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I. The Basic Principles

To make a dialogue between different cultures we first need to know well about two basic principles. One is the “discourse”. The dialogue between different cultures or literatures is not a problem of language but of “iscourse” The so-called “iscourse” generally doesn’t refer to the language or talk but specially to the structural laws in culture by means of contemporary discourse analysis theory. “heses laws are the basic rules to form the thought, expression, communication and reading through the certain cultural tradition, social history and cultural background, and they’re ways to determine how the meaning is constructed and how we communicate with each other and create knowledge.” In brief, discourse is the basic category and rules of the certain cultural thought and articulation.

Discourse is the core of a culture, which is the basic rule followed by all the articulation. Therefore, the first thing we do is have a dialogue (not a monologue) between the discourses when we make a dialogue between the different culture. To neglect the level of the discourse, the way to construct the most basic cultural meaning, and the speech rules, we may have two possibilities: one is the various comparison of the facial cultural phenomena, and the other is the monologue of the power culture. The dialogue between different cultures should make sure of the discourse of both sides of
the speakers. With the different discourse in our mind, we may seek for the basic roles that can make us have the views in common and understand each other. Of course, it’s a very complicated process to form such a discourse, at it requires the two sides to sort out their own literary system, interpret the terms and discuss the different cultural social background. However, whether to establish the discourse of either side or to form a discourse for both sides, we first must obey to this “discourse principle” in accordance with the dialogue theory. We place it in the first position in order to establish our own discourse system before the dialogue and constantly pay close attention to our discourse stand. If only do we stick to this basic principle we can make a real and effective dialogue between different cultures.

The other basic principle is the “quality principle.” It’s difficult to have a truly equal dialogue, but if the comparative literary dialogues between the different cultures gives up and ignores this principle, it may result in the hegemony of a power culture. In the 20th century Chinese culture didn’t stress on the equality when associating with the west, which resulted in the so-called “Aphasia”, that is, the missing of the Chinese terminology in cultural and literary theory. The 20th century is the time when Chinese “seek for a new voice from the other nations” in culture after a bitter self-examination. In the fact of the violent cultural clashes between China and the west, Chinese borrowed various doctrines from the west. This is an omni bearing influx in philosophy, politics, economy, history, culture and even lifestyle. So far as literary theory was concerned, we borrowed all the western systems set up there for thousand years from Plato, Aristotle in Grace to the variety of contemporary modernism and post-modernism. However, in the influx—in the Chinese-Western communications in culture we ignored the two-sided dialogue, especially the equality principle that the dialogue should abide by. What’s the result? —We have learned the theory discourse of others, but lost our own. We didn’t take the advantage of the others’ to enrich our own literary theory, but wholly transplant and sub-
stitute from the cultural discourse level. This is what we call "Aphasia" of Chinese cultural and literary theory. The so-called "Aphasia" doesn't mean that our scholars can't speak Chinese now but that we lose our special thought, the way of speaking, our own theory category and the basic way of thinking. Thus it's difficult for us to accomplish the cultural task of constructing the survival meaning of our nation. From the analysis of the discourse, the reason why we suffer from "Aphasia" is because of the loss of our own cultural discourse in the Chinese-Western dialogue. From the angle of knowledge sociology, the loss of the discourse in "Aphasia" reveals at a deeper level as "the whole substitution of the knowledge system between Chinese and the western." Either to reveal as the loss of our nation's own discourse or the substitution of the knowledge system, the root reason is the indifference and the loss of the conscious of being equal in the dialogue or in the collision of two cultures. The historical experience tells us the different cultural dialogues can be made effectively only when we stick to the discourse equality principle. Otherwise "the dialogues" will turn back into "the monologue".

II. The Approaches

After being aware of the two basic principles for the different cultural dialogues, we may come to the further discussion of the detailed ways and methods. In our opinion the different cultural dialogues mainly have the following four ways and forms. They're "different discourses but common topics", "different discourses but the same situations", "the dialogue in the discourse interpretations" and "interlocked categories and the survival of the different discourses". The following are the detailed explanations for them.

(I) Different Discourses but Common Topics

One of the important ways for a dialogue is to establish the topic, which is the base of a dialogue, as it's the way for various subjects to come
into the dialogue. Not long ago a group of scholars on religion took this advantage to have a profound talk among the ground religions in the world. They established “epistemology”, “ontology”, “theology”, “world outlook”, “outlook on life” and “society, culture and conception of history” as their common topics in the first position, then stood on their own side of religions, such as Confucianism, Buddhism, Taoism and Christianity, to state their basic views of their religions. This is a model case for the dialogues according to the common topics.

