

Beyond *Chinoiserie*: Differentiating Sameness in the Oriental Hermeneutic Community

Wai-lim Yip

The word *chinoiserie*, one hardly needs to be reminded, comes from the French word for Chinese, *chinois*, but it has never meant what the word promises to mean. From the very beginning, it was a misnomer. For centuries, the Europeans had only a very vague idea of the vast land east of the Sinai, variously called the Seres (Land of Silk), Cathay (Land of Khitai) or *Chine* (Land of Ch'in). Partly influenced, no doubt, by Marco Polo's overblown description of the immensity of the Chinese imperial boundaries, this far-reaching kingdom, which, for the Europeans up to the late nineteenth century often subsumed India, Japan and all of Southeast Asia, had become something of a legend, mysterious, mystified, distorted and misunderstood.

Indeed, the word *chinoiserie* has never been used to represent any indigenous understanding of the varying styles found in this inadvertently conglomerated kingdom; rather, it is often taken to mean "the European idea of what Oriental things were like, or ought to be like."¹ Thus, India, China, Korea, Japan, and the other Asian countries have been vaguely seen as one continuous dimension, sharing, as it were, some strong common bond, indivisible and indistinguishable.

As trade between Western and Asian countries increased, as Christian missions penetrated into the heartlands of Asia, and as military aggressions of the Western powers brought about colonized and semi-colonized conditions in the Orient, the once misty and undifferentiated vast kingdom gave way to various clearer national and ethnic contours. And yet, in matters of sensibility, except for a few specialists, most Western readers (and these include scholars, book reviewers and the general public), continued to perceive the Oriental countries as vaguely sharing one unbroken hermeneutic community with very similar, if not identical philosophical and aesthetic roots.

To many, Buddhism is Buddhism, be it Indian, Chinese, Korean or Japanese, as if they all embrace the same circles of metaphysical ideals. Very few Westerners know, (and, for that matter, not too many Indians and Chinese have tried to know), let alone talk intelligently, about the exact changes and modifications that took place in the localization process of Buddhism as it moved from India through China to Korea before reaching Japan.

To many, since China, Korea and Japan modeled their institutions after Confucianism, their societal forms, behavioral patterns and expressive strategies must necessarily be very similar. And in the case of literary compositions, such as classical poems from these three countries, many people would simply view them under one *generalized* Oriental perspective as if they were all produced with the same set of aesthetic assumptions. This is a gross simplification. Willful merging of hermeneutical contours of this kind, surprisingly, is found also in many chauvinistic Chinese in whose eyes Korean or Japanese culture is nothing but derivative.

We must hasten to add, however, that by speaking against putting everything under one large indiscriminate Oriental umbrella, we do not mean to gloss over the preponderous importance of the continuity of "phrases, images or image clusters, and themes" in East Asian literature, so brilliantly demonstrated by Prof. Peter H. Lee in his recent book, *Celebration of Continuity* (Cambridge, 1979). Indeed, the charting of such continuity should be at least one half of our attempt to establish the centers and circumferences of the Oriental hermeneutic community.

In a sense, as implied in the title of this paper, our project endorses Professor Lee's scheme, but aims also at extending it to include the negotiations between and among native sensibilities in the historical morphology of these phrases, images and themes. To be more specific, we are calling for a corporation of scholars from those nations in which inter-nation borrowing and synthesis has been most active, to work together to trace the origins, growth, appropriation and change of the aesthetic assumptions underlying the perceptual models and expressive strategies as well as the attendant thematic and rhetorical topoi, somewhat in the fashion of Curtius' *European Literature and the Latin Middle Ages*. Nobody reading through the literary works of China, Korea and Japan would fail to notice the remarkable continuity of a whole train of *cultural perspectives, language strategies and topoi*. One can detect, for example, dominant perspectives such as the Taoist perception of Nature-as-it-is and

man's tuned correspondence with Nature; the Confucian conception of literature as a civilizing force and of man as a component of the cooperative design of community; the Buddhist priority of emptiness over changeable appearances, etc. Examples of common strategies include the use of negative space and silence in the Taoist aesthetic; the strike-and-spark effect of the Ch'an Buddhist rhetoric; the retreat of the self and the elimination of determinable closures in syntactical manipulations, etc. Similar *topoi* abound, such as the Chinese version of *locus amoenus*, the "Peach Blossom Source"; fisherman idealized as sage; nondiscrimination as a way to keep oneself in natural measure with time, change and transformation, etc.

