, especially on natural philosophy. The way of thinking of Chinese civilization calls for “morality,” which is focused on “feelings.” Chinese people put more emphasis on “emotion” rather than on “reason.” Compared with Western natural philosophy, China is more inclined to advocate moral philosophy. Therefore, it can be said that the West attaches more importance on “consciousness” and “reason” and shows more concern with the exploration of natural sciences,

while China attaches more importance to “feelings” and “morality” and shows more concern with thoughts and feelings and moral qualities.

5.2.2.2 Different “Cultural Genes” and Mind-sets Between Eastern and Western Civilizations

There are five cultural denominations in the world—Christians, Islamic, Buddhist, Chinese, and African, among which the Christian belongs to the Western cultural system and the rest belongs to the Eastern cultural system. Although the structures of the power of contemporary world culture may change from time to time, the layout of the Eastern and Western denominations has not changed at all. When comparing Eastern and Western cultures, it is quite necessary to explore the rules of historical development under different social processes in order to understand the respective characteristics of those different civilizations. Chinese and Western civilizations hold different cultural genes and mind-sets.

First of all, cultural genes refer to those basic concepts, basic ideas, cultural expressions, and the basic styles of those expressions that are inherent in various cultural phenomena and are capable of being inherited and expanded in the duration of time and space.

The cultural genes of Chinese civilization can be summarized as “from the bottom of one’s heart” which is pronounced as *Tiandiliangxin* in Chinese. Such cultural genes have been expressed in China’s history and culture through thousands of years as eight steps: Investigation of things, extension of knowledge, sincerity of the will, rectification of the mind, cultivation of personal life, regulation of the family, national order, and world peace. From rulers and cultural elites to ordinary people and other social strata, all believe and implement such a concept of civilization, which have reflected the wisdom, morality, and emotional features of Chinese people and thus constitute the precious cultural genes of Chinese civilization.

The cultural genes of Western civilization can be summarized as “humanity, divinity, rationality, and citizenship.” The wisdom of Western people that has been reflected during the historical process of major Western nations in understanding nature and shaping societies is permeated with these four characteristics. Western civilization highlighted the strength and effect of “human” in the Renaissance and the myths of ancient Greece. They believe in God and suppose that God created all human beings. Although the creativity of human is infinite, it is still tiny compared with that of God. God dominates all. In addition to “humanity” and “divinity,” Westerners also advocate “rationality.” From the natural philosophy of ancient Greece to the modern technological science, Westerners have always been paying great attention to the knowledge of natural sciences and therefore have made tremendous achievements in the field of science. In other words, rationality has presented its infinite power. Everyone is equal before God; everyone is equal before scientific truth. Such a concept of equality has been developing till now and has become the so-called citizenship.

Second, mind-set refers to an organic whole which consists of the form, method, orientation, content, and process of thinking. Chinese civilization has always been advocating the mind-set of *zhong he*, which can also refer to “the Golden Mean.” (*zhong yong zhi dao*) *Zhong* (being moderate) means either not over the line or not inferior to anything. *Yong* refers to applying. “Over the line” and “being inferior to” are two tendencies and two extremes. “The Golden Mean” is to prevent those two tendencies and therefore prevent the two extremes so as to be just right.

The mind-set of Western civilization expands outward. As a result, when dealing with the relationships between human beings and nature, the West proposes that people should control, conquer, and even dominate nature so as to make nature serve the people; when dealing with the relationships between people, the West proposes that except for God, people should learn to save themselves; when dealing with the relationships between people and “self,” the West proposes that people should fight against their own destinies.

Through the analysis of the cultural genes and mind-sets of Eastern and Western civilization, their attitudes towards non-native cultures can be inferred. The attitudes of Chinese civilization towards exotic civilizations are tolerant and friendly; with the premise of adhering to its own cultural traditions, China pays more attention to absorbing the essence of exotic cultures.

5.2.2.3 “The Orient” in the Eyes of Western Civilizations

Given the different historical backgrounds and thinking postures, the East and the West have always been against each other; therefore, they have formed an opposing structure.

To the West, the center of the Orient are China and India (which should be put aside for now). What they are fascinated with is the invisible world hidden deep inside the Orientals. The stance of Western perceptions towards Chinese civilization is to admit its unique cultural values and to be affirmative while being critical.

How to perceive Eastern and Western civilizations? Generally speaking, scholars suppose that it is an issue of cross-civilization studies. However, because of the constraints and limitations of Western civilization and its subconscious Western-centrism, the Eastern civilization, constructed by Western scholars, contains the elements of ignorance and prejudice. The Oriental images, constructed by Westerners through prejudices, carry the characteristics of “laziness,” “ignorance,” and “lagged-behind.” In the Western academic circles, literary works being put aside, the understanding of Oriental civilization is biased. For instance, in the realm of Comparative Literature, the American school once aroused significant confusion, which was embodied in the fact that some people advocated the boundlessness of Comparative Literature, while some others advocated its boundaries. The representative figures of the former category, such as Wellek, proposed that everything could be used in comparison. Based on their understandings, Comparative Literature, Literary History, and Literary Criticism all placed emphasis on aesthetic studies. And the purpose of Comparative Literature is to explore the common aesthetic of

the literature of all mankind. Wellek believed that the boundaries of Comparative Literature can be infinitely extended; thus, the notion of “Comparative Literature” can be directly changed into the notion of “literary studies.” Wellek asserted that “we must regard world literature as an organic whole, and we don’t consider the difference of language but explore the propagation and development of literature. And we must study national literature and their common tendency” [19]. On the contrary, some other scholars, such as Remarque, believed that Comparative Literature should have its disciplinary boundaries. Weisstein also believed that cross-civilization comparisons did not exist. The boundaries of Comparative Literature should not be expanded. He once criticized that “I think that we expand the boundary so broad that we will consume the power which can reinforce the existing field. As a comparative scholar, the existing field we have now is not enough but so large” [20]. Weisstein believed that there was no need to include more content into the studies of Comparative Literature; if the objects of studies are too numerous and diverse, the American school might not fully concentrate on their own studies. The attitudes of those scholars, such as Weisstein, have shown that in the eyes of some Western scholars, the boundaries and ranges of civilization should not be easily extended or should not be stepped over at all. The study of postcolonial culture, led by Said, is a typical example. The point presented in his *Orientalism* is that the Orient studied by the Westerners is not the real Orient. Such point of view, concluded via theoretical methods, aroused great sensations in the West. It is worth mentioning that Said did not perceive it from the differences between the East and the West but from the perspective of discourse hegemony. He believed that the discourse hegemony of the West has led to their ethnocentrism; thus, they tended to view the Orient based on their own visions. The lack of accurate understandings towards the differentiations between the East and West is the common failing of many Western scholars including Said.

As it is concerned, the impassable boundaries between the Eastern civilization and that of the West are their significant inherent differences (heterogeneity). It appears that the knowledge concerning “the Orient” is the result of the deduction of generations of scholars. Therefore it has seemingly reflected the connotations of “the Orient.” But actually it does not. Looking further, the superior position and hegemonic position of the West may be revealed. They always perceive that the regional knowledge originated in Europe as meta-knowledge and determined the hierarchical order of the Western and non-Western knowledge based on their own criteria. They regard Western knowledge as “scientific” and Eastern knowledge as “primitive” and “barbaric.” The relationship between the Western and non-Western cultures is the relationship between the civilized and the ignorant and between the advanced and the lagged-behind. The Western culture has created its own fiction of a primitive and ignorant Orient. In other words, the “Oriental culture,” established on Western-centrism, can barely have the connotations that are truly in accordance with the images of the Oriental civilization itself. Besides, such understandings are not based on the premise of cultural fusion, but based on clear boundaries between civilizations. Therefore, those Western perceptions towards the Eastern culture are inevitably biased.

5.2.3 *From Bias to Dialogue Between Civilizations*

Although the boundaries between civilizations cannot be easily stepped over, people are still trying to seek for the possibility and method of cross-civilization dialogue and have made a series of achievements. In contemporary world, the coexistence and fusion of diverse cultures are advocated; therefore, a kind of civilization cannot develop in total isolation. Moreover, in the 400-year history of communication, major Western countries such as Britain, France, the United States, and Germany have constructed a multipolar system, in which they influence and compete with each other. In the history of the twentieth century, the most identical difference among peoples throughout the world is the cultural difference. The world has been divided into seven or eight major civilizations. With the enhancement of the national strength and confidence, non-Western societies have been increasingly advocating and promoting their own civilizations and publicly resisting and even refusing to accept the cultural values imposed by Western societies.

In such a new world constructed by diverse civilizations, the clash of civilizations has become a growing concern. And the clash of civilizations can easily lead to the conflicts between different cultural entities. The wars and conflicts among different tribes and ethnic groups in the contemporary world are typical examples of the clash of civilizations. Václav Havel has noticed that “the clash of civilization is increasing, and compared with the past, the trend of development nowadays is more dangerous.” Jacques Delors also believed that “future conflicts will be decided by cultural elements, not by economic or ideological elements” [3]. Therefore, the contemporary civilized world is no longer a single cultural system. The emergence of the bipolarization of “Eastern civilization” and “Western civilization” is partly due to the over-implementation of Western universalism. In such a world of diverse civilizations, it is quite obvious that Western universalism cannot work.

To maintain world security, people should accept the fact that the world system is constructed by diverse civilizations and diverse cultures. The human society is a general element. Sometimes each individual proceeds with others; but more often, everyone proceeds alone. The general tendencies of the common living conditions of all human beings exist in all civilizations, no matter the morality of which is insightful or just plain. Only if we seek for common ground can we obtain peaceful coexistence among cultures. Therefore, in the world of diverse civilizations, we should follow the path of accepting the diversity and seeking for the common ground. For instance, there are several mainstream religions such as Christianity, Judaism, Buddhism, Islam, Taoism, etc. No matter on what basis they are separated, they still hold common values. People can find some common principles from the world of diverse civilizations and further explore and develop those common values so as to reduce conflicts among civilizations and initiate the birth of a higher level of civilization, which implies a higher level of literature, art, science, religion, and morality. Lester Pearson once mentioned that “an age when different civilizations will have to learn to live side by side in peaceful interchange, learning from each other, studying each other’s history and ideals and art and culture, mutually

enriching each others' lives. The alternative, in this overcrowded little world, is misunderstanding, tension, clash, and catastrophe" [3]. Only if people make efforts to construct the world system of diverse civilizations can they avoid tension and conflict. Only if people try to seek for common principles can the great civilizations avoid conflicts and develop hand in hand.

In order to construct the peaceful system of world civilizations, cross-civilization dialogue should be advocated. Such dialogue does not start unilaterally from a certain kind of cultural value system, but has been suggested in the context of general resistance of the non-Western civilization against the repression of Western civilization in the modern understandings of Western-centrism. Such dialogue is a two-way process rather than the compulsory acceptance forced by others. Therefore, it reflects the respect for the characteristics of different civilizations and embodies the peaceful coexistence among different civilizations. Based on the deconstruction of Western-centrism, such equal dialogue among civilizations recognizes the diversity, coexistence, heterogeneity, and differences among civilizations, from which the common ground of civilizations has been explored. In this way, the newly found general principles can be established on the basis of consensus, which is the modern significance of cross-civilization dialogue.

5.3 The Rise of Cross-Civilization Studies in Comparative Literature

Along with the imports of commodities from the capitalist West, Western culture started to penetrate into Chinese society when it entered into the late nineteenth century and the early twentieth century, which aroused dramatic conflicts between Confucian and Christian civilizations and their counter-influences on each other. On the one hand, Confucian culture had been integrated into the Chinese autocratic political system, which triggered its crisis when it failed in rescuing China from the troubles coming from both home and abroad. On the other hand, the economic development of Western countries and the importance they attached to culture had helped in promoting the modern convergence of their culture. During the process of their counter-influence, Western culture had promoted the modern convergence of Chinese culture to a certain extent. That was the chance that China seized to change itself and Chinese Comparative Literature was born at the same time.

5.3.1 The Product of the Clash of Civilizations: Early Comparative Literature of China

The self-sufficient small peasant economy that had dominated China for thousands of years shaped an isolating, conservative arrogance and ignorance of cultural

psychology in China. Consequently, in the late Qing Dynasty, the feudal rulers implemented cultural despotism towards its people and cultural isolationist policy towards the outside world, resulting in China's cultural stagnation. During this period, the Renaissance, the bourgeois revolution, as well as the Industrial Revolution already took place in the West and made it much more competitive than the East in fields of culture, politics, and economy, and under such a context, the advanced Western culture greatly dominated the outdated Orient culture: "Only the psychology of blind arrogance that wouldn't treat other cultures as equal ones will easily cause severe conflicts when dealing with different civilizations" [21]. Therefore, it was inevitable that Chinese culture would clash with Western culture in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century. Such a clash between the two variant civilizations embodied in the following facts that China had been far behind the West in both politics and economy and the Qing Dynasty was forced to face the fate of being colonized by Western powers by their guns and cannons: "To learn from the advanced technologies in the West in order to resist the invasion of the Western powers" was the strategy proposed by the enlightening thinker Wei Yuan. To save the Kingdom, rulers of the Qing Dynasty sent some students abroad to Western countries to learn advanced technologies. Those students acquired Western languages through which they got to understand Western culture. They then realized that Chinese culture was a backward one compared with that of the West. The sense of patriotism to save their motherland as intellectuals arose from such an experience in those students. Therefore, some of those students like Lu Xun, Hu Shi, and Guo Moruo dropped their idea of saving the country by means of industry; they then turned to Western literature, hoping that they could use the means of enlightening people's minds to save China from its meek situation of weakness and poverty. China's early comparative literature emerged under such a context.

