

## 葉維廉教授講座（臺灣文學研究所邀請）

### 第 1 場演講

講題：詩、翻譯與中西美學的冥思系列講座之一：翻譯、神思的機遇

時間與地點：96 年 4 月 13 日（五）上午 10:20-12:10，臺大文學院演講廳

主持人：柯慶明教授

### 【演講摘要】

是甚麼使到中國文字從極其靈活的思維含有想像的感染力，以清澈如畫的意象群呈現，流動自如地融合為一條幾乎無法分析拆解的情感的河流呢？我們必須回到視覺性特強的象形字成形時便擁有的特有的長處，一種合乎自然的徵象，是英文字所無法比擬的。通過中文字的可見性完成它們特有的具體性和綜合性，而以聲音為主的「英文」的抽象性則引向字典式的分析性界義。中國詩既具有繪畫的鮮明活潑，復具有聲音的動態，幾乎每一個中文字，與其說是詞性獨一排他，不如說是兼收並蓄，不是非名詞即動詞，即形容詞，而是同時、甚麼時候都含有所有的詞性。在西方現代詩學中，龐德受中國詩的啟發頗多，他顯然明白要達成中國文字結構和中國詩所提供的美學理想，他必須撤棄邏輯性、指引性的連結元素。

### 【內容大意】

葉教授由中國文字的特性出發，精準的掌握了中國詩相對於西洋書寫語言的特性，尤其西方現代詩學大師龐德亦深受中國文字啟發，葉教授認為：「與其指出范諾羅莎/龐德對中國文字解釋時的一些錯誤，還不如看看他們在中國文字的結構裡找到甚麼美學的根據讓他們如此的興奮，而這些構築的活動如何幫忙他們肯定他們執著的美學目標，也就是我前所談過的「並時性（如羅列意象、不同時間事物的同時併發並列）、蒙太奇和突顯視覺性」等效果。」

龐德對中國文字結構的興奮又是甚麼呢？葉教授認為可以說是因為中國文字構成的特色幫龐德界定和發展了他美學的取向，所以他說范諾羅莎那篇文章是美學文字，不完全著眼在語字本身。龐德顯然明白要達成中國文字結構和中國詩所提供的美學理想，他必須撤棄邏輯性、指引性的連結元素。上面的例句就是最好的證明。事實上，在他的巨著《詩章》裡，他不斷的去掉這些連結元素而引發我所說的「邏輯的飛越」，而進一步由物物的並置推展為事件和事件大幅度的並置，而他所發明的方法 ideogrammic method（中國文字構成的方法），從他大幅度處理來看，是打破傳統西方單線串連的行進，超脫定向、定位、限指僵死的西方語法和縱時式的時間觀，以求把作為氣脈的各種文化精境、各種文化明澈的獨特的契機，彷彿星辰並置的組合，利用感覺印象強烈、視覺鮮明多義的意象回應、疊變、組合、展列為一個龐大的幕景，讓讀者出入於不同的文化歷史時空，並有鳥瞰式的宏觀。

## 【Lecture I :Translation: A Chance Encounter of Imaginations】

I offer 4 stories to illustrate my lifelong commitment to creating and critiquing poetry in a crosscultural context: to synthesize the heritage of the Chinese poets of the 1930's and 1940's, the modernist expressive strategies of the West since Symbolism, and those of classical Chinese poetry, to create a kind of syntactical flexibility that accommodates the perceptual priorities of both worlds, and, in the case of East-West comparative poetics, to provide new pedagogical guidelines for deframing monocultural theoretical hypotheses, leading to truly open dialogues between Chinese and Western cultures in an inter-illuminating and inter-reflective manner, and, through my translations of Wang Wei and *Chinese Poetry: Major Modes and Genres*, to offer a fluid perspective from which modern American poets can re-view and readjust many current poetic and cultural strategies in the West.

The first story highlights how works of translation by Dai Wangshu, Liang Zongdai, Bian Zhilin and others as well as my own translations of T.S. Eliot , modern European and Latin American poets, and later modern and classical Chinese poetry into English, have shaped my own poetic attempt to synthesize the 1930's and 1940's heritage, the modernist strategies since Symbolism, and those of classical Chinese poetry and how they have inspired my contemporaries. These strategies form a new counterdiscourse to the regimented and reductive humanity caused by the culture industry forced upon China through colonization and to the twisted humanity engendered by the high-handed “witchhunt” suppressive acts of the Kuomintang rule under the no-exit atmosphere promoted by the cold war mentality. These strategies include the plurisignificative functions of words and creative ambiguity to provide for a free imaginative space without being persecuted.