But, in sorting out an inventory of these shared perspectives and themes, we must be aware also of the possible restrictive and reductive closures we might be putting over the existential conditions of the different individual creative acts — acts which necessarily involve a constant negotiation between the models of two cultures. It is only through the examination of various kinds of negotiations that have taken place between India and China, between China and Korea or Japan, and between Korea and Japan that we will be able to make finer distinctions between Indian and Chinese Buddhism, between Chinese and Korean or Japanese sensibilities. We will not be able to offer here a complete syllabus of all the aesthetic horizons, expressive designs, topics, themes, and critical problems across all these literatures. What we will do is to focus on a few examples as preliminary explorations. They must be considered as preliminary attempts, not final conclusions. The larger project is to be finished by the concerted effort of inter-Asian comparatists.

When Buddhist legends and stories were transplanted from India into China, a good degree of transformation took place in the localization process. Take the popular exposition of Mu-lien, a disciple of Buddha who descends to hell to save his adulterous mother; we must not seek only to identify its sources from, and parallels to other Indian stories, including its similarities to the Dionysian myth, but should also try to account for the Chinese dimension given to Mu-lien: though a Buddhist, he remains a Confucian son.

Similarly, to trace Sun Wu-K'ung to his prototype Remayana is to notice surface resemblances. We must find out how the borrowed model has been invested, in response to the concrete psycho-sociological needs of the Chinese audience of the time, with a feeling and a personality that is uniquely Chinese.

It is a fact that each of these appropriations from another culture must necessarily be worked into some scheme of one's own culture before it can be accepted by, and before it can take root among, a new set of receivers. Anybody who is familiar with the development of Buddhism in China will not fail to recognize the many ways in which Indian concepts have been radically modified so as to suit the indigenous philosophical and aesthetic temperament of the Chinese intellectuals as well as that of the common folk. Indeed, one of the strategies with which the early Buddhist priests of the 3rd and 4th centuries tried to win over the Chinese intellectuals was to explain the difficult concept of *sūnyata* (空, *K'ung*, emptiness, void), which was alien to the fundamentally earthbound Chinese mentality, in the terms used by the intellectuals of the *hsüan-hsüeh* (Dark Learning) and the *ch'ing-t'an* ("pure talk sessions"); *sūnyata* was oriented toward the Taoist nonconcept of *wu* (non-being, nothingness, nonconfinement to name and concept.) Other Indian concepts were given a similar twist. As summarized by E. Zürcher in his *Buddhist Conquest of China*, under the atmosphere established by Hsiang Hsiu and Kuo Hsiang's reinterpretation of the *Chuangtzu*,

The Mahayana concepts like Gnosis (*prajñā*, 智、明) the Void (*sūnyata*, 空), Stillness (*santi*, 寂) and Expediency (*upaya*, 方便) naturally and imperceptibly merged into their *hsüan-hsüeh* counterparts of Saintliness (*seng*, 聖), Emptiness (*hsü*, 虛) and Non-being (*wu* 無), Tranquility (*ching* 靜), and Non-activity (*wu-wei* 無爲), Spontaneity (*tzu-jan* 自然), and Stimulus-and-Response (*kan-ying*, 感應)²

Following Kuo Hsiang's affirmation of "things spontaneously exist by themselves" which denies the existence of a creative power or permanent substance behind them, Chih Min-tu, and later Chih Tun, defined *sūnyata* as identical with "matter" and opened a new process toward an indigenous Chinese Buddhism.³

Similarly, in Chinese Buddhist cave sculptures, as they moved from Yün-kang to Lung-men, traces of Indian features slowly gave way to indigenous characteristics, from facial structure to attire. To study this Sinicizing process is to take into account seriously the question of negotiation between two cultural dimensions. It is only through the

examination of this negotiation that we will be able to ascertain precisely what authentic native elements were at work at a given moment in the reception, rejection, modification and change of alien ingredients.

Similar questions, as they were expressed in philosophy, art and literature, must be asked regarding the move of Buddhism, Confucianism and Taoism eastward to Korea and Japan. What kind of modification took place during the encounter between these horizons and native sensibilities? What kind of historical, psycho-sociological, and aesthetic needs did they respond to? What aspects were consciously or unconsciously bypassed or rejected because they were fundamentally at variance with native temperaments?