China's early comparative literature was firstly born in those translations and introductions of foreign literary works. Students who once studied abroad made full use of their capacity in foreign languages and translated many foreign literary works into Chinese. By the early twentieth century, translated fiction amounted to 600 kinds and many of them were published in magazines, which also nurtured lots of outstanding translators including Li Shu, Huang Zunxian, Liang Qichao, Jiang Zhiyou, Su Manshu, and many others. In their translated works, they all had already compared foreign and Chinese literatures. For example, Lin Shu had translated more than 300 kinds of fiction, and in his preface and prescripts, there were many comparative critiques. Because translation also belongs to the science of comparative literature, we can say that China's early comparative literature formed in the process of translation and embodied the spirit of cross-civilizations. Many famous translators mentioned above would focus on the homogeneity of Western and Eastern cultures when they compared the two cultures. For example, Mr. Ch'ien Chung-shu believed that "Waters from the Eastern and Western seas will meet at the end; thoughts from the Southern and Northern schools are not apart" [22]. It shows that though literature from different areas of civilization circles would be in various forms, they reflect the common issue of literature. When doing their studies, those translators would usually adopt the method of comparison, which was to find out the

similarities or shortages in Chinese literature compared with that of the Western one in order to promote the development of Chinese literature. Take the famous scholar Lin Shu as an example; in his preface and prescripts, he usually viewed the shortages of Chinese literature by examining the features of Western literature. In his translation masterpiece *The Old Curiosity Shop* by Charles Dickens, he compared the book with *A Dream of the Red Mansions*, and in the prescript of his translation of *David Copperfield*, he compared it with *All Men Are Brothers* by Shi Nai'an.

China's early literature translations had greatly promoted the development of Chinese Comparative Literature, which also closely connected with Mesologie (a branch of Comparative Literature). We can say that translations are the core of Mesologie. Chinese remarkable translator Yan Fu raised the later famous Three Principles of Translation (Faithfulness, Smoothness, and Elegancy), which had been followed by many Chinese translators. In that period, Chinese translators had introduced and translated many foreign literary works and Wang Guowei, Lu Xun, and Zhou Zuoren were among them. These translators were influenced by Western theories of literature and art as well as the fashions of Western literature creation during their translating process, which shaped their own theories on literature and art. Take Wang Guowei as an example, he analyzed the Chinese classic novel *A Dream of the Red Mansion* using the aesthetic ideology of Arthur Schopenhauer. It was a method that was greatly different from the traditional ways in literary studies to adopt Western theories to interpret Chinese literary works. That was the beginning of Comparative Literature in China. Such a method was regarded as one aspect of the "mutual illustrative study" and the beginning of the "getting to know each other" between Chinese and Western cultures.

The early translating literature and the "mutual illustrative study" had some positive influences on the development of Chinese Comparative Literature, and many scholars started to interpret Chinese literary works by using Western literature theories. In 1908, Mr. Wang Guowei released his book of criticism, *Comments on Ci Poetry*. In the book, he introduced and used a new way of thinking and analyzing. He put forward and explained the new concept of "condition," which "represented the end of ancient traditions of literary theory and the dawn of modern scientific literary criticism" [23]. In the year 1927, Liang Shiqiu published his book, *The Romantic and the Classic*, which was also a representative work of early studies in Comparative Literature in China. Later, Liang Zongdai released his two critiques *Poetry and Truth* and *The Second Edition of Poetry and Truth*, and they were successively published by Shanghai Commercial Press. All of the above works represented the achievements of Comparative Literature in China.

5.3.2 *The Variation and Distortion of the Clash of Civilizations*

The early achievements in Comparative Literature were mainly about Western literature and the method adopted was a one-way illustrative study, which was to interpret Chinese literature with Western theories. Such a mind-set caused the

single-directional development of Chinese culture. Not only did our culture lack its diversity, but also acquired Variation and distortion during the process of learning from the West. The slogan of “Down with Confucius and Sons,” the dominance of Russian culture in China after the founding of PRC, as well as the situation that Western languages have been penetrating into Chinese culture and art circles were all caused by the ignorance or abandonment of our national culture. The underlying reason for such ignorance or abandonment was that we did not realize the heterogeneity between Eastern and Western cultures: “The heterogeneity among civilizations refers to different essential characters that demonstrate in their cultural institutions, knowledge systems, academic rules, as well as ways of discourse” [24]. The appearance of one-way direction of development in Chinese culture was caused by the mentality to save the motherland by learning from Western culture without noticing that there was cultural heterogeneity between the two cultures. We thought that Western culture alone was the answer to our troubles and only in the way of comprehensive Westernization could we succeed. We abandoned our cultural essence. As a matter of fact, Chinese traditional culture had great impact on Western culture after the missionaries brought the ideas home to the Westernized Chinese culture and attracted Westerners’ attentions. The arrogant Germans were once quite proud of their remarkable achievements in philosophy, music, science, as well as arts. After the two failures of the two world wars, they realized flaws in their civilization and learned from Lao Tse to make them up. Another example would be American poet Ezra Pound. It was the “image” in Chinese poetry that inspired him to become the pioneer of American imagists. The comparative literary critic Zhao Yiheng examined in detail the influences of classical Chinese poetry on modern American poetry in his book *Excursion of Muse: Influences of Chinese Classical poetry on American New Poetry Movement* from aspects of cultural institutions, knowledge systems, academic regulations, as well as methods of dialogue. Besides, he looked in depth to analyze the profound reasons for such an influence. Therefore, only when we get to understand the heterogeneities of different civilizations can we compare literature phenomena, concepts, and theoretical patterns from different areas of civilization circles in our comparative literature studies. Our current problem is that we are unable to understand the heterogeneities of different civilizations in our studies; therefore, we cannot have a close look at the clashes, convergence, and dialogues among different civilizations. The challenges we have now include the following aspects.

One was the slogan of “Down with Confucius and Sons.” Torchbearers of the New Culture Movement believed that only by introducing advanced Western thoughts could they save the crisis-ridden China. At the same time, the rise of Confucianism, Taoism, and Revivalism (the Confucian Society formed in 1912, for example, stipulated Confucianism as state religion, and the Spiritualism Society formed in 1918 advocated divination and rituals of summoning Spirits) constituted a context in which the New Culture Movement totally denied traditional Chinese culture. To react to the Confucian Society, many advocated overthrowing feudal despotism and they objected to respecting Confucius and reading Confucian classics. Qian Xuantong, Chen Duxiu, and many others had written articles on *The New*

Youth, criticizing the later Spiritualist Society. The slogan of “Down with Confucius and Sons” almost became common knowledge in the period of the New Culture Movement, and it was actually a misreading of our traditional culture. At that time, to fulfill his dream to be the Empire in China, Yuan Shikai wanted badly to restore feudalism, and his strategy was to tie feudalism with Confucianism, according to which he announced a series of policies. To overthrow restored feudalism and Yuan the dictator, torchbearers of the New Culture Movement had to overthrow Confucianism at the same time. *The New Youth* magazine became their battlefield to criticize backward Confucian rituals. For example, Lu Xun pointed out the dangers of feudal rituals in his famous *Diary of a Madman* and Wu Yu in his *Life-destroying and Feudal Codes of Ethics*, furiously criticizing Confucian thoughts centered on feudal codes of ethics. All these efforts helped to get the slogan “Down with Confucius and Sons” known. As we look back today, the slogan of “Down with Confucius and Sons” was a demonstration of clash of the Chinese and Western civilizations.

The second aspect was the advocating of total Westernization. The advanced western cultural ideas brought strong impact on traditional Chinese culture at that time. As to how to face such an impact, intellectuals mainly held two different attitudes: One was to examine the deep-rooted backwardness in Chinese traditional culture according to the standards of advanced Western culture. The intention was to gradually abandon, transform, and develop the traditional culture, hoping that ultimately we could form a New Culture that could adapt to the requirements of the May Fourth Movement. The New Culture was supposed to surpass that of the traditional one and it was capable of saving endangered China. Advocates of such a trend included Li Dazhao, Liang Qichao, as well as Lu Xun. The other attitude was to blindly believe that Western culture was superior to that of China. They advocated a “total Westernization.” Scholars of this kind included Chen Xujing, Hu Shi, as well as Zhang Foquan. Hu Shi published “Cultural Conflicts in China Today in Yearbook of Chinese Christianity” in 1929, and in this article he first put forward the idea of “total Westernization.” In 1932, Chen Xujing systematically demonstrated the idea of “total Westernization” in his book, *The Way of Chinese Culture*. Zhang Foquan, however, proposed a “fundamental Westernization.” By totally denying traditional culture, they made a mistake of not seeing the integration of cultural inheritance and creation. They blamed the backwardness of China on its culture. Because our full attention was on the learning of Western culture, in the process of Chinese modern literature development, we abandoned traditional literary theories and methods without considering the heterogeneities of Chinese and Western civilizations, which encouraged the expansion of Western cultural centralism in China and caused Variation and distortion of literary theories. Only when we avoid the above mistake, can we promote the complementation, promotion, and understanding between each other.

The third aspect was the dominance of Russian critical theories. After the founding of the PRC, under the influence of Marxism, Chinese cultural circles turned to the USSR. Through ways of translation and transmission, many early Russian-Marxist critical texts, speeches, and critiques on literature and the arts of the early

leaders of USSR, as well as lots of policies and trends of thoughts in literature and art had been imported into China. In the 1950s, Russian and Soviet theories dominated Chinese literature and art fields, while traditional and Western ones were marginalized, which was determined by the political context at that time. As we conducted the socialist development, an inspiring socialist culture was needed and the critical traditions from the liberated areas determined the method of criticism at that time. Besides, national leaders including Mao Zedong delivered critical speeches such as “The Speech on Yan’an Forum on Literature and Art” which showed the direction for cultural development. The international force promoted such a development that came from Western countries as well as their cultural blockade policies towards China. USSR was the only source China could learn from. Russian and Soviet patterns had been the only choice we had from the 1950s to 1970s. Russian and Soviet literary theorists Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, and Plekhanov had great influences on a number of Chinese theorists including Zhou Yang. Zhou Yang did not only actively promote aesthetics and literary theories of Russian and Soviet theorists but also practiced those theories in his own literary critiques. The importance attached to Russian and Soviet Marxism and literary theories made Chinese literary theories maintain the characteristics of the Soviet literary theories in a long period of time. Russian literary theories and criticism occupied the leading position in China with emphasis on the combination of revolutionary romanticism and revolutionary realism. Russian literary theories and criticism held that in literary theories and criticism, political standards should be followed first, and then there came art standards; they believed literature and art should serve the people (including workers and peasants) and benefit socialism; literary criticism should be one of the principal methods of struggle in literary and art circles and should insist on the unity of the Communist Party and science. Those theories had long influenced the theories of criticism in China. They constrained critics’ initiative and creativity by the exclusion of learning from other cultures as well as the abandonment of our traditional one. Such a situation set back the healthy development of Chinese literary theories and criticism and blocked the construction of literary theory endowed with Chinese characteristics. For this reason, on September 13, 1958, Zhou Yang in his speech delivered on the “Literary and Artistic Creation Forum on the 10th Anniversary of National Day” said that “The spread of Marxist literary theories in China has been twenty years, yet it did not well integrate itself with the Chinese literary movement in art practice and traditions.” His views indicated that after the importation of Marxist literary theories in China, we failed in paying attention to the differences between Chinese and Western civilizations. The results were that the imported theories were not localized enough, while the local ones were trapped in the middle of nowhere, neither with Chinese nor with Marxist characteristics. During the twisted development of Chinese literary theories, some theorists had tried but failed in fixing such a problem: “It proved that we could only gradually build a Marxist theoretical system of Chinese characteristics by shaking the influences of Soviet literary theories. The right direction would be following Chinese reality and absorbing Marxist classic theories” [25]. The following trend in the field of Chinese literary theory was a negative mentality towards the

once dominating Soviet and Russian literary theories. It arose from the negative influences of Soviet and Russian literary theories, as demonstrated above, as well as from the trauma from the “Cultural Revolution” and the “literary and art dictatorship” enforced by the Gang of Four. Under such a circumstance, Western literary and art fashions had once again been imported into China at the time between the late 1970s and early 1980s, which drove away the dominance of Soviet and Russian literary theories in China.

The fourth aspect concerns the hegemony of Western literary theories. Western literary theories then replaced Soviet and Russian ones and dominated Chinese literary circles. Since we entered the new literature era, Western literary theories including symbolism, Russian formalism, existentialism, Anglo-American “New Criticism,” structuralism, and deconstructionism had been successively introduced into China. Some scholars treated those newly introduced theories as their Bible. However, they failed in combing Western theories with Chinese realities when using them to interpret Chinese literature in ways of arbitrarily citing Western terminologies without a thorough understanding. For example, some would simply define whether or not Chinese writers were Romantic and whether or not Chinese literary works were written by standards of Western Romanticism theories. There were even analyses on *Carving a Dragon at the Core of Literature Vigor of Style* written by Liu Xie believing that “style” was forms and “vigor” was the content of articles. Such analyses did not pay attention to the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western cultures, which in turn made themselves pale in style. Gradually, Chinese literary and art theorists became the torchbearers of Western literary and art theories, and they lost their own voice since then. It proved that to totally adopt a heterogeneous system of theories with the abandonment of national literature and criticism, one would fail in promoting the development of local literary theories. The right choice was to realize the existence of heterogeneity between different cultures, which would promote the complementary integration between Chinese and Western cultures. Chinese literary theories will develop when it is integrated with classical traditions, Western as well as Marxist theories.