How shall we establish common topics to have the cross-cultural dialogues in our comparative literature field? I tried to find out the possibility of bilateral talks between them earlier in my book Comparative Literary Theory between Chinese and Western (Beijing Press, 1988), in which I chose the most basic five topics in the science of literature and art as the units of each talk, then I expounded the main contents of the discourses of Chinese-west literary theory in terms of each unit. Up to now this kind of strategy for the talk is still adaptable. What it lacks is that there’s only a dual talk between China and the west. From the greater scope of the world literature today’s world is a time for plural cultures. So literary talk should certainly from the dualism to the pluralism. We need not only to have Chinese-western talk of literature and literary theory, but also to take Arabian, Japanese, Indian and other nations’ literary theories into our talk.

On the base of this thought, in the book The History of Comparative Literary Theory between Chinese the West • the Ancient Period (Shandong Press, 1998), I initiated and carried out the literary talk—general-literature-styled and omni bearing. “ On the issue of the talk, I still insist on the plural cultural talk in literary theory in the way of setting off from the common topics.”

What is literature and art? What is its essence? This is the most basic question of the science of literature and art. For a long time the literary theorists in different countries offered different answers to it. To begin with
this question as our common topic, we may continue to have a talk among the different discourses.

As to the essence of literary art, the western literary theory put forward various theories in its long-termed development. Generally the "imitation theory" advanced by Aristotle and others is the most authoritative western treatise on essence of literature and art in the ancient. He thought the reason why literature and art was called what it was laid in the mystery that it made a copy remarkably true to nature. But the imitation should certainly be selective and depict the thing's essence. This essence doctrine that literature and art imitates nature played a key role in the ancient west from Aristotle, Horace, Da Vinci, Sidney to Boileau who adhered to the tendency of this basic theory. However, in Romanticism period this tendency had a thorough change, from the imitation of an object to its opposite—the proposition of purely subjective expression. The theorists advocated that the essence of poems was "the natural revelation of the intense feelings" (from Wordsworth). They thought, far from the passive imitation, art is creation. They even had the idea that it's not the art that depicted the nature but the nature depicted the art. Up to the time when the western modern trend of thought in literature and art appeared, this doctrine had a further development, and the western modernism literature inherited the reappearance tradition since Aristotle time and the Renaissance. Nevertheless, the imitation reappearance or the emotional expression shows some important characteristics of the literary essence, that is, the property of image or the property of feeling. Some critics as Belinsky said, the literary essence lies in reflecting reality by images; whereas Wordsworth stressed that the essence of poems lies in the natural revelation of the intense feelings. Once M. H. Abrams used "mirror" and "lamp" to describe these two trends in literary theory.

The ancient literary theory in China tried to research for it in the perfect harmony between soul and scenery. Xie-zhen in Ming dynasty wrote: "Scenery is the medium of a poem; feeling is just like its baby, and their
combination makes a poem.” (Siming Poetic Remarks) Chinese literary theories in all periods basically insist on it, which advances “Perfection lies in combination of both nature and creative idea. (外师造化中得心源)”. In Wenzhin diaolong (Carvings of Dragon and Literary Mind), a large-volume for all aspects of literature, is a good example in this sense. Hence, the way in the study of the essence in ancient literature and art in China differs from that in the west. It seeks esthetically a significance artistic conception in the relation of souls and objects and in the perfect harmony of feelings and sceneries.

Indian literary theory advocates “flavor”, “rhyme”, “program”, “Vakrokti (曲语)” and so on. Among them the most influential or authoritative theses are “treatise on flavor” and “treatise on rhyme”. Early in the ancient time in Greek before the category “imitation” was put forward, India had the category “flavor”. Some ancient classics, such as 楚辞 and 郑风, recorded some different “flavors”. As a category of literary theory “flavor” means the aesthetic perception of works. It appeared in Classic of Desire (欲经), written by 伐蹉衍那) about 300 BC, and about the Christian era (It’s also said AD 200.) it matured in the book N? tya? ñstra by Bharatamumi, who had the idea that flavor is the life of literature and art, the essence of beauty. According to him, no words’ meaning can exist without flavor. Where does this “flavor” refer to? Either subjective or objective? Certainly it doesn’t refer to the true-to-life imitation of the objective world, but to the feelings in the process of creation, performance and appreciation, and rather to the aesthetic experience and affection than to the objective knowledge. Therefore, “Flavors come from feelings”, which is the most basic feature of literature and art. “The sentence with flavors is poem.” “Flavor is the life of a poem.” For the “treatise on flavor”, there are objective school, subjective school and the unity of the two, but on the whole, the flavor, as the essence of literature and art, prefers more to the expression of subjective feelings and to the aesthetic experi-
ence. Just as 纳盖德拉，an Indian modern theorist on literary theory, said: “Flavor is the poetic beauty. Its sense is the aesthetic experience, and the experience of its sense is the aesthetic enjoyment.” In the mind of the Great poet, Tagore, the literary creation is the creation of emotional flavor, which is the soul of literature and art. In the long history of Indian criticism “flavor theory” has always taken the domimative position in this field.