In his *Iemoto: The Heart of Japan*, Francis Hsu, using examples from daily occurrences and folktales, reveals some unique ways in which the Japanese respond to certain given situations.⁴ (1) A karate club member who requested to discontinue his membership was beaten to death by his fellow members; he was considered to have broken the bond of group solidarity, a bond he was expected to honor more than his own family kinship. The same incident in China would not lead to a tragedy of this nature. (2) Both the Chinese legend of the *White Snake* and the Japanese legend of *Dojyōji* involve a love-and-betrayal story between a man and a woman, (in the Chinese, a snake turned woman; in the Japanese, a woman turned snake after the man's betrayal.) But, in the Chinese example, after the betrayal (through the instigation of an outsider), the woman does not seek revenge upon the man, but tries to overcome the obstacles and salvage their relationship, whereas in the Japanese case, the woman turns into a fiery serpent, turning her man into charred remains. We could continue to name many other incidents from tales and novels in Japan that reveal responses of the kind that can only be measured by indigenous cultural assumptions: a young boy felt heavily burdened by a small favor accorded him (a glass of ice-drink); two connoisseurs of swords, whose judgment was corrected by a third, felt that they had to murder him, or else kill themselves by *harakiri*; a woman decided to kill herself together with her daughter because the latter failed to measure up to her expectations as a musician; a schoolmaster committed suicide because the Emperor's portrait in his charge was burned.⁵

When two people from two different cultures are confronted with a similar existential crisis such as exile, breakup of a bond, death, etc.,

initially both might respond to it with instinctive fear, uncertainty and a whole range of anxieties, but each of them might eventually resolve the crisis in a totally different manner, using a set of strategies explainable only by the psycho-socio-aesthetic makeup of the culture in question. Whereas most people would scream in terror in the face of a flood or an earthquake, the ancient Japanese asked for stoic forbearance. This typical response and those enumerated above have roots which reach deeply into the Japanese socio-psychological complex of *on* (恩), *gimu* (義務), and *giri* (義理), loosely translated respectively as *favor*, *obligation*, and *sense of honor-duty-justice-debt of gratitude*. These concepts, often intertwined, control and determine most of the behavioral patterns and actions of the Japanese.⁶ The sense of honor-duty-justice-debt of gratitude, rigidly assigned to clearly demarcated roles, is absolute and non-negotiable. Whereas in China, despite levels of similarly coded obligations in the Confucian system, a potentially tragic decision can be avoided through some form of negotiation. The normative sense of *jen* (仁 , humaneness) and *i* (義 , righteousness) has helped a subject to eschew his obligation to a lord or master who has departed from the norms.⁷

The non-negotiability of *giri* has produced some unusual consequences. Finding no way out from this prison of *giri*, a person is often driven quickly into extremities, such as committing suicide over some (to non-Japanese eyes) trivial matter, or falling into a special form of ennui, melancholy and depression. Indeed, suicide and death, as a form of honor to repay a non-negotiable debt of gratitude, have become one of the most obsessive themes in Japanese literature. Some writers have carried this obsession even to the degree of turning it into an object of supreme beauty.⁸

In our effort to account for the themes and motifs that are common across East Asian literatures, it is imperative that we discriminate from among them the various ways in which Indians, Chinese, Koreans and Japanese respond to similar existential conditions and crises. It is this finer diacritical sense of sameness and differentness in the psycho-socio-aesthetic responses that will furnish one of the richest avenues into the perimeters of the total Oriental hermeneutic community.

Almost all of the ancient oral poems of Korea and Japan came to be recorded in Chinese characters in the form of phonetic or logographic transcription or through translation. In the process of transcription and translation, how many of the indigenous qualities (rhythm, tone, emotion, attitudes) had been subtly changed by the dominant ideology of the

Chinese? In our understanding, there is no such thing as using Chinese purely as a recording instrument without bringing with it structural and hermeneutical modification upon the Korean and the Japanese materials, because language is always thought-forming and thought-imposing. In what way can we retrieve and re-establish from these recorded specimens the authentic compositional reality of the early Korean and Japanese songs?