5.3.3 From “Illustrative Study” to “X+Y”: The Difficult Development of Chinese Comparative Literature

Because of the ignorance of heterogeneity, not only did we make the mistake of always pandering to a particular foreign culture but also faced lots of difficulties when using the one-directional illustrative study and the method of “X+Y” “Illustrative study” was first put forward by the Taiwan scholar Gu Tianhong in his essay “Chinese Comparative Literature: A Simple Exploration of Its Categories, Methods, as well as Mentality” in 1978. It was a method to “illustrate Chinese literature as well as existing literary and arts theories by the systematical Western literary criticism” [26]. His intention was to illustrate Chinese literature as well as

existing literary and artistic theories by the systematic Western literary criticism, which was still an idea of “interpreting Chinese with Western mind-set” and a perspective of viewing the relationship between the two cultures from a Western standpoint. The method and mentality caused a one-way fluid trend of culture, ignoring the fact that we could “interpret West with Chinese mind-set.” It was a proposal of abandoning Chinese literary and artistic theories and treating Western ones as universal theories, which with no doubt would result in the cultural hegemony of the West. The illustrative study could not be viewed as an equal dialogue between Chinese and Western cultures. In the early phase of development, Chinese Comparative Literature studies would spontaneously adopt the unidirectional illustrative method and promote the spread of Western literary and artistic theories in China. However, we should bear in mind that there was unique cultural background and pattern in Western culture. It owned its unique mind-set, discourse rules, as well as language context. Its effects in Chinese studies were not decided: “Are there no theoretic limits and applicability of Western theoretic criticism, which after all was born in its own culture? Are they universal? Despite the heterogeneity between the two cultures, can the Western theories still suit Chinese literature perfectly and properly interpret its features and connotations?” [27]. The famous scholar Ye Weilian sharply doubted and criticized the blind adoption of Western theories in Chinese literary studies as well as the improper classifying of Chinese traditional literature according to Western literary theories in his book, *Comparative Poetics: A Discussion of Theoretic Framework*. Chen Chun and Liu Xiangyu are scholars from mainland China; they tried to make up for the disadvantages of “illustrative study” in their book *Introduction to Comparative Literature* by proposing the “mutual illustrative study.” They added another angle for Comparative Literature studies. The development from “unidirectional illustrative study” to “mutual illustrative study” can help to avoid the dominance of Western centralism and promote an equal dialogue among different civilizations. Furthermore, it can promote understanding and communication between Chinese and Western cultures, which will result in cross-civilization integration and convergence for literature. Until now, Chinese Comparative Literature has matured and some scholars start to interpret Western literary phenomena according to Chinese literary and artistic theories. The comparative literary critic Zhao Yiheng examined in detail the influences of classical Chinese poetry on modern American poetry in his book *Excursion of Muse: Influences of Chinese Classical Poetry on American New Poetry Movement* published in July 1985 from aspects of cultural institution, knowledge system, academic rules, as well as ways of dialogue. Additionally, he looked in depth to analyze the profound reasons for such an influence. For example, it was the “image” in Chinese poetry that inspired Ezra Pound along with Hume and Flint to become the pioneer of American imagists and together they launched the imagism poetry movement. The classical poetry that exported into the United States lost its Chinese characteristics; rather, they had been screened by an American culture context and changed into Americanized Chinese poetry. That was a typical example of “illustrating Western culture with a Chinese one” and to a great extent changed the biased viewpoint that Chinese culture was inferior to the Western one. It strengthened the

confidence of Chinese scholars. There were also other scholars who tried to use the method of “mutual illustrative study” to illustrate both Chinese and Western cultures and achieved some success. For example, the famous aesthetician Zhu Guangqian published his monograph *Poetics* in 1942. In his book, he tried to “use Western poetics to interpret Chinese classic poetry and to use Chinese poetics to back up Western ones” [28]. It discussed in depth about the nature of poetry creation, the rule of its appreciation from an aesthetic point of view. It systematically discussed the basic characteristics of poetic forms. It changed the previous unidirectional research method by means of studying literature from home and abroad with the method of mutual interpretative study.

The simplified study pattern of “X+Y” in Comparative Literature studies has its problem lying in the fact that different literary experience and theories can only be fully understood when being put into their respective cultural backgrounds, and the pattern did not see that fact. It simply cuts the connections between literary works and theories with their cultural backgrounds and tries to compare two “similar” or “heterogeneous” cultural phenomena derived from different cultural patterns. The “X+Y” study was briefly criticized. More vigorous criticism lost their voices in the field of Comparative Literature studies concerning the pattern. The reason for such a situation was that our introspections on such a theory were not deep enough to touch upon the level of heterogeneity on “cultural mode.” For example, in the article “Tang Xianzu and Shakespeare,” the writer Zhao Jingshen concluded, after comparing the similarities in their life and literary creation, that “as the greatest dramatists in Eastern and Western worlds, they were born and passed away in the same year. They were both free-spirited geniuses of tragic dramas, who normally borrowed subject matter from others instead of creating their own stories” [29]. The fault in Zhao’s comparative pattern was that he did not pay attention to the truth that the two dramatists came from two very different civilizations. Without tracing the resources of their respective cultures, Zhao would naturally ignore the different discourse rules under two heterogeneous civilizations. Therefore, the critique was just a superficial comparison. Moreover, many critics new in this field would make the same mistake. For example, Fang Ping compared the two figures in his article “Wang Xifeng and Fox Tew,” arguing that characters who looked bad from an ethical point of view tended to have aesthetic value and artistic charm. There are also many comparisons made between Lu Xun and Pushkin, William Wordsworth and Tao Yuanming, as well as the Monkey King and the monkey god Hanuman in Indian myth. Their similarities and heterogeneities were found in such comparisons; however, these similarities and heterogeneities were not representative aspects of different figures under heterogeneous civilizations. Conclusions in those critiques were not made about features of respective civilization and therefore faulted. Chinese famous scholar Mr. Ji Xianlin once criticized the “X+Y”: “I have said many times under other circumstances that many comparisons were quite arbitrary, which triggered ‘unlimited possibilities’. When ‘possibilities’ expand to such an extent as ‘unlimited’, then it became hard to call it science” [30]. Regarding Comparative Literature, he raised his own opinion, “I want to emphasize that comparative studies require hard work. You have to dig

into the cultural depth of Chinese and Western literature, analyze details to find connections in order to make unprecedented discoveries. Then your conclusions will be convincing” [30]. Here in this speech, what Mr. Ji Xianlin emphasized was what we talked about—the heterogeneity in literature.

5.3.4 *The Emergence of “Aphasia” and the Rise of Cross-Civilization Studies*

The issue of heterogeneity among culture now becomes an inevitable problem calling for academic attention. In the past studies, many scholars have adopted the pattern of seeking similarities. However, such a pattern is suitable for phenomena within the same civilization circle; otherwise, our attention should be shifted to heterogeneities rather than similarities. Both illustrative study and the method of “X+Y” are the demonstration of the mind-set in seeking similarities. They have made the same mistake of ignoring heterogeneity among civilizations, which are essential differences embodied in cultural institutions, knowledge systems, academic rules, as well as discourse patterns. Therefore, Comparative Literature demands not only similarities but also heterogeneity. We have been living in a multicultural and interdependent world, and the trend of diversified cultures is inevitable for every region and country. Therefore, in order to promote cross-civilization communications, we have to admit that all kinds of civilizations are equal and coexistent. Under such a circumstance, neither influence studies advocated by French scholars nor parallel studies advocated by American scholars can explain the more and more complicated issue of diversified cultures. Cross-civilization Comparative Literature studies should treat the heterogeneity among civilizations as the main subject matter. It compares literary phenomena, concepts, as well as theoretic forms from different civilization circles, which changes the traditional mind-set of seeking similarities. The new way of seeking for diversities based on similarities can be more effective in analyzing current complicated multicultural situations. It is no doubt a strategic change in comparative literature which has been acknowledged. The chairman of International Comparative Literature Association Thanet Folan Ke Kawo Ha paid particular attention to the heterogeneity among cultures. In his congratulating letter to the 2005 Chinese comparative literature annual meeting, he said, “The multi-language situation in the history of comparative literature shows that the differences among cultures will help people to understand each other and promote the interrelations between people within the same group and from different groups.” Michelle Foucault also believed that “...its task is to make differences: to constitute them as objects, to analyse them, and to define their concept” [31]. We can see that the importance of differences have been noticed by academic circles, and heterogeneity becomes an inevitable field for comparative literature studies.

The understanding of the clash and convergence of heterogeneous cultures comes from a century-long history of misunderstanding. The inevitable “misunderstanding”

of another heterogeneous culture has been haunting the field of Chinese comparative literature since the time of Wang Guowei and Zhu Guangqian, during which time Western literary theories have been treated as law and caused the aphasia of Chinese comparative literature as well as the dominance of Western ones: “What is the pivotal problem in our literary and critical theory studies? My answer would be the ‘the aphasia’ of Chinese comparative literature...the so called aphasia does not mean that we don’t have a set of discourse rules in this field; it means that we don’t have our own set of discourse rules. The overflowing Western terminologies like Realism, Romanticism, Expressionism, Aestheticism, Symbolism, as well as phrases including decadence and sentimental make Chinese comparative literature silent. We don’t have a set of unique terminology in this field, and what we have are inherited from the Western system” [32]. Regarding such a situation, we have to pay attention to the heterogeneity among civilizations and promote an equal dialogue and communication between civilizations. In this way, we can promote the development of Chinese comparative literature: “The comparative literature study based on the heterogeneity among civilizations differs from Western comparative literature studies in aspect of subject focus. It focuses on culture. Basically, the points of comparative literature are “crossing” and “communicating” [...] If we put it in the way that French school of comparative literature crossed borders between countries and bridged once separated literature from different countries, then we can say that the rising Chinese school will no doubt cross heterogeneity between Chinese and Western cultures as well as the gap between them. It will work as the bridge between Chinese and Western literatures and contribute its own concept to the world’s literature” [33].

We can see from the above analysis that the essential problem in early Chinese Comparative Literature and its denial and overall adopting of Western culture as well as in the slow development of Chinese Comparative Literature and its aphasia lies in the fact that we failed in realizing the existence of heterogeneity between Chinese and Western cultures. The “clash of civilizations” theory of Samuel Huntington has its intention to obtain the leading position of Western civilization in the world. However, it also informs us that the clash between civilizations and diversity of cultures is inevitable. The main features underpinning the clash and diversity lie in their heterogeneity as well as similarities. Therefore, we have sufficient reason to say that comparison and dialogue between heterogeneous civilizations becomes an inevitable subject of Chinese Comparative Literature. As a science to make the comparison and studies between different civilizations, Comparative Literature bears the task to get understandings, proof, as well as integration between different civilizations. Many scholars in this field have been working on heterogeneous studies from a cross-civilization perspective. It is a cultural strategy brought forward under the global context and is suitable for the Chinese situation. According to the relations between globalization and the clash of civilizations, nowadays comparative literature is determined to face the language context of clash and dialogue between civilizations. I further pointed out that in such a new historical context, comparative literature study will embrace an important change, whose feature will be the crossing of Chinese and Western civilizations. The foundation for such a change would be the previous achievements from both

Chinese and Western comparative literature studies. Its goal for such a change would be another breakthrough development for disciplinary theories for comparative literature [34]. I myself have been working for such a change in this field. In my own words, “We have been in a pivotal period when Chinese comparative literature is facing autonomous development and tries to build its own disciplinary theories. He believes that the previous theories can no more fit the needs of ongoing studies in the new multi-language context. The concept of ‘cross-culture’ cannot show the feature of the constructive studies of cross-heterogeneity study conducted by the Chinese school. Therefore, he raised the concept of ‘cross-civilization’ to highlight such a feature” [35]. Here with no doubt, the significance of cross-civilization studies to Chinese comparative literature is emphasized.

The rise of cross-civilization study has deep influences on Chinese even on the world’s Comparative Literature studies. First of all, it will help to achieve an equal dialogue among civilizations. Through dialogue, “the relativities of various civilizations will be highlighted, which will dispel many kinds of ‘cultural centralisms’ especially the ‘western centralism’. It will help to avoid ‘simplification’ and ‘integration’ of the world’s cultures. Cross-civilization study will help to recover the world’s cultural ecology and promote the diversity of world culture” [36]. Second, it offers a broadened way of study for Comparative Literature and reinvests a vigor for the declining Comparative Literature study of Europe and America. Third, it will help to set a clear goal for Comparative Literature study. In cross-civilization study, the concept of heterogeneity has preserved room for the existence of “the other.” When compared with “the other,” the features of one’s own culture will be highlighted, which will help to observe and get to know one’s own culture. On the other hand, to look back to one’s own culture from the perspective of another one will help to raise new concepts and interpretation as well as complement each other. With the inspiration of “the other” culture, one can develop his or her own new literary concepts and characters. At last, it will benefit the development of Chinese Comparative Literature. New literary concepts are always produced through the study of heterogeneities. For example, when Buddhism came to China, it integrated Confucianism and Taoism, which formed Zen. Zen later stretched its impact into Chinese literature and made great achievements.

5.4 The Heterogeneity of Civilization and the Variability of Comparative Literature

5.4.1 The Universality and the Uniqueness of Civilization (Commensurability and Incommensurability)

Till now, Comparative Literature has merely been developing for ten decades or so, during which, nevertheless, it has already experienced ups and downs. There is an important reason that has led to the constant disputes concerning Comparative Literature—there has not been a definite boundary about its comparability. But how

can the framework and boundary of its comparability be delineated? Comparative Literature cannot be perceived as a subject without clarified and definite illustrations about its comparability; for without those illustrations, which mainly contain the scope, objects, and vision of studies, Comparative Literature cannot obtain its theoretical recognition. Moreover, an important aspect, based on which Benedetto Croce once criticized concerning the French school, is that he considers comparison as a kind of method; therefore, it can be used in literature as well as in philosophy, history, etc. Comparison itself cannot be called a “style”; if comparison belongs to the realm of style, then everything can be compared. Therefore, the study concerning the comparability of Comparative Literature is a key step in the development of the whole discipline. In this part, the relations between the variability of Comparative Literature and the heterogeneity of civilization will be illustrated.

In the field of Comparative Literature, cross-culture, cross-nation, cross-discipline, and cross-language have always been considered the basic ideas and methods of the conduct of comparison. The notion of “compare” itself contains the premise—that is, multiple comparable domains or at least two comparable domains (A and B) should be set beforehand. And then, those elements, parts or even the wholes that can be compared and worthy of comparing, can be found out of those domains. During the process of seeking common ground while putting aside difference, the dialogues, exchanges, and integration among those domains can be achieved, which has always been the major concern of Comparative Literature. Therefore, it is obvious that the issue of comparability has to refer to the issue of “crossing.” The initial intention of comparison is to recognize heterogeneity; if there is nothing but homogeneity, it is not necessary to conduct those comparisons. The ultimate purpose of comparison is to cross heterogeneity.

