

## Chinese-*Eastern* Comparative Literature Studies: The Case of China-Korea-Japan

John J. Deeney

Meetings of East and West . . . intriguing as they are, disclose no more than the margins of a broader and deeper and richer terrain of inquiry. What remains to be investigated, what may well turn out to be one of the richest subdivisions in the whole domain, is East-East (that is to say, intra-Asiatic) literary relations. Some of the main currents have already been adumbrated by Comparative Religion. . . . I would not presume to prescribe; but, as an interested observer at these conferences, I should also like to see and hear representatives from the variegated yet interrelated literatures of India, the Middle East, and bordering countries elsewhere, moving toward what might well be termed a reorientation.<sup>1</sup>

In traditional East Asia, literature played a vital role in maintaining society and culture. In that society renovation was innovation, originality often posed as convention, and even in nature poetry, which seeks the liberation and expansion of self away from society, the speaker often assumes a universalized self, the "I" of universal reference. . . . Tradition meant all that was vital and alive for the community, a source of inspiration and a repository of techniques, which allowed poets to rediscover and validate the truth of art in the past to make it live in the present. . . . By the creative use of the past, he [the poet] constantly asserts his relation with tradition and renews cultural contacts between himself and audience. Whatever stance the poet or singer assumes, he is aware of the function of poetry in the education of society and in the development of the imagination.<sup>2</sup>

The above two quotations set the tone for much of what I wish to discuss in this paper. Just one decade ago, The *Tamkang Review* published an article entitled, "Comparative Literature: West and/or East?"<sup>3</sup> In that essay, I suggested a shift — albeit temporary — away from strictly Chinese-*Western*

studies to Chinese-*Eastern* studies. In this paper I wish to suggest some possible blueprints for comparative literature studies between China and its northern neighbors, specifically, Japan and Korea; the countries of Southeast Asia and India' are fascinating virgin territory for other enterprising comparativists.<sup>4</sup>

There are two preliminary notions I wish briefly to touch upon, the first of which might serve as a sub-title for my paper; namely, "cultural infrastructures for social suprastructures." By these words, I simply intend to indicate the interdisciplinary nature of comparative literature and to insist that a society's real strength rests most solidly upon a network of cultural factors. To what extent society has determined literary events or vice versa does not concern me here, although in pre-Republican China the literati seemed to have had an unusually strong hold on the body politic while the reverse seems true in the twentieth century. In any case, many astute political scientists, pragmatic businessmen, and scholarly academics agree that the future of our world lies in Asia.<sup>5</sup> Unless we are willing to exert an enormous effort to lay solid foundations in the future cultural development of Asia, there is a serious danger of the East being over-run by a jungle of tangled technology and soulless scienticism led by merely efficient managers rather than really inspiring leaders. Personally, I believe that Asia can best prepare itself by actively promoting a network of cultural contacts through intra-Asian comparative studies of every kind.<sup>6</sup>

The other preliminary notion that needs to be cleared up before getting into my paper and one that I feel particularly self-conscious about is this: How dare I, a Westerner, be so presumptuous as to advocate comparative literature studies between several Oriental literatures about which I have only the most superficial acquaintance? The short answer to that query is: I do not speak as an expert in Asian literatures but more modestly as one who has traced with interest the history of comparative literature studies in the East, particularly China, and has suggested some theoretical and methodological directions for other specialists' scholarly consideration. I also like to think of myself as something of a global-minded futurist — not an idealist visionary — who invites those more qualified than myself to prepare the educational infrastructures for the next generation of comparativists to build upon. One thing our respective institutions of higher learning should set about to do immediately is to encourage our students to enter *Eastern* language programs as well as the usual Western ones. And why can't we introduce surveys of *Eastern* literatures into our curricula and offer courses on great Eastern

literary classics by experts from neighboring countries? The role of translation during this transitional period is essential, even though — for the foreseeable future — English is, ironically, the *lingua franca* of Asia. Surely, we do not want to perpetuate the academic scandal which occurred some years ago when a handsomely-funded Asian conference had to be called off because the organizer from India could not find enough Asian scholars who could read each other's literatures in the original.<sup>7</sup> On the other hand, in this paper, if I step in where even Asian angels fear to tread, at least the subject will have been broached in a comparative literature context and — I trust — some important questions raised.