The second story points to my almost accidental discovery of the syntactical and aesthetic differences between classical Chinese and English languages as media for poetry in my sophomore year in National Taiwan University, long before my participation in the magazines of *Modern Literature* and *Epoch Poetry*. Before going to bed, I usually tried to write something in my diary, often in poetic form, experimenting with various subject matters, including the blatantly unpoetic, in order to extend my lyrical horizon. It was in one of these experiments that I wrote my first English poem, " Have we overlooked certain facts...?" which was, to my delight, accepted and published by the *Vak Review*, a magazine out of India. Together with this experiment came my initial recognition of how grammatical and syntactical differences in two linguistic/ cultural systems lead to vastly differing perceptual-expressive procedures. The poem in question had several miscarriages in Chinese. The particularly strong narrative drive in the metamorphosis of that poem was looking for a medium that could accommodate a continuous run-on wave motion that my Chinese, still very much conditioned by the classical Chinese poems and rhymeproses I learned by rote in my grade school days, had a hard time to register, but when I switched to English, to my

surprise, the lines flowed with an unexpected momentum. This realization soon led to my second discovery in the reverse, so to speak, of the unique strength of my native language through my careful examination of the gross distortions of classical Chinese poetry by translators who allowed the target language (in this case, English) to mask and master the indigenous Chinese aesthetic, creating treacherous modes of representation. Long before I formulated my challenge to these translations both in practice and in theory, first in my M.A. thesis, *T. S. Eliot: A Study of His Poetic Method* (1961, English Institute Taiwan Normal University), and then in *Delos: A Journal on and of Translation*, No. 3 (1969), in my *Ezra Pound's Cathay* (1969), in my *Chinese Poetry: Major Modes and Genres* (1976, 1997) and in my *Diffusion of Distances: Dialogues between Chinese and Western Poetics* (1993), I began to nourish this seed of discovery both as a poet and as an embryonic critic as early as my sophomore year when I hardly even knew how to make a decent critical statement in English. Central to all these writings is this realization: underlying the classical Chinese aesthetic is the primary idea of noninterference with Nature's flow. As reflected in poetic language, this idea has engendered many a-syntactical or paratactical structures that opens up in indeterminate space for readers to enter and reenter for multiple perceptions rather than locking them into some definite perspectival position or guiding them in a certain direction. The dispensation of articles, personal pronouns, the sparseness, if not absence, of connective elements (prepositions or conjunctions) aided by the indeterminacy of parts of speech and no tense declensions, afford the readers a unique freedom to consort with the objects and events of the real-life world.

The third story is about my realization that to rectify the gross distortions of the Chinese horizon, the Western audience need to be educated to understand, theoretically, what did these important differences evolved and how. This led to my questioning of the differences in critical models, an important beginning to my East West methodology project.

The fourth story is about the various dimensions of my teaching and writing about the theory of translation, including the debunking of Xin, Da, Ya, the battles and negotiations between two cultures, and cross-fertilization.

第 2 場演講

講題：詩、翻譯與中西美學的冥思系列講座之二：中國詩、中國文字與龐德的現代詩學

時間與地點：96 年 4 月 17 日（二）上午 10:20-12:10，臺大總圖書館 B1 國際會議廳

主持人：柯慶明教授

【演講摘要】

現代主義是針對現代性的美學上的反應：在內容方面有：「異化」；「物化」；「片斷化」；「非人化」等；在形式方面有：「邏輯的飛躍」（如羅列語法、語法切斷）；多線發展；並時性結構和空間並列；意義疑決性；語言革命，這裡包括文字的獨尊，如「風格絕對論」、「文字即世界」、「語言自賞」，包括唯美是圖，如「美即宗教」說，包括意象至上主義（物像重於意念；具體重於抽象；反說明性演繹性文字）；還有「多義性」、「晦澀」和「夢的邏輯」等等。中國詩有鮮明活潑的呈現，因為中國詩人只把詩的材料直接呈露，不加說教，不加陳述，我們才費力去翻譯它。

