

The Carved Dragon and the Well Wrought Urn — Notes on the Concepts of Structure in Liu Hsieh and the New Critics¹

W. L. Wong

Although structure alone has little to do with greatness or even excellence, the existence of a fine structure, or organic unity as it is often called, enhances the literary merit of a particular work. The assertion of organic unity as an artistic achievement, as far as my reading informs me, is universal in both Chinese and Western poetics. For reasons to be stated below, I have chosen Liu Hsieh and the New Critics for discussion in this paper.² This is only a preliminary study, many of the cited ideas awaiting further examination and comparison.

I

In his "The Language of Paradox," Cleanth Brooks, one of the prominent New Critics, uses approximately ten pages to explicate John Donne's poem "Canonization."³ Besides seeing the poem as involving "a sort of paradox," in which profane love is treated as if it were divine love, Brooks has this additional remark:

The Canonization is not that of a pair of holy anchorites who have renounced the world and the flesh. The hermitage of each is the other's body; but they do renounce the world, and so their title to sainthood is cunningly argued. The poem then is a parody of Christian sainthood; but it is an intensely serious parody of a sort that modern man, habituated as he is to an easy yes or no, can hardly understand.⁴

Then he proceeds to explain, in the manner of close verbal analysis

characteristic of a New Critic, the profane-love-as-if-divine-love theme; in the main, his explication deals with matters which are closely related to the way the poem is structured.

"The Language of Paradox" is the first article of Brooks' *The Well Wrought Urn: Studies in the Structures of Poetry*, one of the "classics" of the New Criticism. While reading this book, a student of Chinese literature might recall ideas in Liu Hsieh's 劉勰 (c. 465-522) *The Literary Mind and the Carving of the Dragon* (*Wen-hsin tiao-lung* 文心雕龍), a great monument in the old Chinese critical tradition. He might be immensely surprised by the discoveries that, in a great number of cases, the critical views of Brooks and many other New Critics are so close to those of Liu Hsieh that they seem to belong to the same school; that what Brooks and many other New Critics have been doing seems to be the application of critical theories advocated by Liu Hsieh.

In the chapter "An Understanding Critic" (*chih-yin* 知音), Liu Hsieh states that Six Points (*liu-kuan* 六觀) should be kept in mind when one studies a work of literature. The first is *wei-t'i* 位體, that is, the theme, style and genre of the literary work under scrutiny. It seems as though Brooks were applying the first of the Six Points theory to his analysis of Donne's "Canonization" at the beginning of which, as mentioned earlier, Brooks points out the theme of the poem as profane love vs. divine love, and identifies its genre as parody and its style as "serious." Brooks goes on to analyze the text of "Canonization" so as to demonstrate to the reader why he interprets the poem in that way. According to him, the "you" whom the speaker addresses at the beginning of the poem represents the practical world which regards love as a silly affection; the speaker asks "you" not to "chide" him for pursuing his love; instead, he asks "you" to take care of "your" own welfare — get wealth and honor for "yourself." In the line "Or the Kings reall, or his stamped face . . ." (i.e., in Brooks' interpretation, "cultivate the court and gaze at the king's face there, or if you prefer, get into business and look at his face stamped on coins"), the two main categories of secular success are neatly and contemptuously epitomized. Out of Brooks' lengthy analysis of the rhetorical details of "Canonization," I shall quote a few passages (*italics mine*).

- (1) It is touched on in the fourth stanza in the contrast between the word "*Chronicle*" which suggests secular history with its pomp and magnificence, the history of *kings* and princes, and

the word "sonnets" with its suggestions of trivial and precious intricacy.⁵

(2) This second stanza, he fills with the conventionalized figures of the Petrarchan tradition: *the wind of lovers' sighs, the floods of lovers' tears*, etc. — extravagant figures with which the contemptuous secular friend might be expected to tease the lover. The implication is that the poet himself recognizes the absurdity of the Petrarchan love metaphors. But what of it? The very absurdity of the jargon which lovers are expected to talk makes for his argument: their love, however absurd it may appear to the world, does no harm to the world. The practical friend need have no fear: there will still be *wars* to fight and *lawsuits* to argue.⁶

(3) The [last figure of the third stanza], the likening of the lovers to the *phoenix*, is fully serious, and with it, the tone has shifted from ironic banter into a defiant but controlled tenderness.⁷