One of the strangest things in the modern history of comparative literature studies is that Chinese, Koreans, and Japanese should have persisted in travelling so far afield Westward when there are acres of more fruitful comparative work to be found in their own backyards! Once the theoretical and methodological problems of the discipline have more or less been sorted out, why shouldn't Eastern countries with longer and stronger literary ties among themselves than with any other Western nation cultivate comparisons on their own turf, so to speak?<sup>8</sup>

In the remaining portion of this paper I should like to outline a few areas where an explicitly comparative approach to the literatures of China, Korea, and Japan merit careful scholarly attention. First of all, I will make some general observations on the three literatures as related to certain interdisciplinary studies. Next, I will touch briefly on the traditional approaches to comparative literature through period/movement studies, influence studies, genre studies and, finally, thematology. Finally, I shall cite a few representative examples of poems written in Chinese characters by Korean and Japanese authors who follow traditional Chinese prosodic conventions and verse forms. The paper will conclude with a series of questions which invite more thorough research, especially by scholars of Chinese who may wish to compare the Chinese tradition with literary works composed by Koreans and Japanese, though written entirely in Chinese.<sup>9</sup>

In addition to the fascinating possibilities for interdisciplinary study of literature and the other arts (e.g., music, dance, painting/calligraphy, and cinema) as well as literature and the history of ideas (e.g., Confucianism and Buddhism), certainly the most basic element leading to cultural understanding between China, Korea, and Japan is the study of the intimate relationship of the Chinese *language* with Korean and Japanese. Analogously speaking, Chinese was the *lingua franca* used by Korea and Japan in a way similar to the

role Latin played in medieval Europe, although the linguistic structures of these Eastern languages are enormously more diverse than those existing between most major European languages.

In Korea, for instance, the enormous prestige attached to Chinese culture and learning manifested itself as early as the second century B.C. when Chinese characters and classics were first imported. In the late Silla period, large numbers of Korean scholars went to study in T'ang Dynasty China (seventh to tenth centuries) and the civil service examinations were introduced into Korea. Writing in Chinese continued till the end of the nineteenth century and there was over a thousand years of literature written in Chinese by Koreans. There is no complete catalog of all this literary writing, but there are thousands of volumes of compositions in Chinese verse alone!<sup>10</sup>

Linguistically speaking, since Koreans did not have any system of writing until the fifteenth century, they used Chinese characters to express a written meaning (the logographic value, even though the pronunciation of the Chinese character was not known) or to transcribe the sound (the phonetic value) of Korean words. This transcription system was called *hyangch'ai* 鄉札 by some and *idu* 吏讀 by others. It is traditionally attributed to Sol Ch'ong 薛聰 (around 692) and, as Peter H. Lee explains, "he used this method of transcription primarily in deciphering the Chinese classics, which were very difficult to read and interpret. What he did was to insert auxiliary words between the Chinese character to indicate how they should be read in the Korean reading. In short, he made, so to speak, an *explication de texte*. And during the process of this explication he gave a logical systematization to the Chinese characters thus used."<sup>11</sup> Of course, this was not a very satisfactory way of communicating the Korean reading. In the fifteenth century, under the auspices of the sage King Sejong 世宗大王, a phonetic alphabet for transcribing Korean sounds was promulgated. The *han'gŭl* 韓契 or *hurmin chōngŭm* 訓民正音 (1443-44) is an alphabet of twenty-eight letters and has been called "the easiest script in the world and the only alphabet in the Far East."<sup>12</sup> The King's ingenious innovation provoked a reaction from diehard sinophiles like Ch'oe Malli 崔萬里 (d. 1445), the most violent opponent to the system, who sent a letter of protest to the King in 1444 complaining:

From the beginning, no letters were created separate from Chinese characters in any region of the world under the dominion of China simply on ground of the difference in natural features and

dialects. Mongolia, Japan and Tibet have their own letters, but they are all despised as barbarians. Will it not undermine our civilization if we abandon virtue in favor of foolishness at this time when our customs are considered comparable with those of China.<sup>13</sup>

The opposition to *han'gūl* cooled down considerably after Chóe Malli and company were taken to jail for a night.

