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 Major Contributions of Analogy Study and Its Deficiencies

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 exit 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 Analogy Study: 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: X1:X2:X3:X4:X5……→ Y. In this equation, X1, X2, X3, X4…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 Wellek’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, psycho-analysis, 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 Jiasheng 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 criticalism—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 oft 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 ོ 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 citrus (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 citrus fruits 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 inter-penetrated 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.
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