Greatly influenced by Chinese literary theory, the ancient literary theory in Japan still had its own distinctive features in the view of the literary essence. In the book Chinese and Japanese Literature (written by 铃木修次), he wrote about the main discriminations of the literary views. For instance, Chinese theory on literary essence focuses on expressing feelings affected by the scenery, and tries to seek for the perfect harmony in the combination of soul and objects, feelings and scenery. Japanese literary theory also has this tendency, but compared with Chinese, Japanese tends more to have an emotional flavor that is called “ものあわれ” (物の哀), which is difficult to translate into Chinese exactly word by word. “もの” contains the object and feeling, but the combination of these two differs from Chinese with its peculiar features. “もの” in “ものもらい” (worry) and “ものかんし” (sorrow) is the same word, therefore, it embodies “sorrow in Japanese style” and implies the flavors of being implicit, exquisite and aesthetic. Japanese consider that the literary intention is the undulation of “ものあわれ”. They think the most important element of literature is to describe the exquisite vibration of the soul, which should be ingeniously portrayed in terms of being implicit, delicate, timid and shy. Or it can’t be called literature.

In the above, we have had a dialogue of the discourse of plural literary theory by means of taking the subject “essence of literature and art” as the common topic. Through this dialogue we discover that whatever literary theory system has a set of its own discourse rules and contents. To the problem
of "the essence of literature and art" it has its own way and solution. The situation that each discourse behaves as subject effectively break through the long-termed "monologue" of western literary theory and culture. It turned from "the only theory" into one of the great variety of theories. We can have more complete and further discussions on the "essence of literature and art through such plural dialogues. "It's not as what we did in the past that we just regard the essence theory of western literature and art as our available certain answer. Hence, the way of "different discourse but common topic" is surely an effective approach for dialogues between the different cultures.

(II) Different Discourse but Common Language Situation

When having a dialogue between different cultures, can we do it among the different discourses without establishing the common topics? In our opinion, it can be carried out by means of the common language situations we are in.

The so-called common language situation means the different discourses face with the same or similar case under the different social and historical condition. In such a case different modes of discourses response differently and provide completely different solutions, and then form their different ways of speaking and the ways of constructing the meaning. In spite of different discourse contents, functions and topics, they all form in some common language situation, according to which we may let them come into the state and begin to talk. Through the analysis of these different discourses we may know the different responses, the different but possible solutions and approaches when facing with the same language situation. In this way we may develop our ability to understand the theories and leap over the cultural field of vision in different discourse.

For example, at all times the plural cultures in human history have the arguments for the ancient and modern. This is the common language situation that any discourse may meet. These arguments usually occurred at the
turning point when the old culture is not suitable for the new age. At this point, is it the choice to abandon the old traditions, culture and discourse in order to reconstruct a new culture and discourse or to refresh the old discourse into the new according to the traditional discourse? Different cultures have different choices, just as what Chinese and western literary theory discourses do.

Chinese literary theory discourse chooses the mode of developing the old into the new. “Zhou is the old state, but the chosen existence lies in the reformism.” (周虽旧邦，其命维新) This “old-state-in-new-form” (旧邦新命) mode was originally established by Confucius, who was the cultural giant in China. His method of interpreting the classical works is implied in his words “to inherit not create (述而不作)”, which set up the way of interpreting culture for Chinese scholars. In another word we may say he set up a way for Chinese scholars in which they did everything in accordance with the Great Classics, like. This mode of interpreting and the way of constructing meaning are filled with the rich flavor of the doctrine “returning to the ancients”. On this base the other discourse expression ways appeared such as “essential decree in fine words (言辞大义)”, “no definite interpretation for poems (无达诂)”, “admonishing through tactful expressions (婉言诵谏)”, “Comparison and resonance (比兴互陈)”, which have brought the tremendous, decisive and profound affections on Chinese culture and literary theory for thousands of years. The so-called “to inherit not create (述而不作)” and “to produce the new in accordance with the canonical (依经立义)” demands us firstly to study the classics intensively and seriously, second to give some explanations for them including “annotation (笺)”, “commentary (注)”, “commentaries on classics (传)”, and the last to edit and sort out them. Just as Confucius deleted shi (Poetry, 《诗》) and Shu (Book, 《书》), and regulated li (Etiquette, 《礼》) and yue (Music, 《乐》), and worked for the writing of Spring and Autumn (《春秋》). This “classics-worshiped” (“尊经”) cultural mode
and academic mode of discourse established by Confucius don’t focus the attention on the creation of knowledge, but on the worship of the ancients and the worship of the classics. Shrouded in such a cultural mode, Chinese literary theory discourse pay close attention to inheriting, reading and interpreting the classics. Even when a new view or composition is proposed, it must be formed by interpreting the classics (the so-called “wei yan da yi”).