Although Japan had received Chinese culture directly from China during the T'ang Dynasty (embassies of scholars and monks went to China to pay their cultural and ideological tribute regularly), earlier in the fifth to the seventh centuries, Japan had been exposed to Chinese writings through Korea. Furthermore, according to tradition, Chinese characters, *kanji* 漢字, were introduced through Korea in the sixth century, perhaps earlier. There was no written Japanese up to the eighth century and oral Japanese literature was only written down around this period by using a writing system based upon Chinese characters. Like Korean, sometimes the Chinese characters were used for their logographic value to indicate the actual meaning of spoken Japanese; at other times the characters simply had a phonetic value, rendering the sounds of the Japanese syllables. As Shuichi Kato explains,

It was not until the ninth century that the native Japanese syllabary (*kana* [仮名]) was invented and adopted, and in this sense the early Heian period marks a turning point in the writing of the Japanese language.

Japanese using Chinese characters to write their own language also devised a method of reading original Chinese poetry and prose in the Japanese manner. By the use of *kaeri-ten* [返點] (a kind of reading mark) the correct word order of the sentence was established, and individual word inflexions and word endings were indicated by *okuri-gana* [送假名] (another kind of reading mark). By using these methods of 'translating' Chinese, the Japanese were also able to write their own poetry and prose in the Chinese language. Consequently, from the seventh to the nineteenth centuries Japanese literature was written in two languages, Japanese and Chinese (or at least the Japanese version of Chinese).<sup>14</sup>

Native literature by Japanese but composed in Chinese was called *Kanshi*

漢詩 (Chinese poetry) and *kambun* 漢文 (Chinese prose).

A few words are now in order about how China-Korea-Japan literature studies might employ some of the traditional approaches of comparative literature. Unlike most East-West comparative literature studies, a cursory glance at the East Asian comparative chronology chart (see Appendix), shows immediately how closely related the various pre-twentieth century *PERIODS* of these three countries were.

As any history of Korean or Japanese literature will indicate, the *INFLUENCE* of Chinese language and literature on these two countries was simply enormous. Not only did Korean and Japanese writers imitate the *Shih Ching*, the *Ch'u Tzu*, the T'ang poets, the short stories and novels as well as various *belles lettres* from China, but their imitations were in *Chinese characters!* This would be somewhat analogous to a Graecophile poet from England using the Greek alphabet and verse forms to compose poetry. Later on, they went further and used their respective new scripts when translating many Chinese classics.

When we come to *GENRE* studies it is particularly interesting to investigate what bearing, if any, traditional Chinese forms (e.g., the *fu* 賦, *ku-shih* 古詩, *lü-shih* 律詩, *chiieh-chü* 絕句, *p'ai-lü* 排律) had on Korean *kasa* 歌辭 and *sijo* 詩調 and Japanese *waka* 和歌 and *haiku* 俳句, an exercise certainly more rewarding than comparing Chinese genres with Western forms, poetic or otherwise.