### 【內容大意】

葉先生在〈中國古典詩與英美現代詩語言與美學的匯通〉舉兩種詩中九種顯著共有的風格特色，包括（1）用非分析性和非演繹性的表達方式求取得事物直接具體的演出；（2）空間的時間化和時間的空間化導致視覺事件的同時呈現，結果是空間的張力，繪畫性和雕塑性的突出；（3）靈活的語法和意義不決定性帶來多重暗示性；（4）不求直線追尋，不依因果律而偏向多線發展、多重透視和並時式行進；（5）用連結媒介的減少到切斷來提升事像的獨立性、具體性和強烈的視覺性；（6）兩種詩雖有程度和詭奇度的差別，都設法使說話人的位置讓給讀者，讓讀者（也是觀眾）參與美感經驗的完成；（7）以物觀物；（8）蒙太奇的運用來構成疊像美（這個觀念本來就是從中國六書中的會意字發明出來的）；（9）（在西方較少但也有嚐試的）自我的隱散，任未經界分整體萬變萬化的生命世界呈露。當編製性的社會愈超越個人，抒情藝術（Lyric）的狀態愈游離不定。波特萊爾是第一個注記這個現象的詩人……他超越個人的痛楚而控訴整個現代世界反抒情（反詩）的態度，通過一種近乎英雄式的風格和語言，他在控訴中掙鑿出真詩的火花……通過……一種詩，無視於現行社會狹窄的、受制於歷史和意識形態屬於偏面性的所謂客觀的傳達方式……而設法保持一種活潑、未變形的、未被玷污的詩。象徵主義以還現代詩的指標：濃縮的瞬間、反敘述等，但最重要的是詩要「一步一步嚴謹得像數學課題一樣地經營意象、音質、氣氛」的主張，是語言的雕刻，無一字虛設。波特萊爾和馬拉梅稱坡為老師/大師時特別占出這一點，直接影響了龐德的「詩是一種靈召的數學--是情感的方程式」和艾略特的「客觀的對應物」和「情感的對等」。

### 【Lecture II: Chinese Poetry, Chinese Characters (Ideograms), and Pound's Modern Poetics】

Just around the time of the May 4<sup>th</sup> Movement, while Chinese intellectuals called for disposing the Chinese characters, blaming them as barbaric and launched an iconoclastic attack on classical Chinese poetry, Pound had this to say about the Chinese ideogram: “a language written in the way (i.e. in ideograms) simply HAD TO STAY POETIC; simply couldn't help being and staying poetic in a way that a column of English type might well not stay poetic” and about Chinese Poetry: “It is because certain Chinese poets have been content to set forth their matter without moralizing and without comment that one labors to make a

translation.”

Pound’s own aesthetic tangents cut into the Chinese and his encounter with Fenollosa’s drafts of Chinese poetry, which he translated into his Cathay poems, and the essay “The Chinese Character as a Medium for Poetry”(also from Fenollosa) accentuated his early concerns and propelled him into syntactical innovations which include juxtaposition and montage learned from the *huiyi* category of the ideograms. His statement, made before his encounter with the Chinese, “The artist seeks out the luminous detail and presents it. He does not comment,”(1911) and his emphasis on “the necessity for creating or constructing something; of presenting an image, or enough images of concrete things arranged to stir the reader...I think there must be more, predominantly more, objects than statements and conclusions, which latter are purely optional, not essential, often superfluous and therefore bad,”(1916) were developed from Arthur Symons use of Pater’s version of impressionism in the aesthetic of the moment. Pater’s aesthetic contains a critique of Platonic-Aristotelian artificial constructions of the absolute (“to arrest every object in an eternal outline”) and proposes that the end of art is "not the fruit of experience, but experience itself, [which] is the end,...to burn always with this gem-like flame."

This lecture highlights Pound’s fight against the regimentation of the lifeworld, the "iron cage" of instrumental reason that has led to a reductive humanity--"one-dimensional man", alienated, reified, commodified, and "colonized"-- in order to retrieve the sublime, or in Adorno’s words, the untarnished moment, following the suggestions of Baudelaire, Mallarme, Verlaine and Rimbaud.