(4) In this last stanza, the theme receives a final complication. The lovers in rejecting life actually win to the most intense life. This paradox has been hinted at earlier in the *phoenix* metaphor. Here it receives a powerful dramatization.⁸

(5) The comparison of the lovers to the *phoenix* is very skillfully related to the two earlier comparisons, that in which the lovers are like burning *tapers*, and that in which they are like the *eagle* and the *dove*. The *phoenix* comparison gathers up both: the *phoenix* is a bird, and like the *tapers*, it burns. We have a selected series of items: the phoenix figure seems to come in a natural stream of association. . . . The comparison to the *phoenix* seems thus merely another outlandish one, the most outrageous of all. But it is this most fantastic one, stumbled over apparently in his haste, that the poet goes on to develop. It really describes the lovers best and justifies their renunciation. For the *phoenix* is not two but one, "*we two being one, are it*"; and it burns, not like the taper at its own cost, but to live again. Its death is life: "*Wee dye and rise the same . . .*" The poet literally justifies the fantastic assertion. In the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries to "*die*" means to experience the consummation of the act of love.⁹

We see from the above quotations that Brooks picks up words, phrases and lines from the poem — “chronicle,” “sonnets,” “sighs,” “tears,” “tapers,” “the Eagle and the Dove,” “Wee dye and rise the same,” etc. — explains their meanings in the context of the poem, and points out their significance. In particular, Brooks explains the metaphor phoenix which is central to the theme of the poem; he discusses how it helps form a paradox (Quotation 4), how it is “developed,” and “how it comes in a natural stream of association” (Quotation 5). All these are concerned with the way the concrete details are wrought into an organic whole. What Brooks has performed is exactly what Liu Hsieh suggested long ago: in studying a literary work, pay attention to its *shih-i* 事義 (i.e., factual and intellectual content), and to its *chih-tz'u* 置辭 (i.e., wording or rhetoric). And Brooks studies the *shih-i* and *chih-tz'u* in the total context of the poem. *Shih-i* and *chih-tz'u*, as just introduced, constitute another two points in Liu Hsieh's Six Points scheme.

So far, we have found three points in complete parallel between Liu Hsieh's theory and Brooks' practice. Two more points in Liu Hsieh's scheme can be extracted from Brooks' analysis; namely, *t'ung-pien* 通變 (i.e., tradition and innovation) and *ch'i-cheng* 奇正 (i.e., orthodox and unorthodox ways of presentation; *ch'i-cheng* may also mean direct, ordinary as opposed to indirect, extraordinary ways of presentation). Brooks notes that Donne fills the second stanza of the poem with “the conventionalized figures of the Petrarchan tradition” (see Quotation 2 above); however, as Brooks goes on to tell us, Donne is by no means content with borrowing imagery from the tradition. The figures in the line “call her one, mee another flye, / Wee are Tapers too, and at our owne cost die,” in Brooks' words, “are no longer the threadbare Petrarchan conventionalities; they have sharpness and bite.”¹⁰ This is to say that the unconventional use of these figures reflects Donne's ability of innovation. This is *t'ung-pien*. As to *ch'i-cheng*, Brooks' assertion that “Canonization” is a parody indicates that the way Donne presents the love theme is rather *ch'i*, that is, indirect, extraordinary or unorthodox. In fact, Brooks has remarked that “Donne might have said directly, ‘Love in a cottage is enough,’ . . . He might have been as forthright as a later lyricist who wrote, ‘We'll build a sweet little nest, / Somewhere out in the West, / And let the rest of the world go by’ ”;¹¹ nevertheless, Donne chose the non-forthright way.

The last point in Liu Hsieh's scheme is *kung-shang* 宮商 (i.e., rhyme, tone and other musical qualities in a literary work);¹² since Brooks does not

touch upon the aspect of musical qualities in Donne's poem, we have to stop here in our comparison. (Of course, this does not mean that Brooks as a critic is indifferent to the musical quality of literary works; evidences can be found, e.g., in other chapters of *The Well Wrought Urn* and in *Understanding Poetry*.)

All the "five points" in Brooks' article on "Canonization" and all the Six Points in Liu Hsieh's scheme are directly concerned with the artistic quality of a literary work. That Liu Hsieh and Brooks so widely separated by age and culture should manifest such parallel interest in literature is indeed highly surprising. Their common interest is further shown in their belief that a work of art should have a structure, that it should be an organic whole. Correct and clever choice of words, as well as innovation of one aspect or another, is definitely among poetic virtues; but all these virtues should be subsumed in a perfect structure where there is no place for looseness and confusion. A perfect structure is a means by which the poet communicates his ideas most effectively.