However, although the main tasks of Comparative Literature have been found out, it is not easy to do so in reality. That is to say, theoretical analysis and practical activities cannot fully overlap due to people’s subjectivity. One of the critical obstacles is whether there is a clarified range of the issue of cross-analysis. In other words, what is the boundary that such cross-analysis can touch upon? Is it language, subject, nation, culture, or anything else? Since a long time ago, “culture” has usually been considered the basis for cross-analysis. It is reasonable, because subject, nation, and language are after all part of a cultural system, such as American culture, Chinese culture, Japanese culture, British culture, etc. With the advent of globalization, especially with the political and economic independence and rising of more and more developing and even less developed countries, their spiritual consciousness is also experiencing changes of varying degrees. Marx once said that economic base determines the superstructure. When those countries economically broke away from colonialism, they began to seek for their spiritual and cultural independence and integrity. Therefore, the scholars, who study postcolonialism, should pay close attention to the issue of how to achieve the decolonization in culture and discourse. Although many countries have acquired their economic and political sovereignties, their cultures are still subordinate to some other cultures. Therefore in terms of culture, such a pattern is bound to be restructured. And the fundamental dimension of such restructuring is the self-identity and the status of “otherness” in their own cultures.

Moreover, upon further analysis, it has been gradually realized that as the basis for comparison, culture itself contains many problems, the biggest of which is the limitation of culture as the comparable boundary, because it is not enough to compare various cultural entities within the same civilization circle. For instance, American culture and British culture, which are both part of Western civilization, can be compared. How about those of the United States and China? In the past, comparison was established on the basis of homogeneity. Thus, British culture and American culture can be compared for they both belong to the system of Western civilization. However, American culture and Chinese culture belong to a different civilization system, with one being part of the West and the other being part of the East civilization. That is to say, the two cultures have fundamental heterogeneity, and they are found with totally different frameworks of civilization. Can they still be compared with each other? According to the perspectives of French and American school, those two are not comparable.

However, with the emergence of heterogeneous and contradictory factors among different cultures and among different civilizations, cultural comparison cannot cover all the domains of comparison, so the comparison between heterogeneous civilizations is inevitable. As a result, I updated the transformation from “cross-culture” to “cross-civilization,” whose inherent significance lies in the expansion of comparative domains and the emphasis on the importance of difference. Difference is not only among different cultures or within the discourse of the same civilization; it can be further developed based on civilization. Professor Huntington once pointed out that “The idea of civilization was developed by eighteenth-century French thinkers as the opposite of the concept of ‘barbarism’. Civilized society differed from primitive society because it was settled, urban, and literate” [3]. Of course, civilization is not only the opposite of barbarianism but also an important dimension of self-identity and value confirmation of human beings—civilizations are the biggest “we” within which we feel culturally at home as distinguished from all the other “themes” out there [3]. It is thus clear that civilization can provide a feeling of spiritual belonging. And such a comforting feeling of belonging is relative to the differences among heterogeneous civilizations. Moreover, the relationship between civilization and culture is that “Civilization and culture both refer to the overall way of life of a people, and a civilization is a culture writ large. They both involve the ‘values, norms, institutions, and modes of thinking to which successive generations in a given society have attached primary importance’” [3]. Huntington perceives civilization as the magnified culture, which is the largest “us.” Culture can be used for various consciousnesses, which can refer to certain detailed objects that belong to the superstructure; civilization refers to the fundamental cognitive paradigms and values: “A civilization is the broadest cultural entity. Villages, regions, ethnic groups, nationalities, religious groups, all have distinct cultures at different levels of cultural heterogeneity” [3]. Hence, without those thinking models and value rules, one will be separated from the framework of civilization, and it will be impossible to advance the scientific and systematic descriptions towards that consciousness: “Chinese, Hindus, and Westerners, however, are not part of any broader cultural entity. They constitute civilizations. A civilization is thus the highest cultural

grouping of people and the broadest level of cultural identity people have short of that which distinguishes humans from other species" [3]. In short, the largest propulsion of cross-civilization is that it repeatedly emphasizes the principle of the respect for differences.

In fact, no matter it is the "aphasia" or postcolonialism, the overall trend of the ideology in the modern world is centered on the changes in the perspectives towards the "sameness" and "otherness" of civilizations. No matter it is Westernization or Easternization, such an overall trend is inevitable. Additionally, the universality of civilization should also be reflected upon. Huntington believes that "The concept of a universal civilization is a distinctive product of Western civilization. In the nineteenth century the idea of 'the white man's burden' helped justify the extension of Western political and economic domination over non-Western societies. At the end of the twentieth century the concept of a universal civilization helps justify Western cultural dominance of other societies and the need for those societies to ape Western practices and institutions. Universalism is the ideology of the West for confrontations with non-Western cultures" [3]. In this statement, it is obvious that the so-called universality of civilization is actually the issue of homogeneity. It is the idea that concerns the extent to which Western civilization can rule and cover non-Western civilization and the extent to which Western ideology can change or rule non-Western civilization. The universality of civilization is the commensurability. For a long period in the past, Western civilization has always been enjoying the center position in the world order of civilization. Other heterogeneous civilizations are marginalized and therefore should be dominated and led by Western civilization. Hence, ever since the last century especially after the May Fourth Movement of 1919, Chinese civilization has been undergoing Westernization. It is a very clarified demonstration of the universality of Western civilization that the illustration and interpretation that China's intellectual resources are based on Western patterns of discourse.

When the perspective of comparability has shifted from culture to civilization, another issue has emerged, i.e., the universality and heterogeneity of civilization (or the commensurability and incommensurability of civilization). In other words, why can "heterogeneous civilizations" be regarded as within the realm of Comparative Literature? Is it reasonable? How should we deal with the issue of commensurability and incommensurability of civilization? The key of the issue here lies in the sameness (universality) and otherness (heterogeneity) of civilization. It should be realized that the universality of civilization is actually the commensurability and sameness among civilizations. Without such commensurability, there is no way for anyone to compare, just as the comparison between two completely irrelevant domains would be chaotic. Commensurability and universality are the premise for any kind of dialogue and communication, just like the "cultural model" of comparison, the notion raised by Wai-lim Yip. However, it should also be realized that there is incommensurability among civilizations and such heterogeneity should be given sufficient respect and therefore should not be simply covered by homogeneity. Nor should people consider only heterogeneity and ignore commensurability. The so-called comparison is to communicate and complement.

5.4.2 *The Theoretical Transformation of Comparative Literature: The Transformation from the Sameness (of Homogeneity, of the Same Kind) to Variability (the Heterogeneity and Complementarity of Civilization)*

The distinction between the universality and heterogeneity of civilization is mainly to bring in the studies of the comparability of Comparative Literature, which is the theoretical bottleneck of this subject. In their previous studies, many Chinese scholars either illustrated China based on the Western views or commented on the West based on Chinese perspectives. Therefore, as early as in 1995, I published one article in the *Oriental Series (Dong Fang Cong Kan)* and pointed out that there was a serious problem, namely, the “aphasia,” in the studies of Chinese culture and Chinese literary theories ever since the May Fourth Movement. I believe that the fundamental reason for such phenomena is that China’s modern and contemporary thoughts, to some extent, have broken away from its traditional culture. When facing the mighty Western civilization, China does not possess its own system of discourse and speech and therefore is bound to lose the basis for comparability and get trapped into the Westernization of Chinese thoughts, which refers to “the illustration of China from the Western perspectives” and “the comment on the West from Chinese perspectives.” As a result, aphasia is inevitable. The famous contemporary master of Comparative Literature, the French writer François Jullien, considers the heterogeneity of civilization “as a crucial issue. We are in an era of the standardization of the Western concepts and model. The reconstruction of everything makes it impossible for the Chinese to spell over their culture; the same is also true with the Japanese. The ancient Chinese thoughts, which have their own logic, are gradually turned into Western concepts. In ancient Chinese writings, what promotes thinking is the correlation and symmetry between words, and the way they interact with each other. To ignore these characteristics is to throw away the essence of Chinese thoughts” [37]. Therefore, the current studies of Comparative Literature should start from the logic of Chinese literary theories and adhere to its own discourse norms and value positions. The notion of “comparison” should not be used to blindly deny the heterogeneity among civilizations. And the whole theoretical system of Jullien is centered on the “otherness” and “irrelevance” of Chinese to Western ideologies. But why on earth should heterogeneity and irrelevance attract so much concern? What is the ultimate purpose of restructuring the discourse of China’s literary theories? That is, to rethink the theoretical framework of Comparative Literature and to re-illustrate the issue of “comparability.” The research model of the comparability based on the concept of seeking for “sameness” while putting aside differences should be abandoned; the researching model of seeking for heterogeneity and irrelevance among civilizations should be adopted. Researchers should take the initiative to seek for “otherness” to restore the original images of civilization. Only in this way can these independent and autonomous civilizations be interpreted via their own discourse norms so as to be complemented by each others’ advantages and be integrated via exchanges with each other. This is the basic idea of Variation of

Comparative Literature and also a major theoretical breakthrough at the current stage of development.

Then what is Variation? And how was Jullien related to Variation? The Variation of Comparative Literature was first brought up in *Studies of Comparative Literature*, published in 2005. Its third chapter is titled as “Literary Variation,” which is further divided into six sections respectively concerning translatology, Imagology, thematology, genealogy, cultural filter, and misreading of literature. Take genealogy for an example. I believe that “starting from the perspective of ‘Variation’, we can step out of the ideology of ‘seeking for the sameness’ of Comparative Literature and genealogy; we can broaden the research horizons and domain of genealogy and explore Comparative Literature and genealogy in a broader sphere” [36]. And then in the beginning of 2006, I brought up a specific definition for Variation: “According to the Variation of Comparative Literature, the transcendence and literary qualities of Comparative Literature are considered the foundation for research; based on that, the Variation of the exchanges of the literary phenomena are studied, and the literary heterogeneity and variability of non-factual related literary phenomena are also studied, through which the inherent principles of the differences and variations of literary phenomena are explored and illustrated” [38]. It can be seen from the statement that the key word of Variation of Comparative Literature is “otherness,” which has already broken away from the limitations of the comparability of “sameness” proposed by influence study and parallel study. Therefore, another kind of comparability can be constructed through heterogeneity. In fact, it can be seen from the Westernization of Chinese literary theories in the twentieth century, that cultural discontinuity and aphasia are just the results of the “sameness” effect from Western discourse. The seeking for sameness means to first subjectively identify a model, which is also a standardized system. Behind that model and system lay the original destruction, distortion, and Variation of heterogeneous civilization. In this way, theoretical postcolonialism can be achieved under the name of comparison. Similarly, Mr. Wu Xingming has also been aware of the importance of Variation to the present theoretical development of Comparative Literature. Wu has developed his research based on *The Traveling of Theory* written by the representative of postcolonialism, Said. He proposes that “‘Variation Theory’ does not give special attention to the ‘sameness’ between the theories of the travelling target regions and those of the original, but to the ‘differences’. Based on the Variation, the homogeneity based on ‘consanguinity’ is not the focal point, but the differences formed in history” [39].

From the studies, it can be found that Comparative Literature is initially the study of cross-culture. And afterwards, I have adjusted the terminology from “cross-culture” to “cross-civilization.” Many people have shown their disagreement and have criticized such a transformation as a change in form, not in content. Actually, such transformation not only refers to change in terminology but also contains profound theoretical meaning. I believe that “culture,” compared with “civilization,” constitutes an investigation into macroscopic heterogeneity. For instance, the American school of Comparative Literature assumes comparison can only proceed within the same civilization circle. And I regard such perception as

limited for it is “cross-culture” not “cross-civilization,” which refers to “the emphasis on the heterogeneity among different civilizations” [40]. The realm of culture is distinctly limited. Although a civilization usually consists of various cultures that can be compared with each other, those comparisons are based more on the sameness than the otherness, for those cultures are largely identical and with minor differences. It has been shown from “Variation” and the practice of China’s “irrelevance” conducted by Jullien that sameness is still considered to be the foundation for comparison. However, based on the pattern of civilization in the contemporary world, it is obvious that heterogeneity and irrelevance account for a large proportion. Therefore, research should be started from the heterogeneity of civilization, not just from the heterogeneous culture under the same civilization framework. I already elaborated this issue in “Cross-Civilization Study: The Theory and Practice of Comparative Literature in China in the 21st Century,” “On the Issue of Comparability in Cross-Civilization Study,” and “Cross-Civilization Study—The Transition and Construction of the Discipline Theory of Comparative Literature.”

Ch’ien Chung-shu has always been considered one of the founding fathers of Chinese Comparative Literature. It is generally believed that Ch’ien’s research in Comparative Literature is a typical example of “the combination between the East and the West.” However, according to Francois Jullien, Ch’ien’s defect, which is the same as that of Liu Ruoyu’s, lies in the seeking for “sameness.” Liu’s is the typical model of illustrating China based on Western perspectives and Ch’ien’s is the analogy based on a similar pattern. Jullien said that “I admire him [Ch’ien] for his great learning. He knew about China and its traditions like the back of his hand. He was a man of great integrity. His comparative method was one of approximation, one of ceaseless approximation: the meaning of one statement would be identical to another in the final analysis. Comparison of this kind, in my opinion, is not effective. As far as this is concerned, I also made a mention of Liu Ruoyu in the preface to my dissertation. To me, Liu had made an incorrect starting point: he attempted to adopt a typically Western model in his review of China’s poetics, the doing of which would have no value at all” [37]. Thus, the strategy of Jullien’s comparison is to completely avoid the influence, connection, and reference among thoughts; comparison cannot be referred to as the analogy within the same civilization circle. In other words, the more transcendent aspects two civilizations contain, the less total sum those two civilizations can produce. That is to say, during their dialogue, if heterogeneous civilizations have always been adjusted to achieve sameness, the gap between them will be gradually narrowed. In that case, “putting aside differences” can only be considered as a theoretical consciousness, without its impact on the overall value. According to Jullien, the more different, irrelevant, and even distinct the two civilizations are, the more valuable their comparison is; because the meaning of the reflection, astonishment, and restructuring of civilization, which is the result of the conclusion under the two completely distinct perspectives, is far greater than the satisfaction of self-centeredness obtained from the seeking of sameness. If self-identity is always advanced within Western civilization and heterogeneous civilization is usually rejected, “self-identification would slide to internal identification, the rapid expansion of which would lead to the disintegration of

self-consciousness. This would certainly result in a strong appeal for external identification and the anxiety of identity. The split of the external identification route would forcefully cause the internalization of meaning and quest. The antinomy and two-way dislocation of value identification on the part of the reader would show itself between this ‘drive back’ and ‘appeal’” [41]. Thus, the significance of comparative studies strategy concerning the otherness and heterogeneity proposed by Variation of Comparative Literature is that comparative studies do not necessarily elaborate its comparison of “seeking for sameness while wiping out differences” or “seeking for sameness while putting aside differences” based on “sameness” and “otherness”; the end of comparison is not comparing itself, but to achieve “comparison” during the state of “no comparing.”