The Poundian project, especially as it is disclosed in the Cantos , can be described as a non-matrixed presentation characterized by the destruction of linearity, syntax, and temporal order, calling for a simultaneous "happening" or acting-out of luminous cultural moments as patterned energies; poetry, stripped of Aristotelian rigidity and superficiality, has become for Pound the medium into which and out of which myth, history and personal drama constantly undergo metamorphoses providing humans an intelligence for total order. This lecture traces the early beginnings in his *Personae* and work through the Chinese translations, the Fenollosa essay on Chinese characters, from which he not only derived his innovative practices of juxtaposition and montage, but also new weapons to critique the entire grammatical assumptions of the West, to his Cantos. Special attention is given to his use of monologues (Browning/Yeats), persona, moment (Pater, impressionism, symbolism), luminous detail, virtue, image/ imagism (including Hulme's intensive manifold), vortex/vorticism (patterned energies), juxtaposition/montage, ideogram/ideogrammic method, forma, etc. with deep analysis of the Symbolist lyric. Extra effort is given also to Pound’s use of space-break and syntactical break which I try to illuminate by the deframing-as-framing and framing-as-deframing strategies of the Daoist aesthetic via Chinese landscape paintings and classical Chinese poetic practices.

第3場演講

講題：詩、翻譯與中西美學的冥思系列講座之三：中西美學的對話

時間地點：96年4月20日（五）上午10:20-12:10，臺大文學院演講廳

主持人：柯慶明教授

【演講摘要】

我們都有過這樣一瞬間的欲望：

走出箱子一樣的房間

脫下箱子一樣的鞋子

拆下繩索一樣的領帶

鬆開繩索一樣的髮夾

把身體從一個無形的罐頭裏抽出來

把油注入生了鏽的骨節，讓筋絡可以活動

之後，我們便有了隨著我們的脈搏起舞的欲望

這一瞬真美，真詩意，你我都知道，無需我向你說明

但是，我們走出了房間以後，身體仍然是一個箱子，我們甚至曾經隨師學舞，手足都有了舞的姿式，但身體仍然是一個箱子，脫了鞋子以後，腳仍然是那樣笨重，領帶拿下來了，脖子仍然是那樣僵硬....因為我們的心靈也是一個方方正正的箱子！

我們多麼欣賞那一刻毫無疑慮自動自發著著無礙的手足的旋動！但我們不敢動，還是動不了？是哪個無形的箱子和繩子都堅硬了嗎？

放眼門外

河流不方不正，隨物賦形，曲的美，彎得絕，曲曲折折，直是一種舞蹈

或於驚濤裂岸，“捲”起千堆雪！

樹枝長長短短，或倒吊成鈎，或繞石成抱，樹樹相異，季季爭奇，其為物也多姿！

風，翻轉騰躍，遇水水則興波，遇柳柳則蕩迎，遇草草則微動，遇松松則長嘯

雲飛天動星移月轉，或象或兔或鳥或羊或耳目或手足或高舉如泉或翻滾如浪或四散如花如棋

則山，則笨重的山啊也是“凝結色波浪”

著著是舞蹈，無數的曲線，緩急動靜起伏高低，莫不自然

想想啊，想想啊，直線的舞蹈多蹩腳，四四方方的舞蹈多滑稽，我們的生活呢，竟是如此的直，四四方方的，所謂四平八穩，“正”人“均”子是也。想想啊，你們要四四方方的生活呢，還是曲曲折折的自然呢？——葉維廉（1977/6/8）

【內容大意】

葉維廉先生對於中西美學的思索有幾個出發點：

A. 層層身體錯位，精神錯位，語言錯位的意識危機

B. 現代主義與三四十年代的啓示

C. 象徵派文字的雕塑是由他們的傳統的力量，他們的民族共同的意識形構，聯想網絡

- 等等促成；我們的雕塑必須落實在我們的語言傳意方式
- D. 我帶著三四十年代是人們凝煉語言的策略和西方現代主義相似的濃縮多義的手法，進出于傳統與現代不同文化的時空
- E. 道家美學
- F. 其他議題:(1)東思西漸簡述 (2) 物自性的考量 (3) 道家精神與後現代全球化