The character *t'i* 體 in Liu Hsieh's first point *wei-t'i* can mean "body," which implies a structure. Interpreted this way, *wei-t'i* should then mean four things: theme, style, genre, and structure, the latter being the new addition. If this interpretation sounds a little far-fetched, we can look elsewhere in *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragon* for a wealth of statements regarding the importance of structure. In Liu Hsieh's 50-chapter volume, there are three chapters either fully devoted to or partly concerned with the concept of structure. Thus opens the chapter entitled *Fu-hui* 附會 (i.e., structure, or, as in Vincent Shih's translation, "organization"):

何謂附會？謂總文理，統首尾，定與奪，合涯際，彌綸一篇，使雜而不越者也。若築室之須基構，裁衣之待縫緝矣。

What is the meaning of *fu-hui*? It means a comprehensive view of a literary piece as a whole with the respect to both its language and its ideas; it provides an underlying principle to unify all its parts, it defines the conditions governing what should be included and what excluded, and works elements from all the various fields into harmony; in short, it organizes the whole piece in such a way that, though composed of a variety of elements, it will not as a whole fall short of the proper standard. It may be compared to the role of the foundation in the building of a house and the tailor's pattern in the making of

a dress, both necessary in their respective fields.¹³

Liu Hsieh further illustrates his point through the analogy of the branching tree:

扶陽而出條，順陰而藏跡，首尾周密，表裏一體，此附會之術也。

Like a tree, [the writer] will be able to send out some shoots to meet the sunshine and keep in reserve others which remain in the shade. In this way he will achieve a close-knit organization from beginning to end, which manifests a unity of external and inner elements.¹⁴

Again he talks about the ability of fusing various elements into a harmonious body:

故善附者異旨如肝膽，拙會者同音如胡越。

In the hands of those who are good at organization, even ideas which differ may be given as close a relationship as the liver and the gall; and in the hands of those who are poor at organization, even tones of the same quality will seem as vastly different as Hu and Yueh.¹⁵

Besides the entire chapter *Fu-hui*, passages from which we have just seen, in *Jung-ts'ai* 鎔裁 (i.e., casting and editing) and *Chang-chü* 章句 (i.e., composition), great length is also given to expounding the concept of structure. In order to avoid repetitions, only a few sentences from *Chang-chü* are cited in the following:

章句在篇，如繭之抽緒，原始要終，體必鱗次。啓行之辭，逆萌中篇之意；絕筆之言，追躡前句之旨；故能外文綺交，內義脈注，附粵相銜，首尾一體。

In a composition one organizes paragraphs and constructs sentences in an orderly manner from beginning to end, just as one would pull a silk thread from a cocoon. The beginning lines should lead to the ideas to be embodied in the middle of the composition, and the concluding sentences should reiterate the thought expressed in what has gone before. Thus one may

achieve literary beauty in form and organic unity in content, and the piece from beginning to end will be such a tightly knit composition that its different parts will be to each other like flower to calyx.¹⁶

In the above quotations, "harmony," "unity," "principle to unify all its parts," "close-knit organization," "tightly knit composition from beginning to end," etc., are their key words. Perhaps the most catching phrase is this: "literary beauty in form and organic unity in content" (*wai-wen ch'i-chiao, nei-i mo-chu* 外文綺交, 內義脈注). In my opinion, this phrase aptly serves as a "caption" of Liu Hsieh's metaphor "the carved dragon" which is highlighted in the title.

In his article on "Canonization," Brooks performs his task in analyzing the structure of the poem as if he were a loyal disciple of Master Liu Hsieh. The problem of structure has in fact been touched upon when we discussed previously about the phoenix as the central image of the poem. Now let us look more closely at the critic and his task. Carrying out the "master's" theory, the twentieth century "disciple" talks about the way "the poem opens"; about "the conflict between the 'real' world and the lover absorbed in the world of love [*running*]/*through* the poem"; about the "*development* of the theme"; about "the tone [*shifting*]/*from* ironic banter into a defiant but controlled tenderness"; about "the *basic* metaphor of the saint [*being*]/*carried on*"; about "the tone with which the poem *closes* [as] one of triumphant achievement," and the tone [*being*]/*a development* contributed to by various earlier elements"; about how a comparison is "*related* to the two earlier comparisons." (All the Italics are mine.) In short, Brooks is analyzing for the reader how the various elements develop and how they are wrought to achieve the intended theme of the poem as an artifact. To extend Liu Hsieh's metaphor, he is describing how the pillars, beams and bricks are fitly placed together to build the house; or, still, he is telling us how the dragon is carved.