Closely related to genre studies is the approach through *THEMATOLOGY*. For a full-scale treatment of themes in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese poetry (with fascinating asides on Western literature), Peter H. Lee's *Celebration of Continuity: Themes in Classic East Asian Poetry* is certainly the most valuable text in English, particularly from the perspective of Korean literature.<sup>15</sup> He discusses five main topics (praise, nature, love, friendship, and time) and microthemes (*topoi*) under each topic; a few excerpts from his Introduction are indicative of his approach:

Some *topoi* in Japanese and Korean poetry are of Chinese origin, for example, the sky river (the Milky Way), clouds and rain, the Peach Blossom Spring, the chrysanthemum, and the five willows, the last three from T'ao Ch'ien's poetry. These were first used in writings in Chinese and later in the vernacular. Unlike the difficult metamorphosis of unfamiliar to familiar in pictorial art. . . , the verbal reference, the Peach Blossom Spring, for example,

could be invoked by a few images — peach blossoms, a fisherman, a stream — or any combination of these. . . .

Certain preferred subjects are derived from universal and timeless themes; but they also reflect the philosophical, political, and aesthetic concerns of the times, the encounter of poetry with history. The truncated propositions of much nature poetry in China, and especially in Yi dynasty Korea, when Confucianism was an official political ideology and society placed so much premium on public service, include: the relative merits of engagement and withdrawal, the preference of country life to city life, the nature of fame. The relative absence in Japan of certain preferred subjects and topoi so prominent in China and Korea points to differences in that country's institutions, beliefs, and literary tastes. Largely missing, for example, are such types of praise poetry as country-house poems and the "not finding him in" topos; retirement poetry built upon the Confucian-Taoist double vision, especially the topos of the fisherman as sage; friendship poetry — send-off poems, poems of parting, on wine, and *carpe diem*; and such Taoist views of time as nondiscrimination. There the priority rests on the poetry of the seasons and of love, as the imperial anthologies seem to indicate.<sup>16</sup>

Equally instructive from the Japanese perspective is Burton Watson's translations in *Japanese Literature in Chinese: Poetry & Prose in Chinese by Japanese Writers of the Early Period* (vol. 1) and the *Late Period* (vol. 2). He speaks of the

Role which the *kanshi*, regardless of length, played as a vehicle for the treatment of certain themes that could not, or by convention would not, be treated in Japanese. Though there was greater thematic variety in early times, by the Heian period Japanese poetry seems to have been confined almost entirely to the subjects of love and nature, with a scattering of works in a religious vein. Ancient Japanese love poetry is justly famous for its psychological subtlety and great lyric beauty; it is significant that there are very few attempts to treat the subject of love in the *kanshi*, and that these few are purely conventional and impersonal imitations of Chinese models. The Japanese, it would seem, realized that for the expression of romantic sentiment their native poetry was the superior medium. Nature, on the other hand, is treated extensively in the *kanshi* as well as in Japanese poetry, but here the treatment is so different in the two media that they appear to complement

rather than compete with one another, the Japanese being elliptical and impressionistic, the Chinese direct, detailed, and customarily laid out in neat parallelisms. The poet could thus, depending upon which medium he selected to depict the beauties of the natural scene, create very different literary effects. Religious and philosophical musing are likewise to be found in both media, though the *kanshi*, because of its unlimited length, is clearly the more suitable vehicle for complex intellectual utterance. Finally, at least after the early period, it may be stated that Japanese poetry had become so restricted in theme that works dealing with politics, social criticism, the plight of the common people, or everyday family life could be treated virtually only in the *kanshi*.<sup>17</sup>

Perhaps the best way to summarize the usefulness of the genre and thematological approaches is to cite a few poems by Korean and Japanese authors written according to Chinese forms and in Chinese characters. One could profitably compare Korean and Japanese authors, but my perspective is from the Chinese point of view. Here is a poem on separation by Chong Chisang 鄭知常 (d. 1135):

雨歇長堤草色多  
送君南浦動悲歌  
大同江水何時盡  
別淚年年添綠波

After a rain on the long dike  
grasses are thick.  
With a sad song I send you  
off to Namp'o.  
When will the Taedong River  
cease to flow?  
Year after year my tears will  
swell the waves.