葉先生認為道家最能夠發揮英文字 radical 的雙重意義，其一是激發根源問題的思索從而打開物物無礙的境界，其二是提供激進前衛的顛覆性的語言策略--早已預示、預演了西方達達主義(Dadaism)以來前衛藝術常用的 Disturb (驚駭、擾亂)、Dislocate (錯位、錯序) 和 Destroy (打破舊有因襲) 的三個步驟。但道家在用顛覆性語言策略這三個步驟的同時要重現自由無礙、物我物物互參互補互認互顯的圓融世界。達達式的前衛藝術往往只停留在驚世駭俗的層面而未能在解框後提供萬物圓融的精神投向。

### 【Lecture III: Meditations on Chinese and Western Poetics】

This 3rd lecture takes the cue from my personal wrestling with crises of history and consciousness and my search of expressive strategies as a poet and later as a critic and theorist. To resist the regimented and reductive humanity caused by the culture industry forced upon China through colonization, the traumatic separation of parents and children, husbands and wives caused by the violent internecine war between the Nationalists and the Communists that threatened possible total breakdown of Chinese culture, the twisted humanity engendered by the high-handed “witchhunt” suppressive acts of the Kuomintang rule under a kind of no-exit atmosphere promoted by the cold war mentality, and to make sense of this drastic change in feeling, destiny, life and Chinese culture in the midst of metaphysical and physical exile, we turned inward to seek for a new *raison d’etre* by attempting, through creativity, to come up with a world (even if it were only aesthetic!) of coherent values as a way to defy the disintegrating reality around us. In my odyssey, I found out (1) the May 4<sup>th</sup> intellectuals’ intoxication in Western knowledge and its structures of consciousness often prevailed over their attempt to question the nature and quality of cultural allogamy. This internalization has so incapacitated them that they often failed to detect that in the deeper reaches of these intruding ideologies was another form of domination equally repressive, injurious in its sharp deviation from the Chinese emphasis, such as the Daoist horizon on the self-so-ness of Nature and human nature which offers, among other things, many deframing strategies of power structures, East or West, without altering the unique contributions of the Chinese culture, now largely marginalized, if not ignored; (2) the emaciation of the sublime expressiveness of the *baihua*, later accentuated by Mao Zedong’s literary program and cultural directives; (3) the sudden disruption by both the Communist and Nationalist governments of the refinement of the poetic language of the poets of the 1930’s and 1940’s who attempt to appropriate Western modernist techniques by way of nourishment from

classical Chinese. This last is particularly harmful to the growth of new poetry at that historical juncture, because the refinement such as the works of Dai Wangshi, Wang Xindi and Bian Zhilin initiated a most hopeful dialogue between classical Chinese aesthetics and the Western modernists. Whereas, to recover the aura eclipsed by culture industry, Baudelaire and Mallarme and post-symbolists like Pound etc. treated a poem as a multileveled, multidimensional lyrical moment a la mode Poe and worked at its images, atmosphere, music with the precision and rigid consequence of a mathematical problem (Pound: “Poetry is an inspired mathematics...an equation of emotion; Eliot: “objective correlative” and “emotional equivalent”, the latter adopted by Bian) leading to Pound’s image as “an intellectual and emotional complex in an instant of time”, to his poem as a “vortex” into which and out of which ideas constantly rush, poets like Bian and Xindi tried to ground such concerns in the tradition of classical Chinese practices. Such carving of words, we must understand, has been in place in classical China from very early on as can be witnessed in Tu Fu’s claim, “I will not stop searching until I find the word of tantalizing power”, and in the making of the “eye” of the poetic line. Mallarme, Yeats etc. were practicing this old art in a similar fashion. Witness Yeats’s reducing two pages of early drafts in his “Sailing to Byzantium” into three words and Pound’s discussion of placing words in such positions as to exude the most power. It was sheer luck that I and many of my friends, both in Hong Kong and in Taiwan, were able to find the works of the 1930’s and 1940’s as well as those of the Euro-American modernists and came up with language strategies that can fully express our angst and despondency at a moment when direct venting of our anger and devastation was tabooed under the witchhunt of the Kuomintang rule. As one must admit now, the period saw one of the richest, and best carved words in modern Chinese writings.