Analyzing the structure of a poem — how the parts contribute to the whole, etc. — so as to see whether the poetic message is duly communicated to the reader is again the main task of Brooks in his "Keats's Sylvan Historian: History Without Footnotes," another article in *The Well Wrought Urn*. Here the critic frequently comments on the relation of a phrase or line to the context of the poem, Keats' "Ode on a Grecian Urn" (in fact, the word "context" appears at least six times in this article). In Brooks'

opinion, whether Keats's famous line "Beauty is truth, truth beauty" is an asset or a liability to the whole poem is a question that must be solved in a thematically structural manner. In agreement with Middleton Murry, Brooks declares that the relation of the famous line to "the total context is all important."¹⁷

Cleanth Brooks is certainly not the only New Critic who stresses the importance of structure in literature. John Crowe Ransom praises Yvor Winters for his high regard for structure as a poetic virtue: "The value of Winters as a critic lies in the fact that Winters insists on obtaining from the poem a satisfactory rational content or logical structure."¹⁸ Ransom uses the term "logical structure" to refer to a poem's argument or theme; this reminds one of Liu Hsieh's *wei-t'i*. He uses "local texture" to refer to its concrete detail, which is similar to what Liu Hsieh calls *shih-i* and *chih-tz'u*. In Ransom's words, "a poem is a logical structure having a local texture"; a good critic should "examine and define the poem with respect to its structure and its texture. If he has nothing to say about its texture he has nothing to say about it specially as a poem, but is treating it only insofar as it is prose."¹⁹ Ransom values local texture so highly that he thinks it is this quality that makes a poem a poem. In an analogy similar to that of Liu Hsieh, Ransom further compares the poem to a house:

The poem was not a mere moment in time, nor a mere point in space. It was sizable, like a house. Apparently it had a "plan," or a central frame of logic, but it had also a huge wealth of local detail, which sometimes fitted the plan functionally or served it, and sometimes only subsisted comfortably under it; in either case the house stood up.²⁰

While Ransom sometimes allows the local detail of a poem to "subsist comfortably under" the structure, a critic like Liu Hsieh who has a steadfast belief in organic unity would require that all of the local texture "fit the plan functionally or serve it." Although his view on structure is not so strict as the Chinese critic's, Ransom by no means condones the sin of poetic confusion. In his article on Winters, Ransom examines in detail the seven types of structure which Winters has differentiated. He points out that "what Winters impeaches is [the modern poets'] structural confusion. . . . He is the enemy of confusion; better, he is the enemy of technical poetic confusion, of the irresponsibility of craftsmen." Later in the article, Ransom

laments that there are far more "persons with specific power of poetic phrasing, than there are poetic strategists of whole poems."²¹

Another New Critic Allen Tate in his essay "Tension in Poetry" (1938) uses terms analogous to Ransom's "structure-texture" phrasing, namely, "extension-intension," when he speaks of the quality of poetry:

What I am saying, of course, is that the meaning of poetry is its "tension," the full organized body of all the extension and intension that we can find in it. The remotest figurative significance that we can derive does not invalidate the extensions of the literal statement and by stages develop the complications of metaphor: at every stage we may pause to state the meaning so far apprehended, and at every stage the meaning will be coherent.²²

Tate's "intension" is comparable to Ransom's "local texture," which is the meaning a particular word, phrase, line or number of lines carries. As an organic part of the whole poem, that particular word, phrase, line or number of lines extends its meaning to the rest of the poem; hence the term "extension." In this regard, "extension" is Tate's equivalent to Ransom's "logical structure." Tate and the above mentioned New Critics have found their standard for good poetry in the English Metaphysicals because their poems are organically structured. Robert Stallman succinctly sums up the views of the New Critics: The Metaphysical poetry is "a poetry which joins widely divergent and conflicting elements in imagery that is functional rather than decorative."²³ This is exactly the quality of poets who, as Liu Hsieh tells us, are good at organization; in their hands, "even ideas which differ may be given as close a relationship as the liver and the gall." In "Canonization," love and canonization, tapers and the phoenix, etc. represent such ideas and images which are divergent but functional in a close relationship, that is, the poem.