In the face of the common arguments between the ancient and the modern, the western academic discourse, which has stressed “the love for wisdom” — that is, the purely academic attitude of the so-called “pursuing knowledge for knowledge and truth for truth”, on the contrary, chooses the way to give up the old and establish a new one. For the knowledge and truth, the western academy may give a challenge to all the authorities even to one’s own respectable teacher. For instance, Aristotle, a talented student of Plato, loved his teacher and lived in his school for 20 years. However, when he found his teacher’s theory was not in accord with the truth, he selected the truth. This character of “pursuing knowledge for knowledge and truth for truth” in Greek philosophy in the ancient affected decisively on Greek even western literary theory. This is the philosophical foundation of the western literary theory for consistently pursuing scientific spirit. For the creation of the academy, the western discourse has been constantly pushed forward, sometimes even in the reverse direction to show its difference from the others. Whether it’s the brilliant literary theory in ancient Greek or the theory in the Middle Ages reduced to theology; whether it’s the theory of Renaissance and classics or the western literary theory with all kinds of voices and great achievements in the 20th century, it’s full of energetic and creative spirit at all times when compared with the mode of Chinese interpretation and formation of meaning based on “to produce the new in accordance with the canonical(依经立义)” and “to inherit and not create(述而不作)” as rendered classics-centered in intellectual life.
Faced with the arguments for the ancient and the modern in the plural cultural times, Chinese and western discourses have selected the different academic roads and extremely opposite direction and discourse contents. However, the common language situations for both of them are the same one, which is the theoretical base and prerequisite for the talk of these two different discourses.

For another example, the discourse of literary theory of Chuang-tzu’s and the discourse of the doctrine of Existentialism are two different modes of discourses. The former is the most important branch in Chinese academic discourse at the foundation time, whereas the latter is the main force of the western academic discourse in the 20th century. They have different discourse contents, but we can put them together to make a dialogue according to the principle of common language situations.

What is the common language situation for these two? This situation is related with not only social history but also the survivals of the human beings. Chuang-tzu lived in a turbulent society in which the etiquettes and moralities were broken. With the social groups reconstituted, the social interests reassigned and the cultural trends rolling on with full force. In the west the academic discourse of doctrine of Existentialism faced with the same situation. With the breakdown of the trend of the western rationalism and the ruins of the first and second world war, the new understanding and construction for the social justice and human conscience were under the way. On the other hand, the common situation that Chuang-tzu and the doctrine of existence faced in the construction of the significance of discourse were more importantly displayed by the problem of human’s fate and survival. The same difficult situation for human’s survival asked them to propose their way of speech and their mode for constructing the meaning.

In the face of this language situation, Chuang-tzu carried on Lao-tzu’s thoughts and deepened it into a further development and established Taoist’s “way of constructing meaning that is called the clearing-up mode of
discourse interpretation and ‘pure fiction (无中生有)’ . The self-clearing-up interpretation is Chuang-tzu’s most distinguishing feature in his academic discourse, which involves the concern for the state of human’s existence, the research for the answer of the meaning of existence and its value. About the tragic state of human’s life, he laid bare the truth with one penetrating remark: “After coming to this world he is with sorrow.” (Chuang-tzu. zhile) After a man is born in this world, he is doomed to all kinds of sorrows and bitterness “可不谓大哀乎!” (Chuang-tzu. qiwulun) In his opinion the root of such sufferings is “desire”. It’s just the continuous desires that result in human being’s “lifelong suffering from slavery (终身役 役)”, “the little for fortune and the big for fame (小人殉财, 君子殉名)”. Therefore, Chuang-tzu’s prescription for saving human beings from the sufferings is to clear up their desires. For this purpose, the first is to “defend” — defend oneself from having desires, the second is to “forget” — forget the desires. Lao-tzu advocated to have no desires and be content with his lot. Whereas Zhuang-tzu put forward “not to stir up”. The so-called “stirring-up” means to arouse people’s desires and then create confusion. Without being stirred up they may keep still. The society will be steady. “Forgetting” is to forget all the interests and desires, virtues and moralities, just as “fish forget lakes and rivers, people forget the Tao.” (Keyi) Clearing up the desires, Chuang-tzu built up his peculiar values and significance of life. It didn’t turn into either pleasure-seeking cynicism, or ethical transcendence similar to Confucian “humanity as one’s duty”, or the religious Faramita. The distinguish feature of Zhuang-tzu’s is to face directly with the death and clear up the people themselves, in his words, “夫大块载我以形, 劳我以生, 佚我以老, 自我以死.” (Chuang-tzuodazongshi) By means of “forgetting”, Chuang-tzu forgot all the worldly interests and desires, rights and wrongs, knowledge and will, and finally reached the poetic realm where Tao and existence were combined together. In such a realm people have no “sufferings” in life. They have neither worldly de-
sires nor the horror of death. What they have is a clearing-minded realm and the transcendence of life and death. "When things, heaven are forgotten, one forgets himself. Then he enters the real heaven. (忘乎物,忘乎天,其名为忘己。忘己之人,是谓人于天)." (Chang-tzuotiandi) This life realm of literature and art and the poetic dwelling way for people produced extreme influence on Chinese literature and art. In their literary works, Tao Yuan-ming, Wang-wei, Li-bai, Su-shi and so on, turned such a poetic life realm into a poetic literary realm. This makes Chinese scholars have discovered their destination of life voyage and the life transcendence. Many terms such as "yijing (artistic conception, 意境)", "shen (spirit 神)", "xujing (plastic and tranquility, 虚静)", "wuwoji Mrong (blending of things and beings, 物我交融)" etc, are the products from Chuang-tzu's words.