As Professor Lee comments, the river symbolizes sorrowful separation, the enormity of which finds hyperbolic expression through the tears which become "sources of the Taedong River."<sup>18</sup> Chong's poem is a seven-character *chüeh-chü* and corresponds closely in form and theme to Li Po's "Seeing Meng Hao-jan Off to Kuang-ling" 送孟浩然之廣陵, which is also a seven-character *chüeh-chü*:

故人西辭黃鶴樓  
 煙花三月下揚州  
 孤帆遠影碧空盡  
 惟見長江天際流

My old friend, going west, bids farewell  
 at Yellow Crane Terrace,  
 Among misty blossoms of the third month,  
 goes down to Yang-chou.  
 His lone sail's far shadow vanishes  
 in the azure void.  
 Now, only the Long River flowing  
 to the sky's end.<sup>19</sup>

In Li Po's poem, the vast spatial distance of "azure void" and "Long River" subtly implies how the lengthening time is also distancing the two friends.

A similar theme, with the added poignancy of exile and mutability, is expressed by Sugawara no Michizane 菅原道真 (845-903), the most famous of early Japanese writers of *kanshi*. The poem is also a seven-character *chūeh-chū* (written in 901) and is entitled, "Ninth Month, Tenth Day" 九月十日:

去年今夜侍清涼  
 秋思詩篇獨斷腸  
 恩賜御衣今在此  
 捧持每日拜餘香

This night last year, attending  
 at the Seiryō Palace,  
 I spoke of my sorrow in a  
 "Poem on Autumn Thoughts."  
 The robe His Majesty bestowed  
 on me, here with me now—  
 Each day I lift it reverently,  
 bow to its lingering fragrance.<sup>20</sup>

The poem in Japanese form with its combination of *kanji*, *kana*, and *okurigana* is reproduced below as it appears in Kawakuchi's 1966 edition:<sup>21</sup>

去にし年の今夜 清涼に侍りき  
 御在所の殿の名なり。  
 秋の思ひの詩篇 獨り腸を斷つ  
 勅して秋の思ひといふことを賜りて賦ひき。臣が詩のみ多く愼る所を  
 述べにたり。  
 恩賜の御衣は今此に在り  
 捧げ持ちて日毎に餘香を拜す  
 宴終りて晩頭に御衣を賜へり。今身に隨ひて篋の中に在り、故に云ふ。

The theme of solitary loneliness occurs in my last two examples, both of which are seven-character *chüeh-chü*. The first is by the Korean poet, Ch'oe Ch'ung 崔冲 (984-1068):

滿庭月色無煙燭  
 入座山光不速賓  
 更有松絃彈譜外  
 只堪珍重未傳人

The moonlight in my garden  
 is a smokeless candle;  
 The reflection of the hills  
 in my room, a voluntary guest;  
 The strings of pine improvise  
 their wayward tunes;  
 Unable to share, I cherish  
 them alone.<sup>22</sup>

The next poem is again by Sugawara no Michizane, and entitled, "The Lamp Goes Out" 燈滅一絕, the first of two poems with this title, written in 902, a few months before his death:

脂膏先盡不因風  
殊恨光無一夜通  
難得灰心兼晦迹  
寒窗起就月明中

It was not the wind —  
the oil is gone;  
I hate the lamp that will not  
see me through the night.  
How hard — to make ashes of the mind,  
to still the body!  
I rise and move into the moonlight  
by the cold window.<sup>23</sup>