Peter H. Lee, for example, complains about the difficulty of re-establishing the literary nature of the Koryo period.⁹ One reason was precisely the problem of recording. Since there was no proper system of writing the Korean language, many of the poems of this period, which were of oral and folk origin, were lost. The earlier *hyanch'al* method (transcription of Korean in Chinese) was not practiced during this period. But, even when it was used, as in the case of *Saenaennonae*, the question still remains as to how much contamination of the original flavor (rhythm, tone, emotion, attitudes) took place in the process. The irrecoverability of the Koryo songs is further aggravated by the fact that the succeeding Yi Dynasty accelerated its study of Chinese literature and encouraged composition only in Chinese as part of the deification of Confucianism as state philosophy and institution. The few Koryo songs that came to be recorded were expunged by the Yi Dynasty annalists and anthologists as being "vulgar and obscene."¹⁰

But if we could identify the degree of contamination and resurrect the pristine voice from the ancient Korean and Japanese songs, we would be able, in turn, to gauge the exact curve and chord of modification in the process of appropriation. In fact, if we could resurrect the perimeters of this indigenous lyrical horizon, we would be in a better position to read correctly those works that have been considered for years as "Chinese" instead of "Korean" or "Japanese." I refer to both "poems written in Chinese" and "poems in Japanese or Korean with dominant Chinese themes and tropes." It is futile to view "Chinese poems" written by Koreans or Japanese as second-rate Chinese imitations (although we cannot deny that some are). Even if we view some of them as first-rate Chinese poems, we are not going anywhere, because we are still measuring them against the Chinese norms. The case of "Chinese poems" written by Koreans or Japanese can be extremely intriguing. On the one hand, we find the poets projecting themselves outside their existential space-time to identify themselves with a hermeneutic community larger than their own, creating a sense of temporal and spatial ethereality, since in using

Chinese, including Chinese place names and Chinese periods, they rise beyond their immediate reality. On the other hand, they must also make these "Chinese poems" establish rapport with their immediate audience rooted in a life distinctively different from Chinese ways of life. For example, a Korean poet who has adopted T'ao Ch'ien's "Peach Blossom Source" motif (the Chinese version of *locus amoenus*) finds his "source" in a Korean mountain (Ch'ong Chol's "Little Odes of Mount Star").

Similarly, Korean and Japanese poets writing poems in Chinese might employ allusions in the same fashion as the Chinese, but their referentiality could be totally Korean or Japanese. The uniquely Korean or Japanese characteristics are sometimes extremely difficult to detect and can only be illuminated by an intelligent juxtaposition of the Korean or Japanese "Chinese poem" in question with native poems of well-defined indigenous qualities. But before this can be done, it is imperative that we resurrect, first and foremost, the pristine compositional reality of the ancient Korean and Japanese songs.

In spite of the obvious difficulties already noted, the recovery is not entirely impossible. If we understand that distortion or obscuration of certain lyrical impulses and expressive strategies of the oral songs comes from the tyranny of written poetics, and this is particularly true in the Korean and Japanese impositions of Chinese models upon their native oral materials, there is, then, a good chance for us to reconstruct some of the excluded features. This we can do by referring the "contaminated" products to existing, better-documented oral songs, even if they are of a later period. By comparing and contrasting these songs with poems in Chinese or Chinese-inspired poems, certain indigenous qualities will emerge, and it is with these qualities that we can better gauge the degree and type of modification that has taken place.

The study of presences and absences of certain genres and themes in these literatures will also help to mirror the potentials and limitations in each indigenous culture. In an important but not developed "Epilogue" to his *Celebration of Continuity*, Peter H. Lee takes note of a series of interesting absences in Japan of certain themes and forms that are dominant in China and Korea. Here is one unique example that he cites:

Hyperbolic praise of a ruler begun in the *Book of Songs* and continued by Chinese and Korean poets is almost absent in the

Japanese imperial anthologies. Even in China there is nothing that approaches the *Song of Flying Dragon* (*Yongbi ōch'ōn ka*) in its sustained use of ecomiastic topics. The creation in words of the ideal portrait of the Confucian soldier and statesman cannot be expected in a society where the civil service examination did not take root, where the emperor had a unique status, and where Confucian political and moral philosophy, in spite of the rise of neo-Confucianism from the Tokugawa Period, varied in emphasis from that in China and Korea.¹²

Then, from the viewpoint of formalistic priorities, Lee continues

The predominant form in the imperial anthologies was the *waka* and *tanka*, consisting of thirty-one syllables. Although such techniques as allusive variation enlarged the dimensions of *tanka*, its brevity precludes the treatment of certain topics that required extended description and development [such as *The Songs of Flying Dragons*].¹³