The existential doctrine met with the same life situation as Zhuang-tzu. Heidegger, the great master of existential doctrine, had the idea that man's being (存在) was a kind of "being" (在世), "sinking into depravity", and that death was the "most possible form" (最高可能性) of man's being. In view of such a man's being he proposed "to dwell on poetically in this world" (诗意地栖居). He said: "Poetizing is the acceptable standard strictly in this sense, and the human gain the regulation to measure the scope of his nature. As a man who is definitely going to die, he takes a journey in this world. The reason why he's definitely going to die is because he's able to die. The meaning of being able to die is; death is death. The man is the only creature who's able to die. Moreover, if he's still on his journey on earth and dwell on, he's continuously in the process of death. However, his dwelling is in a poem." Nevertheless, the poetic dwelling in his opinion is not similar to the clearing-up poetic life of Chuang-tzu's. At all times the western thought has the foundation of dualism, that is, the contradiction between this shore and the other shore, human and god, the world and the heaven. Though Heidegger was not a theologian and didn't di-
rect a way for the human beings to transit from this shore to the religious other shore just like the discourse depicted in western classical academy. Anyway, his academic system is still a four-dimensional structure of “heaven, world, human, god”. In his view the standard of poetic dwelling is neither on this shore, on earth, and nor in the human mind. “What is the standard of poetizing? —divinity.” This shows that his academic discourse is still in the accordance with the western thought which says the greatest significance of life is still decided by the supreme god.

In the dialogue between Chuang-tzu’s “clearing-up mode” and Heidegger’s “divinity mode”, whatever similarities and differences in discourse regulations or in the way of constructing meanings, the common situation they met with is the basic foundation for their dialogues. So it can be obviously seen that the common situation is the second approach for the dialogues between the different discourses.

(III) The Dialogues between the Discourses in the Translation

The dialogues between the discourses in the translation is also a form for the different cultures. The dialogues in the way of “common discourses” and “common situations” are “overt” because the subjects and contents are directly displayed in the situation and process. But the dialogues in the translation are different. They are “covert”. The translation between different cultures involves two languages and two texts; one is object text that will be translated and the other is the target text that is the achievement of the translation. On the surface, translation is usually regarded as the purely linguistic correspondence between the two texts. On the theory of translation the “recreation” of a translator is stressed. It is called “the creative rebellion”. (that is, the distortion, addition and deletion of the original text in the translation) However, for the reason why the “creative rebellion” occurs, the theorists have different views. On the general, people concluded as the following reasons; morality, differences among the languages and some elements related to the translators themselves. This shows
that translation hasn’t been regarded as a way of making a dialogue between
the different cultures.

With the development of language philosophy and comparative science
of medio- translatology( 译介学 ), people has paid more and more attention
to the essence of translation. Translation is concerned with not only linguistics but also the two texts or two absolutely different cultures and discourse
systems behind these two languages. We always think that different cultures
and discourse system have their particular concept category and discourse
principles. There are some possible overlapping, intersection and corresp-
dondence, but no possibilities of absolute equivalence among them.
Therefore the facial translation between different cultures and discourses is
full of profound discourse "tensions" behind it. In this sense translation it-
self is a potential dialogue between different cultures and discourses. Nowa-
days "misreading" is often discussed in the academic world. The basic rea-
son of "misreading" is "the different cultural dialogue" between the differ-
ent discourses, which inevitably resulted in "misreading".