I should like to conclude my paper by opening up some questions for possible discussion, taking them according to my divisions above but in the reverse order. Regarding *THEME* and *GENRE*, since the poems cited are actually written in Chinese characters and forms, how do they rate among critical connoisseurs of Chinese classical poetry? According to Professor Lee, "The writings of Yi Chonggu 李廷龜 (1564-1635) were well-known not only in Korea, but also in China, where they were unanimously praised by the Ming critics for their freshness of imagery and noble emotion."<sup>24</sup> As for Japanese poetry, Professor Watson tells us that "it was not until the late nineteenth century that anyone in China took serious notice of the Japanese works" of the Tokugawa period (seventeenth to nineteenth centuries). The Ch'ing scholar Yü Yüeh 俞樾 (1821-1907) compiled a selection of *kanshi* by Tokugawa poets, "bestowing warm, even lavish praise on many of the poets."<sup>25</sup> Did Korean and Japanese writers go beyond technical competence and were they really able to communicate their native emotions and innermost feelings? In the words of Professor Watson, are their works "sufficiently accomplished to pass for the work of Chinese writers if examined by Chinese critics?"<sup>26</sup> Generally speaking, is it true that Chinese was used to express works of a public or official character, while more private feelings were expressed in the native language? More particularly, were certain poetic forms (e.g., the Korean *sijo* and the Japanese *haiku*) so distinctive that nothing in Chinese could as effectively communicate the native sensibility?

When it comes to *INFLUENCE* and *PERIOD* questions, scholars seem to be divided about whether the profound and prolonged Chinese literary presence in Korea and Japan was truly beneficial or had adverse effects on the development of the native literature. How, in fact, did individual Korean and Japanese writers react to the conflict between their respective native traditions and the various Chinese influences? How did the naturalization of literary works actually take place? The frequent allusions by Korean and Japanese poets to China's eminent personages, famous places, and historical events, certainly does not seem conducive to fostering independent literary creativity.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, perhaps what Professor Watson says of Japanese literature can also be applied to Korea. He takes a positive approach,

admiring the men of the early period for their determination to transcend their insularity and participate to some degree in the larger sphere of Sinitic culture. I would also like to speculate on the advantages that may have accrued from such efforts. First of all, it is clear that the attempts of the Japanese to compose in a foreign language made them more conscious, and appreciative, of the characteristics and peculiar excellencies of their own language and literature. Further, it allowed them more readily to absorb Chinese literary devices such as parallelism, as well as Chinese literary themes and ideas, and to adapt them to the native literature. . . . Chinese literature had the effect of refining the native tradition and making Japanese a richer and more effective medium for literary expression, just as Latin enriched the vernacular literatures of the various European states. In addition, it at times led to the creation of a certain number of deeply felt and important works of literature, works that probably would not have been composed in the native language. . . . More important, it seems to me, is to inquire whether the *kanshi*, and those *kambun* works with literary pretensions — regardless of how they might be viewed by Chinese critics — ever advanced beyond the level of mere imitations of mainland models or exercises in erudition, and if so, what particular characteristics and merits they display.<sup>28</sup>

Finally, in reference to *INTERDISCIPLINARY APPROACHES*, it seems to me a special effort has to be made to engage comparative literature studies more thoroughly into literary history and literary theory. Both

modern and traditional approaches should be examined in order to come to a deeper and more thorough understanding of one another's literatures. In the case of Japan, in particular, it should not surprise us that the insights of a modern Japanologist like Earl Miner can help Chinese scholars to reformulate some of their views on comparative literature studies.<sup>29</sup> As for traditional literary theory, it is perhaps worth recalling that Korean and Japanese authors and critics — early pioneering comparativists of the Eastern world — thought about and wrote about the exciting new literary developments they found in China. For instance, a famous monk-scholar, Kūkai 空海 (otherwise known as Kōbō Daishi 弘法大師, 774-835), “through his extensive reading of the works of poetic theory of the Six Dynasties and T'ang dynasty periods, . . . systematized the rules for the composition of poetry. The richness of his source material may be judged from the fact that he quotes many poems which no longer survive today and are known only through his having quoted them. Such a wide-ranging coverage of poetical theory was not even produced in T'ang China, . . . and the same remark applies equally to the history of Western poetic theory from Horace in the sixties B.C. to Boileau in the seventeenth century.”<sup>30</sup>

We are indeed fortunate to have so many illustrious examples of literary and critical works upon which to model our Chinese-Eastern comparative literature studies. On a more pragmatic level — and by way of corollary to all that has been said above — the program outlined here stresses the importance of introducing Eastern languages and literatures into university curricula in a systematic and progressive way. Initially and by way of transition, a judicious selection of translations has to be employed; their importance should not be underestimated. Histories of national literatures and literary theories must be edited for non-natives as well as bibliographies compiled and literary concepts and terminology clarified in glossaries. Teacher and student exchange programs should be increased; comparative literature organizations and conferences should be promoted and publicized more; research and publications should regularly be put in the hands of fellow comparativists. My purpose has been simply to introduce something of the scope of the field and invite further scholarly discussion in order to explore this area more fruitfully.