Following this line of pursuit, we can also try to account for the dominance of the female voice and sensibility in Japanese literature, a dimension and charm hardly matched by anything in Chinese and Korean works. Classical Japanese literature was largely shaped, if not initiated, by women who enjoyed a freedom and a high political and economic status, again not to be matched by their counterparts in China or in Korea (except perhaps those from the "Kuo-feng" section of *The Book of Songs* in China). The large representation of women poets in the *Manyōshū*, *The Tale of Genji*, *The Pillow Book*, and the numerous poetic diaries left their indelible mark and impact upon later compositions. It is with good reason that Noriko Mizuta Lippit disagrees with Virginia Woolf's claim that poetry is not a form of expression suitable for women, since they cannot aspire to place themselves at the center of the universe and to reinterpret it accordingly.¹⁴ In Japan, before the Heian Period, the female lyrical voice, both in poetry and in prose fiction, was quite pervasive. Hence, the very unique quality of *mono-no-aware*, which Motoori Norinaga (1669-1736) singles out in his *Genji monogatari tama no o-gushi* (*The Precious Comb to Unravel the Tale of Genji*) as the most important sensibility, and which the modern novelist Kawabata Yasunari so much values and no doubt emulates himself, must be seen as a specific form of pathos for things

imbued with the fine delicacy and charm of a woman's sensibility.

The case of reception is related to the study of presences and absences. Of the four types of Chinese paintings imported into Japan — the monumental landscape of the Northern Sung, the abbreviated landscape of the Southern Sung, portraits and the genre of flowers and birds — those of the Southern Sung, the Ma-Hsia School and Ch'an paintings which emphasize large areas of emptiness, became the vogue. The preference for the Southern Sung School of painting is perhaps related to the popularity of the Haiku, the poetics of "in between" of Seami, and the extended development of Ch'an Buddhism, all of which stress a strike-and-spark effect, all direct to the flash of a moment and all aspire to transport the viewer-audience to a negative space. All these entered Japan from China and are still being practised by Chinese poets and artists, but not with the same degree of intensity. What was the native element in the Japanese sensibility that allowed these Chinese ideals to be so readily received? This is one of the most fascinating aspects in the study of reception among Asian literatures.

Another example is the peculiar popularity of the T'ang poet Po Chü-i in Japan. We are particularly indebted to Lin Wen-yueh for her patient documentation of the reception of Po Chü-i in Japan in her essay "The Influence of the T'ang Dynasty Culture on the Japanese Heian Literary Circle."¹⁵ From her documentation, one intriguing convergence emerges. Aside from the commonly held reasons for Po Chü-i's reception in Japan — Po was extremely popular in China; his poetry was easy and accessible to a wide audience; his poetry was rich in Buddhist feeling; and his poetry embraced the widest variety of subjects — it seems that Po Chü-i's popularity in Japan can largely be attributed to the unique way in which his poetry was received and transformed by Lady Murasaki. It is almost as if Po Chü-i's poetry was given the additional dimension of Murasaki's unique mode of *mono-no-aware*. This can be seen from the motifs of melancholy selected from Po Chü-i's poems and woven into the *Tale of Genji*. Under the hand of Murasaki, Po Chü-i has been, so to speak, feminized. The popularity of *The Tale of Genji* has helped greatly to enhance the reception of Po Chü-i by a much wider audience, an audience whose sensibility induces a view of the poet distinctly different from the image held by Po's audience in China.

We should also look into the particular ways in which a topos was

received and used. Earlier, we mentioned the localization of the topos of T'ao Ch'ien's "Peach Blossom Source" in Korea. Professor Toru Haga, in an excellent essay, maps out from T'ao Ch'ien's poem the spatial shape of the fisherman's progress along a river in Wu-ling through a narrow cave into a suddenly wide-open space, the *locus amoenus*, in which he sees the "mulberry," hears "cocks' crow" and "dogs' bark."¹⁶ In the Korean adaptations, many of the motifs are followed, but the spatial progress of the prototype is not always adopted. The most interesting twist is perhaps the poem by Yi Hwang (1501-1571).¹⁷