The literary quotation of "Milky Way" in Chinese translation world
closely relates to "the dialogues between different cultures in translation".
The quotation "Milky Way" originated from the translation of Tchikov’s
short story 樊凯 (now translated as 万卡) by Zhao Jing-shen. His transla-
tion copy is from English version. His translation caused some arguments
when translating the following sentences: "The whole sky spangled gay
twinkling stars, and the Milky Way is as though it had been washed and
rubbed with snow for a holiday." The argument is about the translation of
"the Milky Way". According to the dictionaries the definition for these two
words is "yinhe". So most of the translators think "the Milky Way" in this
passage should be translated as "yinhe" or "tianhe" in Chinese. However,
Zhao Jing-shen translated it as "niulailu" in Chinese, which turned into
people’s derision.

However, is it the only way to translate it into "yinhe"? Some schol-
ars spoke in defense of him and caused the further discussions on the cultural images in literary translation. From the angle of discourse theory of different culture, the Chinese translation difficulty of “the Milky Way” is essentially a profound dialogue between Chinese-western cultures. Without doubt the rational meaning for “the Milky Way” is “yinhe”. But “yinhe” has quite different discourse meaning in Chinese-western cultural systems. In the west, “the Milky Way” has close relationship with Greek mythology. Greek people in the ancient regarded it as a “way” to Olympus mountain where all the gods lived. It's bright and splendid because of goddess Heva’s milk. In China “yinhe” is not called “way” but “river” because of the folk mythology “niulangzhinü”. If we translate “the Milky Way” as “yinhe”, it means that we take Chinese culture as a substitute for western culture. Thus the imagination of Greek mythology in the ancient and the other discourse meaning brought by “the Milky Way” to people will be lost totally. If we preserve the word “lu” in Chinese translation in the train of the thought of Zhao Jing-shen (we may choose the translation “shennailu” by Lu-xun), the contents of western culture will be well remained and conveyed. In this way the discourse systems of Chinese-western mythologies will be equally kept in the same language system. We think this can be called the really significant “the dialogue in the translation between two different discourses”.

This is not merely a problem of discourse dialogue caused by a literary image. In the translation of rationalized terms, the expression of the potential dialogue in the different cultures is more complicated. The most obvious example is the translation of the highest category “Tao” in Chinese philosophy. It is well known that “Tao” has quite a few translations in English such as “Way”, “Logos”, and “Tao”. To translate it into “Way” or “Logos” implies a dialogue between the different cultures. In English “Way” means “road”, “approach” and “method”, etc., which is likely to remind people of “law” or “rule” and so on. But “Way” in English is
not able to be promoted to the level of "ontology". Using "Way" to interpret "Tao" only gives consideration to the meaning on the surface, whereas using "Logos" means the same dialogue between these two different cultures. It's also a "misreading". Certainly we may find some similarities between "Tao" and "Logos" such as "eternity", and the so-called "constant (常)" in them. Both of them contain the meaning of "to say", "to speak", and "Tao speaks (道说)". They are related with "law" and "ration". But "Tao" and "Logos" have completely different natures that we once had a discussion on this special subject. In our opinion, "Tao" and "Logos" both are the source of all the things in this world, but "Tao" tends more to imply "nothingness (无)", whereas "Logos" to imply "beingness (有)". In the aspect of language, "Tao" stressed more on "to be unable to express in words", whereas "Logos" on "to be able to express in words". Therefore, as the highest categories in Chinese-western thoughts "Tao" and "Logos" profoundly display their discourse natures. To translate "Tao" into "Logos" is to use western discourse to force a comparison (比附) and explain Chinese discourse. In such kind of mutual translations there're always some hidden Chinese-western discourse dialogues.

It's the same case with the translation in literary theory. "Fenggu" is an important literary term in Wen xin diao long, which is also an important literary category in Chinese classical literary theory. Its translation in English also shows the dialogueal phenomena in the mutual translations in different discourses. In the English translation version of Wen xin diao long (The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons) by Vincent Y-chung Shih, he proposed that "fenggu" should be interpreted as "organic unity" because "in Liuxie's writing fenggu was regarded as one phrase in order to show it's an organic unity of ideas and language”. But in his translation he still translated it directly into "the wind and the bone". Another American researcher (Donald Arthur Gibbs) for Wen xin diao long separated it into two. He translated "feng" into "suasive force", and "gu" into "bone".
structure”. The embarrassed state of the English translation for “fenggu” reflects not only the differences on the surface of the two languages but also the differences of the natures in the profound discourse system. The crucial problem is the dialogue between the different cultures. The objects that comparative literary theory has studied are the potential dialogues in such mutual translations of different discourses.