Like my predecessors, my search led me to move in and out of time-frames and space-frames of both modern West and classical China simultaneously, not always at peace, but in battles and negotiation. Traces of tension abound, not just in our generation, but also in works since Lu Xun. Modern Chinese writings must be considered as antagonistic symbioses. Even though I was only a student in the English Department, and even though my knowledge of classical Chinese at the time consisted only of *Guwenguanzhi* (Selected Prose Works from Ancient Masters) and readings from *Three Hundred Poems from Tang Dynasty*, I had been reading Yan Yu’s *Cang-lang Shi-hua* (Yan Yu’s Poetic Talks) and Sikong Tu’s *24 Orders of Poetry*, both wonderfully annotated by Guo Shaoyu, and the books of Shihua (Talks on Poetry). Looking back, the first two books and the exhaustive annotations from sources stretching thoroughly before and after Yan Yu and Sikong Tu’s time (Sikong of course precedes Yan Yu, but they came to me in that order) more than well prepared me to speak both to modernity in the West and the eventful birth of modernity in China. I must be unconsciously looking for a discourse for the modernist poems that we are



producing: imagistic and. nondiscursive, or to sum up in Archibald MacLeish 's words: "A poem does not say/but be". Long before the modernists, Yan Yu wanted poetry to be a kind of free activity..."The highest kind of poetry is that which does not tread on the path of reason, nor fall into the snare of words...like the antelope that leaves no trace, hanging its horns...luminous, unblurred and unblocked." Yan Yu reaches back to Su Dongpo, and Su reaches back to Sikong Tu and both are indebted heavily to the Daoist Aesthetic, Zhuang Zi in particular. It was the Daoists, some 23 centuries ago who, by questioning the framing functions of the Naming System, first offered this free activity unrestricted by words.

Daoism is a root-awakening forward-looking horizon, which can be best characterized by the double meanings of the English word "Radical". On the one hand, it attacks the root questions of how language affects our conceptions, both of the world and of our selves as beings in the world, leading to opening up a new perception of total phenomena as an interweaving, inter-disclosing, and inter-defining entity free from the restriction and distortion of ideas, on the other, it offers us radical, avant-garde subversive strategies to retrieve and re-inscribe such a space in and out of which we are empowered to move freely. In the Daoist discourse, we often find words, phrases, statements, or stories of actions that take us by surprise, unconventional, strange forms of logic, or anti-logic, teasing language and rhetoric, including paradoxes and attacks by way of using off-norms to re-inscribe off-norms as possible norms, and challenging norms to expose their acceptance as treacherous. In the neo-Daoist developments, we find further the use of actions or activities to tease and assail the life-imprisoning institutions, including techniques of shouting and beating in Chan (Zen) Buddhist *gongan* or *koan*. These language strategies and actions or activities of ancient China have anticipated and previewed the three stages of attack often used in Western avant-garde art events since the Dadaist movement, namely, TO DISTURB, TO DISLOCATE, and TO DESTROY. It is important to note that these triple stages of the Daoist attack are inseparable from their target vision of retrieving the free flow of Nature and humanity to the full. Without this understanding, all these "disturb-dislocate-destroy" attempts in avant-garde art movements since Dadaism, including deconstruction and poststructuralist attempts, will remain merely shock techniques as such.

The Daoist Project, in deframing power structures of feudalistic China, reawakens the memories of the repressed, exiled and alienated natural self, leading to recovery of full humanity. As a counterdiscourse to the tyranny of language, it is at once political and aesthetic. The deframing-as-framing and framing-as-deframing language strategies achieved by the gaps between objects or visual events made possible through asyntactical and paratactical structures in classical Chinese poetry or the free-floating perspectives through the diffusion of distances in Chinese paintings, it is apt to note here, have helped stimulate syntactical innovations by a huge number of modern American poets since Pound to use space breaks and

syntactical breaks to achieve similar aesthetic effects of simultaneity, montage, and visual perspicuity, including elaborate extensions of these techniques in the juxtaposition of luminous cultural moments on a large scale (as in Pound's *Cantos* ), leading to a polyphonic of orchestration of patterned energies. These Daoist decreative-creative parameters have also opened new points of departure for rethinking the problems in the modern and globalized postmodern world.