In T'ao Ch'ien's original poem, the speaker, on his second attempt to retrace the *locus amoenus* he had recently found, failed to find the source. In Yi Hwang's poem, after having proclaimed his *locus amoenus*, the speaker is afraid of losing it again; hence, he decides to keep the secret to himself by requesting the peach petals not to fall, for fear that the fallen petals might reveal this place to other intruders. T'ao Ch'ien, after having evoked the ideal place, renders it an impossibility; it should remain with the "misty," "mysterious" Nature beyond men's reach. All subsequent poets, starting with Wang Wei, have followed this message. Yi Hwang's poem, by contrast, not only renders the Peach Blossom Source a possibility, available for possession, but even suggests that it can become a "personal" possession. When the poet commands the peach blossoms not to fall, however, he requests the impossible and is, therefore, acting against Nature. Despite the speaker's affirmative voice declaring his possession of this ideal place, there is an undercurrent of denial of this possibility, and thus, a tension between the poet and his supposedly found harmony. Was this twist of the original perception a purely personal decision, or did it go deeper? How much did the *sijo* form, a short lyric with possible origins in the oral tradition, contribute to the personal subjective tone of Yi Hwang's poem? These and many other questions regarding similar modified uses of topos from Chinese literature demand that we examine them not against the so-called "objective" norms, but the very historical and cultural grounding of the aesthetic strategies in question.

To return to our initial proposal: In order to clarify the contours of convergences and divergences between and among Asian literatures, a group of inter-Asian comparatists should come together (1) to compile an anthology of literary works that will reveal intelligently their inter-workings with an introduction, comparative in nature, to lead each category. This

anthology should be prefaced by a succinct history of Oriental aesthetics written jointly by critics who have knowledge of at least two, if not three literatures; (2) to edit a series of independent books on one concept or theme across several literatures with the above-mentioned diacritical sense. These books together will form an encyclopedia of Oriental poetics, a source book for later students of Oriental literature. Both projects, when completed, should be published in all the languages concerned, plus an English version. The latter is, of course, intended to help Western readers and critics to understand more fully the finer discriminations between and among these various Asian sensibilities.

The present proposal is admittedly forbidding. And yet, if we do not take the first step now, we will never be able to reach the goal of the much needed mutual illumination and reflection working within a unified but coextensive hermeneutic community.

Notes

1. Oliver Imprey, *Chinoiserie: The Impact of Oriental Style on Western Art and Decoration* (New York, 1977), p. 9.
2. E. Zürcher, *The Buddhist Conquest of China* (Leiden, 1959, 1972), p. 73.
3. Zürcher, p. 123.
4. Francis Hsu, *Iemoto: The Heart of Japan* (Cambridge, 1975), p. 16, p. 23.
5. Read about these and many similar incidents, many of which form the themes of Japanese novels, in Ruth Benedict, *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword* (New York, 1946) and in Mamoru Iga and Kichinosuke Tatai, "Characteristics of Suicides and Attitudes in Japan," *Suicide in Different Cultures*, ed. Norman L. Farberow (Baltimore, 1975). The latter explores, in particular, the complex reasons behind the suicide of Yukio Mishima.
6. See Benedict, pp. 115-34 and Iga and Tatai, pp. 265.
7. Benedict, pp. 117-19.
8. Such as the novels of Yukio Mishima.
9. Peter H. Lee, *Korean Literature: Topics and Themes* (Tuscon, 1965), p. 15.
10. Lee, pp. 16-17.
11. Peter H. Lee, *Celebration of Continuity* (Cambridge, 1979), p. 80.
12. Lee, p. 207.
13. Lee, p. 209.
14. Noriko Mizuta Lippit and Kyoko Irinye Seldon, *Stories by Contemporary Japanese Women Writers*, (New York, 1982) "Introduction", p. ix.
15. 林文月, "唐代文化對日本平安文壇之影響," 台灣大學文吏哲學報, No. 21 (台北, 1972), pp. 169-99.
16. 芳賀徹 "桃源郷の詩の空間" 比較文學研究 No. 32 (東京, 1977), pp. 1-32.
17. Only I and the seagull/Know the thirty-six peaks of Mount Chong-Yang./Seagulls might report Arcadia is here (i.e., Peach Blossom Source)/Even more untrustworthy are peach blossoms./0 blossoms, do not fall, do not float down/To tell the fishermen this sunny site. Lee, *Celebration of Continuity*, p. 80.