Take Jullien’s research about Chinese thoughts as an example. He has not used a set of Western discourse to conduct the illustration, but has always been concerned with such domains as “wisdom,” “ordinariness,” “process,” “relations,” “conscience,” and “virtual reality and reality.” He has not apparently conducted the comparison; but actually during the research process and theoretical illustrations, he has given much thought in his sublime words with profound meanings. His comparison is neither to explore the counterparts in the East and the West under the “same” framework nor to explore the relations among civilizations, but to “discover” all those things that have not been touched upon, which is exactly what has been mentioned—the “otherness.” Thus, the factors concerning otherness can be used to restructure the civilization system. In the history of Comparative Literature, the French school, American school, and even Chinese school have always been struggling between the comparative framework of “sameness” and “otherness.” That is to say, they have always been entangled with the issue of “comparability.” The emergence of aphasia is that holding a certain conceptual system of ideological domain, the West has been seeking for similar elements in Chinese documents and then has been trying to elaborate its so-called comparative illustrations. However, the major problem of such comparative research is that it has not truly actualized dialogue and integration and therefore has led to the serious consequence of “two-way Variation.” The West usually presets a framework for comparison and then adds quantities of materials and explanations to supplement or verify. From its conceptual domain to its whole comparing pattern, the West holds the strong subjective desire to compare just for the sake of comparison itself: “It can be perceived that the formation of Chinese comparative literature was initiated by the clash of Chinese and Western civilizations, thus the result of those frictions between Chinese and Western cultures. The heterogeneity and Variation have outweighed the commonality during the clash of civilizations; and heterogeneity and Variation are the modes of expression for Chinese Comparative Literature, as well as the core issue of cross-civilization studies [...]. Therefore, if to conduct cross-culture studies under the mentality of ‘seeking for sameness’, there will be tremendous difficulties and barriers; and Variation should be the focal point for the subject theories of contemporary Comparative Literature” [42].

However, Jullien’s research also contains a serious problem—he has been excessively pursuing irrelevance and heterogeneity and therefore has been heading towards the antithesis of “sameness” and “homogeneity.” He has been trying to step out of the

civilization framework of sameness and homogeneity and to refuse the assimilation and dissimilation of ideas using otherness and irrelevance. His perspective has been moving towards the other extreme. That is to say, the traditional French school has been focusing on the “sameness,” whereas Jullien has been focusing on the “otherness.” Both sides have been initiating the development of Comparative Literature theories from their own perspectives. However, I believe that neither one-sided convergent thinking nor one-sided divergent thinking can comprehensively solve the current problem of Comparative Literature. “Divergent thinking” can only be considered the method and strategy of Variation in Comparative Literature. The essence of Variation actually lies in the “harmony of both.”

5.4.3 Mutual Elucidations and Variations Among the Literatures of Heterogeneous Civilizations

It can be inferred from the previous analysis that the real end of Variation of Comparative Literature is neither “convergence” nor “divergence,” but “the harmony of both.” Then, what is the difference between the initial strategy of “seeking for sameness while reserving differences” and “being harmonious yet different”? The first difference is that no matter if it is the strategy of “seeking for sameness while reserving differences” or “seeking for otherness while reserving sameness,” “seeking” is the core, the purpose of which is to establish a kind of comparability. Thus, the process of “seeking” is actually the establishing process of comparability. However, when subjectively seeking for sameness or otherness, it is easy to subconsciously heterize the original images of ideas. When conducting real comparison, it ought to eliminate value preconceptions, respect reality itself, and restore the original images of reality. Only in this way can comparison proceed; otherwise, it will be trapped into two-way assimilation and dissimilation. Therefore, the first step of Variation is to “seek for otherness,” which is not the completely opposite perspective of “seeking for sameness,” but to correct the French School’s excessive emphasis on sameness. According to Variation, the heterogeneity among civilizations should be restored. That is to say, Chinese thoughts should be Sinicized. Meanwhile, it should also be realized that “seeking for otherness” is only a kind of approach. The comparison between Chinese and Western civilizations is not to find out the specific “sameness” or otherness, nor is it to establish comparability based on “sameness” like the French school did, nor is it to excessively pursue heterogeneity and even head off for “irrelevance” like Jullien did. The ultimate goal of Variation is to achieve harmony and even the effect of “harmonious yet different” through “seeking for otherness” and mutual elucidation and Variation among literatures from heterogeneous civilization. It should be commonly accepted that facts should speak for themselves and comparison is an implicit inspiration. Therefore, the essential relation between civilization heterogeneity and the Variation of Comparative Literature is to first acknowledge commensurability and otherness and then to establish comparability.

In order to restore the heterogeneity of Chinese civilization, I have proposed a new way of thinking as discourse restructuring: “To restructure China’s literary discourse is actually to restructure the rules; only when the discourse and cultural rules of China’s literary theories are mastered can one not only ‘follow them’ but also ‘make use of and develop them’; whereas the implementation of western rules will only result in distortions. Therefore, we should start from the heterogeneity of China’s literary theories and restructure China’s literary theories using China’s own traditional discourse and its principles” [43]. There are two important prepositions—the comparison between the Sinicization of Chinese literary theories and heterogeneity and also the comparison between the Sinicization of Chinese literary theories and otherness. These prepositions, compared with the irrelevance proposed by Jullien, are a more thorough theoretical restoration through the comparison in terms of heterogeneity and otherness, which also contains the projections of “sameness.” While comparing, these elements of “sameness” are usually put aside and the elements of otherness are usually of major concern. On the contrary, the perspective of “irrelevance” focuses on the contrast and comparison among the civilizations with completely different historical and cultural background, such as Chinese civilization and the ancient Greek civilization. The value of irrelevance is that it does not provide referential conclusions on the basis of certain factors (such as the “sameness” and “otherness” of China and the West on the basis of certain theoretical domain), but creates inspiration and astonishment. It has been maximizing the avoidance of the possibility of “sameness” and the synergistic effect under the influence of thought and has stepped into total irrelevance, which coincides with “Variation.” Irrelevance has made it possible that Western ideas, Chinese ideas, factors, and phenomena still exist as themselves. Otherness will not be analyzed based on the comparability of “sameness”; “sameness” will not be analyzed based on the comparability of “otherness.” Irrelevance refers to the basis of complete “exoticness” or “otherness.” But actually, the otherness or exoticness is actually a necessary starting point or observation parameter to restructure the image of “self.” Therefore, a specific operational model of irrelevance is to Sinicize Chinese thoughts and Chinese literary theories and to restore China’s heterogeneity. Comparison should not be conducted for the sake of itself, just as and Wu Xingming and I mentioned that “Apparently, Chinese poetics must be confirmed as another kind of knowledge; thus, the knowledge of Chinese characteristics should be used to conduct dialogue with the West, rather than the submission and adoption of Western perspectives” [44]. Of course, there are such factors as ideological patterns, intellectual systems, and discourse rights behind comparison. And deconstructionism, semiotics, and postcolonialism have already dismantled some of those inherent connections, which have provided sufficient philosophical background for the comparison of irrelevance. In brief, the comparison of irrelevance is a major breakthrough in the contemporary fields of Comparative Literature and Comparative Philosophy. It has constructed another particular relevant domain, in which the “self” can be observed and restructured via the analysis of otherness, which contains distinct cultural and ideological patterns. While comparing, “self” and “otherness” can achieve mutual inspiration, complementation, and dialogues and finally help form the

ideological state of “being harmonious yet different.” Bauman once described that “One cannot knock on a door unless one is outside; and it is the act of knocking on the door which alerts the residents to the fact that one who knocks is indeed outside. ‘Being outside’ casts the stranger in the position of *objectivity*: his is an outside, detached, and autonomous vantage-point from which the insiders (complete with their world-view, including their map of friends and enemies) may be looked upon, scrutinized, and censored. The very awareness of such an outside point of view (a point of view epitomized by the stranger’s status) makes the natives feel uncomfortable, insecure in their native ways and truths. Besides, entry is always a passage, a changing of statuses and this mysterious avatar event more than anything else puts the ‘yesterday’s stranger-prospective native’ in conflict with the world he wishes to enter, a world which draws its confidence (and its attraction for the stranger in the first place) from the assumption that no one is ever transformed, no one moves, and no one ever finds himself outside” [45].

In this way, the inherent relationship between the heterogeneity of civilization and the variability of Comparative Literature can mainly be reflected in the following aspects.

First of all, the heterogeneity of civilization is an inherent core of variability: “The Variation study of Comparative Literature will take ‘difference’—dissimilarity—as its groundwork, whether it is ‘the study of change’ or ‘the study of difference’. As is suggested by its name, what it seeks are elements of ‘heterogeneity’” [46]. To the West, the value of Chinese civilization is not that to what extent it reflects homogeneity. Bauman perceives that “If recourse to racism seems to be the natural way of salvaging the objective of ‘assimilation programme’ in the wake of the bankruptcy of its ostensible means, so the retreat into ‘strangerhood’ as a substitute home of rootedness and confidence seems to be an equally natural way of salvaging the purpose of the cultural self-adaptation once the vehicle offered by the programme have proved ineffective” [45]. Therefore, the saving of one’s own civilization is bound to rely on another referential civilization system. In this way, the “self” can be in the state of “strangers” and thus can observe the discourse patterns of its own civilization and also can break away from the sphere between “this” and “otherness.” In this way, the patterns of style versus usage and center versus margin can be combined and integrated into a holistic framework. And such a perspective has also been influencing the discourse pattern and discourse domain of the East and the West because “the restraints towards such discourse boundaries and the insightful doubts towards the rights and norms have implied the emergence of an ‘uncertain’ statement model, which means that the traditional, stable and authoritative discourse framework is about to be dissembled, restructured, contracted, or expanded at any time and the identities of those elements in such process will be reflected as Variation in terms of connotation and extension” [41].

The heterogeneity of cross-civilization and the Variation of Comparative Literature share a theoretical way of thinking. They both hold the end of “returning” by circuitous “going away.” Such returning implies integration, complementation, and dialogue among heterogeneous civilization so as to restructure and develop one’s own civilization, which has provided the poetics and philosophy of China and

the West with important methodology: “The advocacy of the so-called referentiality and complementarity is to realize the communication and integration among world cultures via Comparative Literature, and to construct a harmonious world with the characteristic of ‘harmonious while different’, which is the ultimate end of concerning differences and developing the Variation of Comparative Literature raised by us” [47]. The greatest confusion of the comparison between China and the West lies in the contradictory issue concerning “comparability” and “heterogeneity.” In other words, what is comparable, how to compare, and how to specify a domain for comparison? In the field of Comparative Literature, the French school has always been considering that the issue of “comparability” lies in the seeking of sameness. Their three major pillars—Doxologie, Crenologie, and Mesologie—all lay stress on empirical convergent thinking. After all, France is the civilization center of Europe and therefore has its impact on Europe and even the whole world. They would like to find out the homogeneity among different languages, civilizations, and subjects; but they have not noticed the meaning of Variation within a different cultural context. They have chosen to ignore such Variation for the French school to put more emphasis on convergent thinking, which is also their major defect. As for the American school, although they have realized such a problem, they have chosen to avoid and even refuse to admit the existence of heterogeneity.

Weisstein believes that the studies of Comparative Literature cannot proceed from different civilization circles. That is to say, the American school has complemented and corrected the perceptions of the French school, because the latter has completely neglected the heterogeneity issue among different civilizations. However, the American school does not consider such heterogeneity as the comparability. If the French school’s purpose is to seek for sameness while neglecting differences, the American school’s purpose is to seek for sameness while resisting differences. As for Chinese scholars, they conduct comparison based on the perspective of illustration. No matter in terms of one-way or two-way illustrations, Chinese scholars hold the cognitive model of “seeking for sameness regardless of differences.” They tend to illustrate Chinese literary phenomena based on the Western theories and vice versa, regardless of the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western civilizations: “In terms of the Comparative Literature between Chinese and Western poetics, Jullien has always been advocating ‘otherness comparison’. He believes that because of the long-term isolation between China and the West, ‘influence comparison’ based on factual connections contains obvious limitations; besides, because of the complete differences between China and the West in terms of thinking and language system, there are no comparative counterparts in existence; thus ‘parallel comparison’ based on the comparison of the same kind is also deemed to be blind and farfetched” [37]. Therefore, according to Jullien’s point of view, the study of Chinese Comparative Literature is different from both the influence studies of the French school and the parallel studies of the American school because there is no such thing as “relationship” between Chinese literature and French literature. Hence, to study starting from the empirical perspective is the same as getting water from a flint. Likewise, because of the heterogeneity of Chinese literary theories and discourse, there are no existing domains, concepts, or systems to conduct comparative studies between Chinese civilization and Western

civilization. That is to say, such parallel studies will cover heterogeneity and irrelevance. Therefore, an important mission of the Chinese school of Comparative Literature is to set the premise of otherness and irrelevance and then proceed with those two-way illustrations and the cross-civilizational dialogues and reflections. Based on that, the “irrelevance” raised by Jullien and the “Variation” are not different approaches but concepts.