## Notes

1. Harry Levin, “What Is Literature If Not Comparative?” Forthcoming article based

- on his keynote address delivered at the Second Hong Kong Conference on East-West Comparative Literature, held at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, March 1-4, 1982.
2. Peter H. Lee, *Celebration of Continuity: Themes in Classic East Asian Poetry* (Cambridge, Mass. & London: Harvard University Press, 1979), pp. 213 and 3.
  3. See *Tamkang Review*, 4, No. 2 (Oct. 1973), 157-66, *passim*.
  4. In recent years, numerous conferences of academics and literary writers have been held in Southeast Asia. In December of 1982, the University of Hong Kong hosted the 14th General Conference and Seminar of the Association of Southeast Asian Institutions of Higher Learning (ASAIHL), the theme of which was "The Teaching of Literature in ASAIHL Universities." It was gratifying to hear many papers with a comparative dimension but also disconcerting to realize how seriously colonialism has influenced so many of these countries. For brief descriptions of this and other literary events, see 1983 issues of *Asiaweek*, January 14, 42-44; February 11, 40-41; May 6, 55-57; June 3, 54-55; June 17, 58-59.
  5. *The Far Eastern Economic Review* quotes Norman Bailey, director of planning at the White House National Security Council (NSC): "The economic centre of gravity of the world is rapidly shifting to the Pacific basin" (July 14, 1983, 55). And the famous historian, Arnold Toynbee in *Half the World: The History and Culture of China and Japan*, states: "It would not be surprising if the 21st century proved to be an East Asian century of human history" (London: Thames & Hudson, 1973), p. 11.
  6. See my "Comparativist's View of the Development of Literature and Society in Asia," *Asian Culture Quarterly*, 6, No. 2 (Summer 1978), 3-32. For an interesting collection of materials on this same subject, see Tham Seong Chee, ed., *Essays on Literature and Society in Southeast Asia: Political and Social Perspectives* (Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1981).
  7. See Robert J. Clements, *Comparative Literature as Academic Discipline: A Statement of Principles, Praxis, Standards* (New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1978), pp. 33-34.
  8. Other interesting areas for comparison would be China's literary relations with Tibet and Mongolia. And if British vs. American literature is seriously proposed as a topic for comparative study (cf. Henry Gifford, *Comparative Literature* [London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1969], pp. 80-89), then why not the various expressions of Chinese literature which flourish in different parts of the world?
  9. There is an increasing number of publications appearing on intra-Asian literary topics in Chinese, Korean, and Japanese, to say nothing of English sources. The large number of participants in this Conference's Inter-Asian Comparative Literature Studies panel also testifies to the growing interest in the field.
  10. Most of the observations made in this paragraph are paraphrased from D. Ha-Yun-Yi, "A Comparative Approach to Korean Literature," *Proceedings of the IIIrd Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association* (The Hague, The Netherlands: Mouton & Co., 'S-Gravenhage, 1962), pp. 215-23, *passim*.
  11. *Korean Literature: Topics and Themes* (Tucson: The University of Arizona Press, 1965), p. 5. See also *Hangul* (Seoul: Korea Background Series, Korean Overseas Information Service, 1973), *passim*.
  12. Quoted from *Der Grosse Herder* (V, 685), in Lee, *Korean Literature*, p. 28.
  13. *Hangul*, p. 14.
  14. *A History of Japanese Literature: The First Thousand Years*, trans. David Chibbett