In fact, different cultural discourse dialogues appeared in the ancient time. The discussions on the concept “geyi” (格义) in the history of Buddhist Scripture interpretation were the dialogues of the mutual translations between Chinese and Indian. Chen Yin-ke once made a textual research for the source of “geyi”. He thought the following passage provided the correct explanations for “geyi”. The passages is; “geyi means to illustrate things with explanatory notes based on the Buddhist principles (以经中事数拟配外书,为生解之例,谓之‘格义’)” (《高僧传 · 竺法雅传》). “shishu (事数)” in the Buddhist Scripture refers to “wuyin (五阴)”、“shi eru (十二人)”、“sidi (四谛)”、“shi r yinyuan (十二因缘)”、“wu gen (五根)”、“wu li (五力)”、“qi jue (七觉)” and so on. “wai shu (外书)” refers to the classics by Chuang-tzu, Lao-tzu, Confucius and Tao. And “shengjie (生解)” refers to the “explanatory notes”. All of the above combined together means to interpret Indian Buddhist doctrines according to the masters led by Chuang-tzu in central plains in China. In the practice of Buddhist Scripture translation, An Shi-gao translated Hinayana Sutra (小乘佛典) in the strong flavor of Confucians. 支娄迦谶 used a great deal of Chuang-tzu’s terms such as “natural nothingness (本无)” and “nature (自然)” to interpret Buddhist Scripture. It’s the earliest dialogue of different cultural discourses in China for the scholars to take the masters’ theories in Central Plains as their comparison, understanding, and interpretation of Indian Buddhist doctrines. And “geyi” is the earliest theory for the discussions on the different cultural discourse dialogue in translation.

(IV) The Interlocked Categories and the Survival of the Differ-
ent Discourses

There's another important form or phenomenon that we call "the interlocked categories and survival of the different discourses". This form describes the state in which multiple discourses of the contemporary literary theory survive at the same time and the intricate relationship with one another. This is a radiant state in which different cultural discourses have their own say. It's also a dialogue form that we advocate.

The first time we proposed "the survival of the different discourses" was when we advanced "to reconstruct the discourse of Chinese literary theory". The most important purpose for "reconstructing the discourse of Chinese literary theory" is to break the academic situation in which there are only the monologues of western literary theory, and also to make Chinese culture and literary theory have their own say. Only to set up its peculiar discourse system—not to repeat western discourse as it did in the past, Chinese literary theory can make the real dialogues with western literary theory. At the beginning of reconstructing the discourse we will be in a state in which all the discourses will get along with one another. Within one day we can't and needn't get rid of all the western literary theories that are ruling us and replace them with purely Chinese discourse. In this period all the discourses, ancient and modern, Chinese and foreign, will take its own position. All kinds of different discourses will run foul of ours and be sorted out and combined with ours. People will talk about not only typical environment and figures, but also "xing (形)", "shen (神)", "qing (情)", "li (理)"; not only the brightness of existence doctrines, but also 虚实相生; not only the contents and forms or structures, original figures, tension, but also speech, imagery, meaning and Tao(言象意道), to cover more with less words(以少总多), and shenyun (神韵), fenggu (风骨), and qingcai (情采). In the situation where a great diversity of discourses exist together we may be in such a case in which each does what he thinks is right and each has nothing to do with one another. However, this case it-
self means the end of the “monologues” ruled by western literary theory and discourse. It’s also the inevitable result caused by our proposal of making dialogues between different discourses.

Recently some scholars proposed that there are two kinds of “concept semantic elements” in contemporary language situation of Chinese when make the comparison of Chinese-western literature. He said; In language situation of Chinese there’s one noticeable phenomenon that some Chinese words only have the shapes of Chinese characters such as the word “literature” because their concept semantic elements are completely modernized. But a great deal of them still keep the basic meaning in ancient Chinese way after the modernization such as “wen” (文), “shi” (诗), “fu” (赋), “qu” (曲) and so on. We think that this is not a simple linguistic phenomenon but a potential discourse phenomenon behind the form of contemporary Chinese. That is to say, the root reason why the contemporary Chinese has two kinds of concept semantic elements is that the contemporary Chinese keeps the discourse system of the ancient and has an influx of western discourse system. As we know Chinese is not a language or talk in a general sense but a set of meaning-constructed ways and the principles of knowledge creation. Two or even more discourse systems exist in contemporary Chinese is the vivid portrayal of “the interlocked categories and the survival of the different discourses” that occurs in the field of Chinese contemporary academy, thought and culture.