Second, if cross-civilization comparison is bound to lead to the Variation of text and meaning, the objective fact of such Variation should not be neglected or even forgotten like the French school because as long as there is cross-language transformation, time-space transfer, and reference to diverse civilizations, Variation is definitely in existence; so the empirical convergent thinking is only a kind of theoretical illusion and utopian delusion. Furthermore, the objective fact of such Variation should not be avoided and resisted like the American school because heterogeneity can also be considered the analytical domain of comparability according to the perspective of dialectical philosophy. Comparison should not only be conducted in accordance with the exact boundaries of “sameness”; the analyses and illustrations of “otherness” are actually also a kind of comparison. And the heterogeneity has made diverse civilizations worthy of comparing. And the objective fact of such Variation should not be unfamiliar as evident with Chinese scholars. Unfamiliarity implies the blindness of behaviors. The prospect of comparison should not lie in the blindly convergent thinking, but lie in to be “harmonious while different.” To initiatively seek for otherness, one should first accept and apply the Variation principles while translating literary works. And then, one should study the meaning transitions during the process of cultural filtration and try to achieve “creative treason” rather than passively accept the “otherness.” Adorno, a Western Marxist scholar, has enlightened his critics based on criticism towards the “homogeneity” advocated by Western civilization: “What is negated is negative until it has passed. This is the decisive break with Hegel. To use identity as a palliative for dialectical contradiction, for the expression of the insolubly non-identical, is to ignore what the contradiction means” [48]. Hence, homogeneity can cover heterogeneity; the fundamental purpose of the denial of heterogeneity is to maintain the discourse of hegemony of Western civilization. “When showing respect to the subject theories of the schools of law and aesthetics, there is an issue that should be attached importance to, that is, the entire subject of Comparative Literature lacks the studies in variability, which is a new perspective, methodology, and theory in the studies of Comparative Literature and thus is a major breakthrough in the subjective theory of Comparative Literature of the whole world” [42]. The immediate consequences of lacking Variation studies are dissimilation, assimilation, or aphasia, so the studies of Chinese Comparative Literature should be established in China with the purpose of discovering the Orient, just as what Wang Yuechun once said that “the mission of Chinese scholars lies in ‘to discover the Orient’; but it doesn’t mean the neglect of the West. The West is a powerful other, which is a huge context for Chinese scholars to conduct research. Thus, those of the West should constantly be concerned and ‘brought about’, which is still a major task for Chinese scholars for centuries; but the core of the task has developed into ‘speaking for their own’” [49].

In a word, the Variation of Comparative Literature cannot be simply concluded as “seeking for sameness while reserving differences” or “seeking for differences while reserving sameness,” but should be established to seek out the “otherness” of China, compared with that of the West. All such “otherness” should be used to establish and recognize Chinese discourse identity, which should not be blindly considered as emphasis on the heterogeneity, irrelevance, incommensurability, and the inherent structural differences of Chinese culture and Chinese literary theories. Chinese and Western cultural ideologies surely share the commonalities that are commensurable. But meanwhile, the “comparability” should not only be based on commensurability, but also refer to the incommensurability, heterogeneity, and irrelevance. Only in this way can the new discourse principles and academic paradigms of Comparative Literature and Comparative Philosophy be restructured.

5.5 The Heterogeneity of Cross-Civilization Literary Theories and the Studies of Variation

Cross-civilization literary theories refer to those fundamentally different literary theories generated from diverse civilizations. For instance, as for Chinese and Western literary theories, they are generated from different civilizations and therefore hold fundamentally dissimilar theories in terms of basic cultural principles and literary theory discourse (and the literary theories of the Western countries are based on homogeneous civilization). During exchange and dialogue, the heterogeneous discourse of literary theories can shape the heteroglossia interdependence through mutual understanding, mutual testifying, and mutual complementing, and those theories will further lead to the emergence of a new discourse of literary theory. If the heterogeneity of cross-civilization literary theories cannot be clearly recognized and dealt with, it is very likely to receive mutual coverage, which will finally lead to the decline and loss of certain aspects of heterogeneity. As for the Chinese literary theories ever since the ancient times, the academic circle has ignored its heterogeneity, which can be considered its modern destiny. Western literary theories are always applied, whereas the heterogeneity of Chinese literary theories is ignored and covered under the Western discourse of literary theories, which has finally led to the decline and loss of the Chinese discourse of literary theories [50]. Therefore, the studies of Variation should be centered on the studies of heterogeneity of cross-civilization literary theories. The variability of cross-civilization literary theories refers to the theoretical Variation during the theoretical traveling process from one heterogeneous literary theory to another heterogeneous culture. According to the “Travelling Theory,” the spread of a theory from one cultural context to another will lead to a certain degree of Variation on its own: “Such movement into a new environment is never unimpeded. It necessarily involves processes of representation and institutionalization different from those at the point of origin” [51]. The Variation of literary theories is aimed to explore the inherent rules of literary theories via the research in the state of

Variation while theoretical exchanging of different civilization and research in the expression differences of dissimilar countries, civilizations, and literary theories in the same domain.

5.5.1 The Principles of Foreignization of Literary Theories

The exchanges and fusions among heterogeneous literary theories require feasible ways and methods, which should be based on the general principles of the cultural exchanges of all human beings and the developing principles of literary theories of diverse countries. In China for thousands of years, there were actually several “fusions” between Chinese and Western cultures, during which Chinese culture was “transformed” and “restructured.” For instance, during the periods from Wei, Qin, and the Southern and Northern Dynasties till Tang Dynasty, Chinese culture, literature, and literary theories encountered two major experiences of the exchanges, fusions, transformations, and restructurings with heterogeneous civilizations: One is the collision and fusion of Southern and Northern cultures; the other is the exchange and transformation of Indian culture and Chinese culture, and the establishment of Zen Buddhism. In the era of Wei, Qin, and the Southern and Northern Dynasties, Indian Buddhism was introduced into China, which imposed great impact on Chinese culture and even shook the foundation of Chinese culture. That is the so-called Buddhization of China. The situation of that period was somewhat similar to the overall westernization of modern and contemporary China, in which Chinese culture has almost completely fallen apart under the great impact of European and American culture and the foundation of Chinese culture has become rather fragile. Such a situation is deemed the “aphasia” of the present cultures and literary theories. So far, the situation may develop towards two possible directions—one is the continuous “westernization” (Buddhism was used to convert China in the ancient times and Western culture is used to convert China nowadays); the other is the “Chinization” of Western culture. Although Buddhism has “westernized” (or Buddhized) China, it has also gradually embarked on the road of Chinization. After “converting China” in the Wei, Qin, and the Southern and Northern Dynasties, “western” Buddhism, ever since the Tang Dynasty, has undergone its cultural adjustment and sped up its Chinization. Thus, Chinese culture has lived through its critical period and has finally been heading towards the fusion between the East and the West (India) and has embarked on the road of “conversion” and “reconstruction,” which has led to the formation of Sinicized Buddhism—Zen Buddhism. The key issue and the fundamental difference between the “Buddhization of China” and the “Chinization of Buddhism” lie in what dominated “Chinization.” If the Indian Buddhist culture dominated “Chinization,” it would just lead to the opposite of what everyone wishes, which is the “conversion” of China by Indian Buddhism; the right way should be to implement Chinization of Buddhism mainly on the basis of Chinese culture and the discourse principles of Chinese culture. Only in this way can the “conversion” and “reconstruction” be

truly realized. From the progress of the “Buddhisization of China” and the “Chinization of Buddhism,” the basic principles of the development of literary theories can be concluded, which can also be referred to as the “foreignization principles of literary theories.” Both culture and literary theories can be “converted” under certain historical and cultural circumstances. Such “conversion” is also known as “foreignization,” and the “Buddhisization of China” and the “Chinization of Buddhism” are both the phenomena of “foreignization.” This is the developing principle of culture and literary theory, which is an objective law independent of man’s own will. If such a principle can be understood and applied properly, the reliable way to “restructure” the contemporary literary theories of China will be sought out. The restructuring task of the contemporary culture and literary theories of China is to achieve the transformation from ancient literary theories to modern ones and meanwhile to achieve the “Chinization of Western literary theories” based on the principle of “foreignization.” The primary task of “Chinization” is not to tightly follow the lead of the West and let the West “convert” China, but to give priority to China itself and “convert the West” mainly on the basis of Chinese culture [52].

The premise to understand the principle of the “foreignization of literary theories” is that when under a different cultural context and being cross-linguistically interpreted and disseminated, a theory will definitely be “foreignized” to some extent, which is determined by the characteristics of cultural diffusion and language translation. According to cultural diffusion, when a culture is disseminated into another culture of a different civilization system, it will definitely experience recreation after being misread and interpreted, due to the differences among civilizations: “These differences are the product of centuries. They will not soon disappear. They are far more fundamental than differences among political ideologies and political regimes” [3]. As an important carrier of culture, literary theories, while being translated and interpreted, also possess the characteristics of “foreignization.” No matter it is the original theory or the target theory, it will certainly take along the qualities of different cultures; the inherent differences among cultures cannot be simply eliminated through translation. From the perspective of language translation, when a linguistic semiotic is transformed into another, the implied national and cultural psychology and the different understandings of language will necessarily lead to misreading and recreation. From the perspective of hermeneutics, when analyzing and illustrating a certain text, the translator’s “pre-understanding” will be the strongest; his “dialogue” with the text is actually the dialogue between two cultures; the integration of two particular visions will constitute a completely new “vision.” In this way, the target text cannot be the same as the original one; and the differences are the parts which have been “foreignized” to some extent. As a result, first of all, after being translated into Chinese, the Western literary theories have been filtered and misread due to Chinese culture and Chinese language and therefore differ from the original ones, which is actually the superficial reflection of the “Chinization” of Western literary theories. Second, the thorough reflection is the introduction of Western literary theories mainly on the basis of the academic principles of China. Cultural diffusion and theoretical translation is definitely not only indicative of language but of discourse transformation among different academic principles. Once a

theory deviates from its own academic disciplines, it is hard to find its original meaning; therefore, the introduction and transformation of Western literary theories should be mainly on the basis of Chinese academic principles. To “Sinicize” Western literary theories, on one hand, the importance of Chinese traditional academic principles should be fully recognized. Chinese academic principles and those of the West represent different cultural heritage and civilization characteristics. They hold fundamental differences in terms of cultural mechanisms and discourse patterns. Their differentiated academic principles have determined the heterogeneity between the discourse of Chinese traditional literary theory and that of China. Chinese should recognize its own cultural tradition and identity and participate in the dialogue with Western literary theories equally. Only in this way can Chinese and Western cultures and poetics get to a higher level of integration following their own developing trajectories. On the other hand, in practice, while reflecting and adjusting the overall Westernization of modern Chinese literary theories, besides Western materials, there is nothing but the traditional Chinese poetics materials, which must be got hold of. Its value is not to comment and confirm a modern understanding of poetics but to reflect and adjust the deviation of modern poetics starting from the perspective of “heterogeneity.” Under the context in which Western poetics have completely replaced Chinese traditional poetics, which has led to the crisis of “aphasia,” the academic principles of traditional poetics should be considered a platform to introduce and integrate, on which foreign theories and modern poetics can complement and inspire a Chinese discourse system and Chinese academic principles [53].

To restructure Chinese literary theories mainly on the basis of Chinese culture and Chinese literary theories themselves is not only feasible but has been proven to be feasible. In the history of modern literary theories, the successful practices of Wang Guowei and Ch’ien Chung-shu are clear proof of that statement. Wang Guowei was greatly influenced by German classical philosophy and aesthetics. Thus, in many of his theses, the aesthetic theories, raised by Schopenhauer, Nietzsche, Kant, and Schiller, were used to explore the issues concerning the masterpieces in Chinese literature. Such phenomenon is the product of cultural integration between the East and the West. There are two identical features of Wang’s poetics—“First of all, he took in quantities of Western discourse in terms of concept and domain, thus his works possessed a stronger capacity for expression and a broader theoretical vision; second, his works held the tendency to return to Chinese traditional poetics in terms of poetic spirits” [54]. In his work of *Jen-Chien TZ’u-hua (Poetic Remarks in the Human World)*, Wang made clear the purpose and the main theme that “TZ’u-hua, which is a type of classical Chinese poetry, regards State as the highest standard in poetry. And Wang Guowei directly applied the traditional Chinese speech expression “TZ’u-hua” and meanwhile integrated a lot of Western aesthetic terminologies, starting from the basis of Chinese traditional discourse of literary theories. For instance, in terms of the classification of “State,” he perceived that “it is difficult to distinguish the state category which can be classified as ideal state and realistic state. What the great poet expressed is natural language of the heart and affected by his imagination” [55]. His classification concerning “ideal state” and “realistic state” was actually

influenced by Western classification of Romanticism and Realism. But Wang Guowei did not hold the idea of either this or that based on the philosophical perspective of binary opposition, but interpreted the two based on the idea of Chinese philosophy of overall harmony and the identity of object and self. He supposed that the two were difficult to separate and therefore should coexist in works. It was thus clear that although Wang Guowei took up Western discourse of literary theories, he successfully digested and integrated it into the spirit and expression of Chinese traditional poetics and made it become an organic part of Chinese discourse of literary theories. Thus, the “Chinization” of Western discourse was achieved. Ch’ien Chung-shu had a thorough knowledge of both the West and the East. He quoted quantities of Western utterance into his works of *Notes on Literature and Art* and *Some arts and partial views*. However, unlike the common people, Ch’ien Chung-shu’s perspective towards traditional thinking and culture was not “to mechanically ‘incise’ the thoughts from ancient China” but “to develop a new method of exploring the modern Western culture, which would reflect the once lost intellectual wisdom in Chinese traditional books and documentation. In this way, the once lost intellectual wisdom would glow in its ‘Contemporaneousness’ and place itself in modern thoughts. And such development would proceed” [56]. The success of Wang Guowei and Ch’ien Chung-shu is that they took their root in Chinese discourse of traditional literary theories and therefore effectively “grafted” certain “branches” of Western discourse of literary theories onto the “big tree” of that of Chinese. The speech and expression capacities of Chinese discourse of literary theories were strengthened and meanwhile the “inherent qualities” of Chinese discourse of literary theories were maintained. This has shown that the “Chinization” of Western literary theories is not only a good intention and assumption but is possible and realistic. After sorting out the Chinese and Western literary theories, those intersections can be found, which can be effectively “grafted” on the basis of Chinese discourse of literary theories. As long as the developing principle of the “foreignization” of culture and literary theories is followed and the Chinization of Western literary theories on the basis of the Chinese perspective is applied, the modern transformation and restructuring of Chinese literary theories can be truly accomplished [57].