The terms "structure-texture" and "intension-extension," valuable as they are, smack too much of current professional jargon to appeal to the layman. I think it might be the intention of Ransom and Tate to startle, instead of scaring away, his reader so that he realizes afresh the importance of structure. This is perhaps their critical "strategy," a word cherished by both Ransom and Tate.

II

Discussion on the structure of literature as an organic unity has a history as long as that of criticism. In ancient Greece, Plato is, in the words of Gian N. G. Orsini, "the originator and main formulator of the concept."²⁴ There is an important passage in *Phaedrus*: "Every discourse must be composed like, or in the likeness of, a living being, with a body of its own, as it were, so as not to be headless or footless, but to have a middle and members arranged in fitting relation to each other and to the whole."²⁵ In his *Poetics*, Aristotle contends that plot is the most essential element of tragedy; he states his view metaphorically, as Plato does: "To be beautiful, a living creature and every whole made up of parts, must present a certain order in the arrangements of parts."²⁶ In the treatise "On the Sublime" attributed to Longinus, the author praises a poem by Sappho for, in that piece of fine writing, the poetess manifests her skill in "choosing the most suitable particulars and arranging them so that they form a single living body."²⁷ Later testimony asserting organic unity as a literary virtue is too numerous to mention. Perhaps one quotation from Coleridge is needed, since he is respected by the New Critics as one of the forerunners of modern criticism. Without using the term organic unity, Coleridge says, "the sense of beauty subsists in the simultaneous intuition of the relation of parts, each to each, and of all to the whole."²⁸

In Chinese literary criticism, discussions on the concept of structure are also abundant. The T'ang dynasty (618-907) witnessed the establishment of Recent Verse (*chin-t'i shih* 近體詩) which consists of the Quatrain and the Regulated Verse. Among its manifold characteristics, the Recent Verse — especially the Regulated Verse — is marked by its high concentration and close-knit organization. The poetry of Tu Fu 杜甫 (712-770) and Li Shang-yin 李商隱 (813?-858) provides typical examples of excellent poetic structure. Critics and commentators since the T'ang dynasty such as Ch'en Shan 陳善 and Ch'ou Chao-ao 仇兆鰲 have taken pains in discovering the ways in which T'ang poems are organically structured. Hence the abundance of commentaries in this subject. The ways drama is constructed also drew the interest of traditional Chinese critics. The Ch'ing dynasty (1644-1911) writer Li Yü 李漁 (1611-1680) is probably the most articulate and authoritative spokesman on the concept of organic unity in drama. Li Yü begins his theorization on the art of drama by saying unequivocally that "structure is of foremost importance." He further uses a metaphor

reminiscent of the ancient Greek masters:

至於結構二字，則在引商刻羽之先，拈韻抽毫之始。如造物之賦形，當其精血初凝，胞胎未就，先為制定全形，使點血而具五官百骸之勢。倘先無成局，而由頂及踵，逐段滋生，則人之一身，當有無數斷續之痕，而血氣為之中阻矣（「閒情偶寄」卷一）。

The consideration of structure takes precedence over rhyme, tone and the like. The playwright first designs the total framework of his play just as the Creator did in the creation: After the quintessence has first gathered together, and before the embryo takes shape, there is above all the total design. In this way, when blood is provided, all the organs in a body are formed. If it is made without a total design, and is from head to foot produced part by part, there would be numerous broken joints; and the circulation of blood and air would be blocked.²⁹

III

The above sidetracking to some historical accounts on the concept of structure is meant to demonstrate that the assertion of organic unity is universal in aesthetic criticism. The reasons Liu Hsieh and the New Critics are selected for discussion in this paper I shall now explain.

(1) Liu Hsieh is definitely among the earliest Chinese critics to stress the importance of structure and he is obviously the first to treat it elaborately. As to the New Critics, especially Cleanth Brooks, they are probably the critics who analyze the structure of poetry in the most minute manner (one is reminded that the subtitle of *The Well Wrought Urn* is "Studies in the Structure of Poetry"). In a study of the concept of structure in literature, it would prove that both Liu Hsieh and the New Critics should occupy high positions in the history of that concept.