- (London: The Macmillan Press, 1979), p. 6. For an illustration of *kanji*, *kana*, and *okuri-gana*, see below p. 13.
15. I wish to express my gratitude here to Professor Lee not only for his inspiring book but also for the stimulating interview I had with him at the University of Hawaii just prior to this Conference. Professor Lee has been organizing seminars on intra-Asian literary topics at the Association of Asian Studies for over fifteen years. He is currently engaged in editing the proceedings of a 1983 conference he organized in Seoul under the topic, "Korean Literature in the Context of East Asian Literature." For an appreciation of the Conference, written in Chinese by one of the participants, see 杜國清, 「會外雜思: 寫在『韓、中、日文學比較會議之後』, 中國時報 (七月五日, 七十二年), 第八版。
  16. *Celebration*, pp. 2-3.
  17. (New York & London: Columbia University Press, 1975), I, 11-12.
  18. *Celebration*, p. 149. Professor Lee is also the translator of the poem.
  19. Trans. Paul Kroll in *Sunflower Splendor: Three Thousand Years of Chinese Poetry*, ed. Wu-Chi Liu and Irving Yucheng Lo (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1975), pp. 101-02.
  20. Watson, I, 112. Watson also supplies an informative note on line 2: "The 'Poem on Autumn Thoughts,' (*Kanke kōshū*), written on a theme set by Emperor Daigo, expressed Michizane's uneasiness at the honors bestowed upon him and the great difference in age between himself and the sixteen-year-old ruler, as though he had a premonition of the disaster about to befall him in the following year. The present poem is one of Michizane's most admired works, principally because of the reverence it expresses toward the sovereign. Professor Kawaguchi points out that it bears a close resemblance to a poem in 7-character *lǚ-shih* form by Tu Fu, the second of two poems entitled "Expressing Elation at the Winter Solstice" written in 758. In general Tu Fu's works seem to have been very little known in Japan in the Heian period, however, and the resemblance may quite possibly be coincidental." The original of Tu Fu's "Winter Solstice" poem follows:

憶昨逍遙供奉班，去年今日侍龍顏。  
 麒麟不動爐烟上，孔雀徐開扇影還。  
 玉几由來天北極，朱衣只在殿中間。  
 孤臣此日腸堪斷，愁對寒雲雪滿山。

Incidentally, Michizane was Po Chu-yi's most important follower in Japan (see Watson, I, 79-80). The preferred poets of the Korean writer, Yi Kyubo 李奎報 (1168-1241) were T'ao Ch'ien and Mei Yao-ch'en 梅堯廷; he also tried to emulate Po Chu-yi. The most popular poet in Korea during Yi's time was Su Shih.

21. *Kanke Bunsō Kanke Koshū* 管家文草管家後集 [Sugawara Family Manuscripts and the Sugawara Family Late (Second) Collection] ed. Kawakuchi Hisao 川口久雄 (Tokyo: Iwanami, 1973), p. 484.
22. Trans. Kim Jong-gil (Kim Chong-gil), *Korea Journal* (August 1980), p. 54.
23. Watson, I, 122.
24. *Korean Literature*, p. 95.
25. Watson, II, 14.
26. Watson, I, 7.
27. An interesting study of this problem is found in Nicholas John Teele, "The Love Poems of the *Kokinshū*: A Translation with Commentary, and Study of the Influence of Chinese and Earlier Japanese Poetry" (Diss. The University of Texas at

- Austin, 1980).
28. Watson, I, 6-7.
  29. See, for instance, his "Concepts of Value in Japanese and Western Literary Criticism," *Proceedings of the VIIth Congress of the International Comparative Literature Association*, ed. Eva Kushner (Stuttgart: Kunst und Wissen-Eric Bieber, 1979), pp. 625-28; "Japanese Literature and Comparative Literature," *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, No. 30 (1981), 21-30; "Some Theoretical Implications of Japanese Linked Poetry," *Comparative Literature Studies*, 18, No. 3 (September 1981), pp. 368-78.
  30. Kato, p. 104.