5.5.2 *The Study of Chinization of Western Literary Theories*

The “Chinization” of Western literary theories refers to giving priority to Chinese academic disciplines and creatively absorbing and applying Western discourse of literary theories, through which Chinese traditional discourse of literary theories can be enriched and updated. And such “updated discourse” can truly be used in the practice of the composition and criticism of contemporary literature, which will initiate the development and contemporary restructuring of Chinese discourse of literary theories. And the essence lies in that first, the approach of accepting and imitating the West blindly should be transformed and Western literary theories should be placed in the practice of Chinese literature and their universal value

should be identified and tested on the basis of Chinese literary composition and specific literary phenomena, and second, the achievement of Western literary theories should be creatively transformed on the basis of Chinese academic principles and the fusion between the two will be achieved on the basis of such dialogue and mutual illustration; thereafter, the general laws of literary development and evolution will be revealed. Thus, the key of “Chinization” is “to adhere to the China-oriented, based on which to digest and absorb Western literary theories and to proceed deepened principle integration in terms of discourse; in this way, a new academic discourse principle will be shaped” [58].

The “Chinization” of Western literary theories requires certain conditions, which can be concluded as the following two points at least. The first one is the cultural adaptability. A literary theoretical system and discourse patterns are usually constructed according to their respective cultural academic principles. Based on that, culture is the core and the basis of literary theories; literary theories are the results and the literary extension of culture. Cultural adaptability refers to the similarities and intersections between two heterogeneous cultures, which contain common or similar cultural factors. Without those similarities or with completely different cultural factors, it will be rather difficult to advance the Variation and “Sinicize” those literary theories. For example, in terms of Western literary theories, the literary theory of medieval Christian theology was based on the religious belief of Christianity. In his work of *The Confessions*, Augustine perceived that God was the noumenon of all beauty and one must worship and love God if he/she wants to understand beauty itself. However, there was no place for such a theory during the “Westernization of Chinese literary theories” because there is no commonality or similarity between Chinese cultural traditions and Christian dogma. According to Confucian culture, the issue of ghosts and gods was left open—“Confucius said, ‘It is already difficult to understand people and the reality, let alone ghosts and gods.’” Just because of the huge differences between the cultural foundation of the literary theory of Christian theology and Chinese traditional culture, there is no way that the literary theory of Christian theology can be “Sinicized.” Chinese people would rather believe in the Confucius perspective rather than Christian theology. On the contrary, the literary theories of Marxism–Leninism have been “Sinicized,” due to several factors. But an important point lies in the spread of the advanced culture of Marxism. Without the October Revolution, which brought to China such advanced ideology and culture, the literary theories of Marxism–Leninism could not have been “Sinicized.” The second condition is to meet the needs and demands. The “Chinization” of heterogeneous literary theories does not refer to the complete copying and unconditional transplanting, but adapting to the demands of China. For instance, after the founding of New China, the legitimating of the literary theories of the former USSR was due to the needs of times and politics. During that period of time, China implemented the policy of “leaning to one side” and comprehensively learned from the former USSR. In the 1950s, the former Soviet Union sent a large number of experts to help China develop its industries, sciences and technology, and higher education. In 1954, the Central Ministry of Education along with Peking University invited the Soviet expert Bi of Markov to lecture on the theory of

literature and art in Peking University, which at that time was actually a government action. His lecture and the publication of his teaching material *An Introduction to Theories of Literature and Art* symbolized the legitimating of Soviet literary theories in China. In the National Ideological Remoulding Movement of Intellectuals, literary newspapers criticized the education of the Theory of Literature and Art in the departments of Chinese language and literature of colleges and universities. However, after that, there was no uniform textbook; thus, the teachers were at loose ends and did not know how to teach the subject. Under such circumstances, it was a matter of logical thinking to resort to the Soviet expert. Besides, it was also urgent for the faculty to own such a textbook. In the massive discussions concerning the education of the Theory of Literature and Art initiated by the literary newspaper, the teachers from the preliberation era could no longer meet the teaching needs and the young graduates had just stepped into their positions and had not matured enough. There was an urgent need to open seminars, lectured by Soviet experts, in order to cultivate the teachers so that they could be qualified to teach the courses concerning Theory of Literature and Art. It is thus clear that the legitimating of Soviet literary theories just met the demands of China. Such adaptability is the foundation for Variation and transformation, without which there may lack the conditions and possibilities for Variation; therefore, the transformation of literary theories from “the Westernization of China” to “the Chinization of the West” may not be realized [59].

Besides the dialogues among heterogeneous literary theories and the activation of the new qualities of literary theories (see the illustrations in *The Dialogue and Activation among Heterogeneous Literary Theories*), there are at least two feasible approaches concerning the “Chinization” of Western literary theories.

First of all, those heterogeneous literary theories, which are similar to each other, could be inspired and illustrated by each other. When facing common literary themes, those heterogeneous literary theories could hold the same or similar perspectives in certain aspects, which will initiate those inspirations and illustrations. In this way, because of the similarities with Chinese literary theories held by some other literary theories, which have been generated under certain cultures, it is fairly easy for the Chinese circle of literary theories to accept and understand. Thus, those heterogeneous literary theories can achieve their “Chinization.” For instance, starting from the literary nature, the Western literary theories have a long history of imitating. Democritus believed that literature and art were just the imitation of nature: “We learned from the spider weaving and mending; from the swallow building houses, from the Swan and warbler singing” [60]. Aristotle once said that “Epic poetry and Tragedy, Comedy, Dithyrambic poetry, and most flute-playing and lyre-playing, are all, viewed as a whole, modes of imitation” [61]. In the 48th chapter in the first part of *Don Quixote*, Cervantes believed that the principle of drama is the imitation of reality. In ancient China, there were the same or similar perspectives. It is said that “one can obtain and create images by observing the target objects.” *Yi Zhuan—Xi Ci* has told us that in ancient times, the governor observed and imitated to experience everything in the world. To “observe” refers to the process of observing and experiencing; to “obtain” means that “images,” which are similar to

the target “objects,” can be created based on the observation and experience and in the aftermath comes process and refinement. Obviously, this Chinese perspective is just like the imitation theory of the West. It is thus clear that when facing the same topics concerning literary nature, both Chinese and Western literary theories share a similar understanding. Thus the imitation theory of the West could easily be accepted by the Chinese circle of literary theories. And the Western literary theories could be Sinicized. In his “Speech on Literature and Art on Yan’an Forum,” Mao Zedong once emphasized that “as an ideological form, the works of literature and art are all the reflections of social life in the human mind.” For instance, Western hermeneutics has imposed a great impact on contemporary Chinese literary theories, because it shares certain sameness or similarity with the literary theories of ancient China. Hermeneutics originated in the interpretation of the Bible, which is similar to exegesis in the Confucian tradition. An ancestor Schleiermacher believed that “where there are understandings, there is hermeneutics.” And its counterpart can be found in *Zhou Yi—Xi Ci*. The intention of such a comparison is to emphasize that existing knowledge usually helps to lay favorable conditions for acceptance, and a similar perspective usually helps to “Sinicize” heterogeneous literary theories. If those differences on the much broader platform of similarities are the reason for comparison, the similarities on the much broader platform of differences are the cornerstone for mutual inspiration.

Second, those heterogeneous literary theories can be creatively misread. Heterogeneous literary theories can be learned. While reading, one should try his/her best to accept and understand accurately. But “misreading” is also acceptable; but such “misreading” does not refer to the realm of mastering knowledge, but rather to the creation of new theories, which occurs in the misreading of heterogeneous literary theories. As is evident, Pound, the master of Western imagism theories, was inspired by Chinese traditional poetics and Confucianism and created the theories of Western imagism theories, which has made him the founder of American modernist poetic theories. His success was that he did not only absorb the essence of Chinese poetics and draw from Chinese ancient imagery theories which were unfamiliar to the West, but also set foot in the utterance foundation of his national poetics and applied the poetic discourse expression which was logical and noumenon oriented. In this way, his theory became a scientific, systematic, and feasible theoretical criticism. Without the logical and systematic basis of Western expressions, imagery poetics may not attain so many achievements like what it has today. Thus, heterogeneous literary theories can achieve their localization via creative misreading as is the “Chinization” of Western literary theories. For instance, to Lu Xun, who emphasized the creation of new theories, he in fact misread Nietzsche’s theory. Right before the May Fourth Movement, Lu did not perceive Nietzsche’s thoughts as an integrated system to research and adopt, but selectively picked up those parts that could arouse his resonance and accorded with his own willingness, based on the idea of “serving for my own.” He then applied those parts in accordance with his own interpretation to serve for the construction of his own theoretical system, which originated in the “misreading” of Nietzsche’s thoughts. During such “misreading,” he preceded the take-in and

transformation process and illustrated his own theoretical assertions. There are many other cases concerning such creative “misreading.” When expressing his perspectives of poetics, Bian Zhilin once raised the idea of “dramatized situation”: “I have just written a couple of lyric verses, because I have always been afraid of appearing and showing myself in public and even more afraid of publicizing my personal love affairs. I just feel easier being unknown to public. For now, I would like to express my feelings and emotions by something or someone. Without true feelings or emotions, I will never write a poem. But currently, I would just write less about the true stories of people. I have always been influenced by the old saying of ‘dramatic conception’ or the Western perspective of ‘dramatized situation’, which can also be referred to as novelization, typification, depersonalization, and even the occasional parody” [62]. As can be seen, Bian raised the lyric strategy of “dramatized situation,” which he considered “novelization, typification, and depersonalization.” It was actually the “misreading” of Eliot’s poetic theory of “depersonalization.” In his work of *Tradition and the Individual Talent*, Eliot said that “Poetry is not a turning loose of emotion, but an escape from emotion; it is not the expression of personality, but an escape from personality” [63]. The conclusions of such “misreading” may not be approved by all. However, to serve for the construction of China’s own theories via the creative misreading of heterogeneous literary theories is truly an effective approach to “Sinicize” Western literary theories [64].

5.5.3 *The Dialogue and Activation Among Heterogeneous Literary Theories*

Generally speaking, modern and contemporary Chinese literary theories are the result of the spread of Western literary theories, which mainly consist of the literary ideas of Renaissance thinkers and the literary system of the former Soviet Union. These theories may have included the commonality of human aesthetic activities. However, if the heterogeneity among different regions, nations, cultures, and civilizations is recognized, literature and literary theory themselves are the core content of culture, which should possess the characteristics of their respective nations and cultures. And the content concerning life and author mentality that are reflected in literary works also contains the issue of heterogeneity. If the Western literary theories are considered the only basis, Chinese literature and literary theories may not be fully comprehended. Ever since the twentieth century, the major problem of the ancient Chinese literary theory is that the “heterogeneity” of its own culture and tradition has been ignored and neglected. When illustrating the relationship between Chinese intellectuals and traditional culture, Yu Ying-shi once wrote that “Chinese intellectuals have been more and more unfamiliar with its own history, culture and tradition, because classical training has been gradually declining in the previous one hundred years. Till now, very few people are able to get rid of Western ideological framework to consider Chinese

literature thought and history. It seems that they can only illustrate Chinese classics via certain Western theory” [65]. Such observation should be considered accurate. For instance, existing Western literary theories such as Realism and Romanticism are used to study the authors and literary theories of ancient China, which will therefore be put into a place within the system of Western literary theories. Such phenomenon is commonly seen in the works of the modern and contemporary Chinese intellectuals. In the modern academic history, scholars have been fiercely arguing whether the literary theories of Bai Juyi belong to Realism or Romanticism, which is a typical case in this regard. And the perception that the thinking of Li Bai and Du Fu belong to Romanticism and Realism respectively is another example in this regard. Ever since the new era, various fashionable Western theories have been used to study the literary theories of ancient China (or more specifically to castrate the literary theories of ancient China), which is simply the contemporary continuation of that modern “tradition.” As a result, the heterogeneity between Chinese and Western literary theories is the realistic basis to proceed with dialogue and communication [66].

The so-called dialogue is actually the consciousness of the intake of perspective. Mikhail Bakhtin believes that dialogue is the reflection of meanings and therefore can reveal the multiple aspects of meanings. He said that “We should know that, in ideologic field of vision of any times and of any social group, there exist not one truth but several contradictory truths; not one pathway but several separate ideologic pathways” [67]. The contradictory truth can neither be fully observed from a certain fixed angle nor can it be comprehensively illustrated through a single discourse pattern. It requires a chance to be highlighted in dialogues. According to Habermas, no individual and no group can acclaim itself as the representative of rationality. Real rationality should be presented in a certain field and horizon, which is a space for public dialogues. And the consensus, which has been reached to a certain extent, is actually the embodiment of the principle of rationality. That is to say, rationality is in fact reflected during the process of communication and dialogue. Thus, Habermas attaches importance to the meaning of real life itself and perceives the knowledge of life as “A kind of deep non-theme-oriented knowledge is always the base of superficial horizontal knowledge and contextual knowledge.” Both the addresser and addressee are involved in the participation of certain domains. Although different people may perceive things differently towards certain issues, both two sides rather than only one of them should be considered the subject. This idea towards dialogue has a fairly prominent significance in the restructuring of the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theories, which is reflected in the following aspects. In terms of the relationship between Chinese and Western literary theories, on one hand, to blindly advance academic construction like the old-time close-door policy should no longer be accepted and although there are still defects, such transformation in the new era has basically been completed; on the other hand, during the process of learning from and introducing the Western literary theories and academic thoughts, Chinese people usually lack the problematiques that are generated from their own, which has led to the impact in commercial culture and modern society from the European and American literary theorists. And it is

actually necessary to demonstrate the applicability of such criticism in China first. While following the West, it is a common phenomenon that Chinese people lack the sensitivity towards the reality around themselves, which is just abnormal in the development of the humanities.