In the works of the contemporary Chinese scholars there’re some dialogues with “the categories interlocked and the diversity of discourses surviving” among the different discourses at all times and in all countries. We may give an account for it with Hu Jing-zhi’s Aesthetics on Literature and Art (Beijing University Press, 1989.), which is a creative works among the latest scholars in our country and gains a great fame in the academic world. From the angle of dialogue theory between different cultural discourses it obviously shows the feature of “the interlocked categories and the sur-
vival of the different discourses” in the world of contemporary literary theory. The theme of this work is to research the essential characteristics of literature and art. The book is divided into 12 chapters as "Aesthetics on Literature and Art", "Aesthetic Activities", "Aesthetic Experience", "Aesthetic Transcendence", "The Control of Literature and Art", "The Truth of Noumenon of Literature and Art", "The Aesthetic Construction of Literature and Art", "The Images of Literature and Art", "The Artistic Conception of Literature and Art", "The Acceptance of the Explanation of Literature and Art" and "The Aesthetic Education of Literature and Art". The book starts with the analysis of aesthetic activities, and carefully analyzes how the literature and art controls the world. Then it researches the characteristics of aesthetic experience and looks for the profound mystery of literature and art. Afterwards it turns into the exposition of the beauty of literature and art and the exposition of artistic conception of literature and art. In the aspect of overall structure and composition it makes a detailed analysis of every item from the very beginning to the end. It adopts the mode of scientifically rational explanation and the mode of analyzing discourse created by Aristotle in western literary theory. However, there are some exceptions such as chapter eight—"The Artistic Conception of Literature and Art" which directly adopts the category of "artistic conception" and its theoretical contents in Chinese classical literature and art and then makes them as key links in the whole theoretical system. From the development of the system and the expressive way of the theory we may see that the discourses of Chinese and western literary theories are interlocked. This book takes "aesthetic experience" as the core category, which shows that it's profoundly affected by the western contemporary experience philosophy and the aesthetics of life and then displays the characteristics of perception, experience and even intuition. In the chapter of "The Artistic Conception of Literature and Art" it absolutely shows the poetic spirit of Chinese classical poetics, and it analyzes not only the aes-
thetic formation of the artistic conception of Literature and Art, but also the three levels of the structures of the aesthetic and artistic conception. It lays emphasis on the aesthetic features of the artistic conception in the following three aspects: "the beauty of the making from both the plastic and substantial (虚实相生的取境美)"; "the beauty of the mood from both the meaning and condition (意与境浑的情性美)" and "the beauty of lingering charm from the abstruse and remote (深邃悠远的韵味美)". In the chapter of "The Forms of Literature and Art" the author adopts the logical and analyzing discourse in the west to divide the general "Literature and Art" into 7 categories according to the principle of ontology (time and space) and the principle of epistemology (reappearance and expression). They are: the literature and art of time reappearance (dramas); the literature and art of space reappearance (pictures and sculptures); the literature and art of time and space (films); the literature and art of language (literature). These phenomena fully displays the basic features that the discourses in Chinese-western literary theories are overlapped each other and interlocked each other. From parts of the book it can be seen that it takes great advantages of the concept categories in the discourse of western literary theory, and on the other hand it gives a great influx of the basic terms in the discourse of traditional Chinese literary theory. What he does in his book creates a situation of "the interlocked categories" for different cultural discourses. For example, when explaining "the aesthetic experience"—the core concept in this book, the author not only observes the moving process of aesthetic experience from the angle of time and condition, but also discusses its features with much poetic flavor filled in it. Moreover, in order to discuss the levels and the developing categories in aesthetic experience, he takes the two literary theories of Chinese and western directly into the equal dialogues. Therefore, "xing (兴)" and "yiqing (移情)"; "shensi (神思)" and "xiangxiang (想象)"; "xinghui (兴会)" and "inspiration (灵感)", all of these terms appear in front of us. So we say Aesthetics on Literature
and Art typically represents the state in which the different cultural discourses have their dialogues with the state of ‘the interlocked categories and the survival of the different discourses’. Perhaps you’re not for his theoretical thesis and basic system, but you can’t deny his academic intention to make innovations in literary theory on the base of sticking to the dialogues between the different cultural discourses.

In a word, the 21st century is the time for the intercommunications and dialogues for the plural cultures. The developing situation in the world culture requires us to adjust the policy of our discourse and end the state of “Aphasia”, the missing of Chinese terminology for cultural and literary theory ("失语症") that has lasted for more than one century, and then to make our voice heard by the other nations in the field of world couture. Once we proposed that we should join in the dialogues by “reconstructing the discourse of Chinese literary theory”. Now we have made the same proposal that we should have more profound policy to make the dialogues between the different cultural discourses—the two basic principles and the four detailed approaches. The purpose is to adapt the general situation of the world cultural development, to realize the survival, mutual supplements and intercommunications for the plural cultures. I wish these arguments would have the real and propulsive functions on the discussions for the dialogue theories in the different cultures.
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