How to carry out the dialogue among heterogeneous literary theories? I hold the view that the key is to master two basic principles and three specific approaches. The two basic principles refer to “discourse independence” and “equal dialogue.” The so-called discourse independence means that the dialogue among heterogeneous literary theories requires the recognition of their differences, based on which the basic principles for mutual understanding and consensus can be reached. The “discourse” here refers to the basic domains and principles of certain cultural ideology and speech. Thus, the dialogue among heterogeneous literary theories is actually the dialogue among different discourses. The neglect of the aspect of discourse and the neglect of the construction pattern and speech principle of the basic meaning of culture may lead to two possible results—the superficial comparison among cultural phenomena, or the monologue from a dominant literary theory. The second basic principle is “equal dialogue,” which is not easy to achieve. But without such a principle, there will emerge the hegemonic status of a certain dominant culture. In the twentieth century, during the communication of culture and literary theories between China and the dominant West, the equality between the two was not highlighted. As a result, the phenomenon of “aphasia” emerged in the domains of Chinese culture and literary theories. Chinese people may have learned from other theoretical discourse, but have lost that of their own. They did not take advantage of other literary theories to enrich those of their own, but entirely transplanted and replaced their own cultural discourse. History has shown that the dialogue among heterogeneous literary theories can be effectively carried out only under the context of discourse equality. Otherwise, “dialogue” would again be turned into “monologue.” Furthermore, there are mainly three specific approaches to carry out such dialogue among heterogeneous literary theories—“different discourses but common topics,” “different discourses under the same context,” and the “dialogue while being translated into other discourses.” The so-called different discourses but common topics means that such dialogue should be based on common topics, which are the foundations of dialogue. For example, “the nature of literature” can be set as the common topic so that multidimensional dialogues can be carried out among the ancient Chinese literary theories, Western literary theories, ancient Indian poetics, and even ancient Japanese literary theories. Moreover, “different discourses under the same context” means that even without common topics, they can be set under the same context. And the same context refers to the same or similar situation or circumstance under which different discourses once encountered in their respectively different social and historical conditions. Under such identical or similar situations or circumstances, different discourses will respond in their respectively different ways and thus will form their own patterns of discourse expression and construction of meaning. Though different in terms of content, function, and topic, those discourses are the results of the same context or situation, based on which the

dialogue among those discourses can proceed. The third approach—dialogue while being translated into other discourses—means that comprehensive discourse dialogue can be carried out while being mutually translated in terms of literature and literary theory. With the development of language psychology and the translatology of comparative literature, the nature of translation has been increasingly understood and valued. Translation is no longer simply the issue of linguistics because any two texts or languages are usually backed by two disparate heterogeneous cultures and discourse systems, which respectively contain unique conceptual domains and expressing principles. They may have certain transcendence, intersections, and counterparts, but it is impossible that they are just the same. That is to say, such a superficial translation actually reflects the tensions of the discourse of the deeper level. Translation itself is the latent dialogue among heterogeneous cultures and discourses [68].

Heterogeneous literary theories can be mutually activating and inspiring through dialogues, which will initiate the emergence of new qualities of literary theories. For instance, while being Sinicized, Indian Buddhism was gradually transformed into a Buddhism with Chinese characteristics—Zen Buddhism. Based on a new cultural quality, many creative concepts with Chinese characteristics emerged in the ancient Chinese literary theories, such as “realization to truth” and “artistic conception.” Take the former one as an example to further illustrate this point. In the poetics of the Tang and Song Dynasties and thereafter, the notion of “realization to truth” was widely used. Ever since the conception of “realization to truth” raised by Zeng Chao, Zenists began to develop and widely spread the notion from word of mouth, which greatly influenced literary theories and poetic compositions during those dynasties.

While mutually inspiring, heterogeneous literary theories should accept the influences of exotic literary theories based on their respective local culture. That is to say, their local cultural traditions should play the leading role. And the starting point and end should also be their local culture. As explained by Chen Yinke, “the formation of a theoretical system and the obtaining of new quality require both the intake of exotic theories and the emphasis on national theories. These seem contradictory but actually are complementary perspectives in accordance with the true essence of Taoism and the long-lasting approach of Neo-Confucianism, which has also been demonstrated in the 2000 year history of theoretical communications between China and other nations” [69]. The sources in the dialogues among heterogeneous literary theories are just related to the intake of exotic literary theories on one hand and the emphasis of national qualities on the other hand. In his article, “Translation Art of Kumarajiva,” Chen supposed that “Translation of Kumarajiva” “has wiped off the varieties and heaviness of the original text, and has stepped out of the structure of the original text, and has transformed the original text” [70]. The “transformation of the original text” mentioned here refers to the acceptance of mutual dialogue and inspiration. And Variation is the inevitable course for the mutual dialogues and inspiration among heterogeneous cultures and literary theories.

References

1. Shunqing Cao. 2003. Cross-civilization study of comparative literature. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 1: 72.
2. Shunqing Cao. 2003. Patterns in cross-civilization study. *Journalism and Communication* 1: 23–24.
3. Huntington, Samuel. 1996. *The clash of civilization and the remaking of the world order*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
4. Feng Tianyu. 1994. The limitations of civilization conflict theory. *Teaching and Research* 4: 49–53.
5. Su Hao. 1998. Conflict and cooperation of civilization in international relations. *World History* 3: 18–27.
6. Wang Tianxi. 1998. Peace first in multipolar world—Comments on Huntington’s civilization conflict theory. *Studies on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics* 4: 14–19.
7. Wang Yuechuan. 2002. *Literary theory of postcolonialism and new historicism*. Jinan: Shandong Education Press.
8. Said, Edward. 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House.
9. Wang Ning. 1995. Orientalism, postcolonialism, cultural hegemonism criticism—An analysis of Edward W. Said’s postcolonialism theory. *Journal of Peking University* 2: 54–62, 128.
10. Shunqing Cao. 2007. Patterns in cross-civilization study. *Journalism and Communication* 1: 23–24.
11. Tu Weiming. 2002. The context of dialogue: Globalization and diversity. In *Collected papers of history studies*. Changchun: Ji Lin University Press.
12. Xiao Yongming. 2002. Confucian humanism and civilization dialogue-written record of Tu Weiming’s speech in Yuelu Academy. In *Civilization conflict and dialogue*. Changsha: Hunan University Press.
13. Yue Hua, and Gan Dong. 2001. Tu Weiming and modernization of Confucianism. In *Civilization conflict and dialogue*. Changsha: Hunan University Press.
14. Tu Weiming. 2001. Prospect of the third-stage development of Confucianism. In *Civilization conflict and dialogue*. Changsha: Hunan University Press.
15. Tu Weiming. 2001. Modern transformation of the tradition of Confucianism. In *Civilization conflict and dialogue*. Changsha: Hunan University Press.
16. Hong Xiaonan. 2000. On Tu Weiming’s thought of cultural philosophy. *Journal of Dalian University of Technology* 1: 1–8.
17. Li Minghua. 1999. Response and innovation: An interview With Tu Weiming at the conference on Confucianism at Harvard. *Seeking Truth* 4: 5–14.
18. Reischauer, Edwin. 1992. *The problem of China*. Japan: Ideal’s Society.
19. Gan Yongchang. 1985. *Translations of comparative literature studies*. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
20. Weisstein, Ulrich. 1987. *Comparative literature and literary theory*. Shengyang: Liaoning People’s Publishing House.
21. Yang Hongchang. 2000. The argument of the globalization: Harmony vs. new confliction, new competition. *The Social Science Research* 5: 23–28.
22. Qian Zhongshu. 1984. *Art dialogue (complement)*. Beijing: Zhonghua Book.
23. Tang Jianqing, and Zhan Yuelan. 2006. *Bibliography of Chinese comparative literature in hundred years*. Beijing: Qunyan Press.
24. Shunqing Cao. 2006. *Tutorial of the Chinese comparative literature*. Beijing: Higher Education Press.
25. Sun Shuwen. 2005. Soviet Union’s theory’s influence on the Chinese Marxism’s construction—Literary theory of Zhou Yang. *Social Science in Shan Dong* 5: 10–13.
26. Gu Tianhong. 1982. Chinese comparative literature: First quest to its category, method and spirit. *Collected essays in comparative literature*. Beijing: Chinese Academy of Social Science.

27. Shunqing Cao. 2002. *Discussion on Chinese comparative literature*. Chengdu: Sichuan Education Press.
28. Zhu Guangqian. 1984. *Poetics*. Beijing: The Joint Publishing.
29. Zhou Jingshen. 1989. Tang Xianzu and Shakespeare. In *Research materials of the Chinese comparative literature, 1919–1948*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
30. Ji Xianlin. 2001. *Comparative literature and folklore*. Beijing: Peking University Press.
31. Foucault, Michel. 1998. *The archaeology of knowledge*. Beijing: The Joint Publishing.
32. Shunqing Cao. 1996. Aphasia of literary theories and cultural pathosis. *Literature and Art Forum* 2: 50–58.
33. Shunqing Cao. 1995. First exploration to the character and methodology system about China school of comparative literature. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 1: 18–40.
34. Shunqing Cao. 2003. Study of cross-civilization comparative literature—Turning and constructing of comparative literature. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 1: 73–87.
35. Yang Linxin. 2002. New age: Comparative literature in cross-culture—Reviews on Society of Chinese comparative literature the 7th annual meeting international symposium. *Chinese Comparative Literature* 4: 148–154.
36. Shunqing Cao. 2005. *Science of comparative literature*. Chengdu: Sichuan University Press.
37. Qin Haiying. 1996. A dialogue on Chinese poetics and western poetics—An interview with Jullien. *Comparative Literature in China* 2: 77–87.
38. Shunqing Cao, and Li Weitao. 2006. A research on the variation study in the discipline of comparative literature. *Journal of Fu Dan University* 1: 79–83, 114.
39. Wu Xingming. 2006. The traveling of theory and the variation study. *Cultural Studies and Literary Theory* (Series No. 13) 1: 149–159.
40. Shunqing Cao. 2005. Cross-civilization study: Grasping the fundamental orientation and frontier of learning in the world. *The Battlefield of Ideology* 4: 57–61.
41. Wang Chao. 2007. From the ‘death of the author’ to the ‘death of the reader’. *Literature and Art Criticism* 5: 11–16.
42. Shunqing Cao. 2008. Variation study: A great breakthrough in the discipline theory of comparative literature. *Journal of Sun Yat-sen University* 4: 34–40, 202.
43. Shunqing Cao, and Wang Qing. 2008. The discourse reconstruction of Chinese literary theory. *Literature, History and Philosophy* 5: 5–12.
44. Shunqing Cao, and Wu Xingming. 1999. The loss in replacement. *Literary Review* 4: 69–80.
45. Bauman, Zygmunt. 1911. *Modernity and ambivalence*. Oxford: Polity Press.
46. Ren Xiaojuan. 2007. The variation study of comparative literature in the context of post-colonialism. *Cultural Studies and Literary Theory* (Series No. 15) 1: 145–150.
47. Shunqing Cao, and Zhang Yu. 2008. The academic background and theoretical conception concerning the variation study of comparative literature. *Foreign Literature Studies* 3: 142–149.
48. Wang Chao. 2006. From the surface system to the rational depth order—On the critical thinking of negativism of Adorno. *The Social Science of Inner Mongolia* 3: 63–65.
49. Wang Yuechuan. 2003. *Discovering the East—The ending of euro-centralism and the cultural reconstruction of the image of China*. Beijing: Beijing Library Press.
50. Shunqing Cao. 2000. Why to study the heterogeneity of Chinese literary theory. *Literary Review* 6: 26–29.
51. Said, Edward. 1983. *Traveling theory, the world, the text, and the critic*, 1983. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
52. Shunqing Cao. 2005. The domestic appropriation of literary theories and Chinesization of Western literary theories. *Journal of Xiangtan University (Philosophy and Social Science)* 5: 8–11.
53. Shunqing Cao, and Tan Jia. 2004. Another effective way of the reconstruction of Chinese discourses for literary criticism: Sinicization of Western literary theories. *Foreign Literature Studies* 5: 120–127.
54. Li Siqu. 1999. *Chinese poetics discourse*. Chengdu: Sichuan People’s Publishing House.

55. Wang Guowei. 1998. *Jen-Chien TZ'u-hua*. Shanghai: Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House.
56. Hu Fanchou. 1993. *Studied on Ch'ien Chung-shu's academic ideology*. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.
57. Shunqing Cao, and Tong Zhen. 2004. The discourse of Western literary theory in china—Transfer switch or grafting improvement. *Hebei Academic Journal* 5: 105–118.
58. Shunqing Cao, and Zou Tao. 2005. From aphasia to the localization of Western literary criticism in China—Second thinking on rebuilding the Chinese literary theory. *Journal of China Three Gorges University (Humanities and Social Sciences)* 5: 47–49.
59. Jin Yizeng. 2005. The basic conditions of Chinesenization of literary theories from the view of variation. *Journal of Nanyang Normal University (Social Sciences)* 7: 55–58.
60. Wu Lipu (ed.). 1979. *Selection of Western literary theory*, vol. 1. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
61. Aristotle. 1920. *Poetics*. Oxford: Oxford Press.
62. Bian Zhilin. 2002. *Selections of Bian Zhilin*, vol. 2. Hefei: Anhui Education Press.
63. Eliot, T.S. 1920. *The sacred wood: Essays on poetry and criticism*. London: Methuen.
64. Jin Yizeng. 2006. The basic roads of sinicization of literary theories from the view of variation. *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art* 5: 45–50.
65. Yu Yingshi. 1996. Cultural crisis and national identity. In *Collection of academic theses*, vol. 7, ed. Wang Yuanhua. Shanghai: Shanghai Far East Publishing House.
66. Zhang Rongyi. 2006. Modernity, interactivity, distinguishing—Internal key words of contemporary Chinese literature theory. *Journal of Xiangtan University (Philosophy and Social Science)* 5: 90–101.
67. Bakhtin, Mikhail. 1998. *Formalist approach of literature and art (vol. 2 of collected works of Bakhtin)*. Shijiazhuang: Hebei Education Press.
68. Shunqing Cao, and Zhi Yu. 2003. Basic principles and concrete ways to construct discourse of Chinese literary theory. *Social Science Research* 4: 138–143.
69. Chen Yinque. 1990. *Selective works in Jin Ming*, 2nd ed. Shanghai: Shanghai Ancient Books Publishing House.
70. Chen Yinque. 2002. Translation art of Kumarajiva. In *History of vernacular literary*, ed. Hu Shi, 115. Tianjin: Baihua Literature and Art Publishing House.