(2) I have discovered manifold similarities in the poetics of Liu Hsieh and the New Critics. Their views on structure may serve as a good starting point in the comparative study of their criticism.

(3) One of the aims of this paper is to defend the stance of the New Critics; in doing so I draw the support of an old Chinese critic. This I shall elaborate.

The New Criticism has often been accused of being an "esoteric aestheticism" which pays no attention to the human and social aspects of

literature. It has also been frequently attacked as "unhistorical", for its disregard for the historical context of the literary work.

Let me deal with the second accusation first. As Brooks' analysis of "Canonization" reveals, the critic, in order to elucidate and evaluate the poem under study, has gone into history to find out the meanings of some particular words (e.g., the word "die"), and to find out certain literary conventions (e.g., the Petrarchan images). In fact, Brooks has said that the critic "needs the help of the historian — all the help he can get"; and he has argued that the critic "obviously must know what the words of the poem mean, something which immediately puts him in debt to the linguist . . .; and since many of the words are proper nouns, in debt to the historian as well."³⁰ The fact that the New Critics are not historians, we ought to understand, should not be construed to mean that they dismiss history.

As to the accusation of its being "aesthetic criticism," preaching the doctrine of art-for-art's-sake, we must know that the New Criticism emerged on the American literary scene at a time when literary art was not looked at as the art of literature. As René Wellek recalls, in the 1920s, "a purely philological and historical scholarship dominated all instruction, publication and promotion. I remember that when I first came to study English literature in the Princeton graduate school in 1927, fifty years ago, no course in American literature, none in modern literature, and none in criticism was offered. Of all my learned teachers only Morris W. Croll had any interest in aesthetics or even ideas."³¹ At a time when the humanistic views and the Marxist doctrine ruled supreme and "aesthetic" criticism was at best a sort of impressionistic sketches, the then young teachers of literature, Winters, Ransom, Tate, Brooks and their followers, stood up to proclaim that the literary art is the art of literature, and should not be reduced to something else. This was the birth of the New Criticism.

The New Criticism has flourished and cast a tremendous influence on the way literature is taught and evaluated. Then attacks have been aimed at it and there have been sayings that the New Criticism is already old. Although literature serves many purposes and has a variety of appeals, there is this unmistakable quality — it is an aesthetic object that appeals to our sense of beauty. The Chinese critic Liu Hsieh wrote his monumental work at a time when men of letters indulged in creating euphuism with great efforts; literature was then too decorative, too precious. Liu Hsieh was determined to change the tide and correct the taste of his times; however, in doing so, he did not reduce literature to plain writing that serves nothing

but practical purposes. He made clear his point that both content (*ch'ing* 情) and form (*ts'ai* 采) are important and that the former takes a slight precedence; on the other hand, he rightly devoted chapter after chapter to explicating the various literary techniques including the method of structuring; in short, he views literature as an aesthetic object.

As Wellek correctly states, "the New Critics [assert] quality and value"; "a decision between good and bad art remains the unavoidable duty of criticism."³² I also join Wellek in his conviction that "the New Criticism has stated or reaffirmed many basic truths to which future ages will have to return."³³ These basic truths include "the normative presence of a work of art which forms a structure, a unity, coherence, a whole." A literary work of art is "a literary beauty in form and organic unity in content," which means to Cleanth Brooks a well wrought urn or to Liu Hsieh a carved dragon.

Notes

1. I am grateful to Professors Yu Kwang-chung and William Tay of the Chinese University of Hong Kong for their valuable comments and suggestions.
2. An explanation of the term "the New Critics" in this paper is perhaps needed. While there is a critical school known as the New Criticism, it is debatable that who exactly are *the* New Critics. (For an examination of the New Critical school, the reader is referred to Murray Krieger, *The New Apologists for Poetry*, Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1963.) In this paper, I have only selected a few prominent New Critics for discussion. A further investigation could include more names and ideas.
3. Donne's poem is included in this paper as an appendix.
4. *The Well Wrought Urn* (London: Dobson Books, 1949), p. 10.
5. *Ibid.*, p. 12.
6. *Ibid.*
7. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
8. *Ibid.*, p. 14.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 14-15.
10. *Ibid.*, p. 13.
11. *Ibid.*, p. 16.
12. For a discussion of the Six Points, the reader is referred to Shen Ch'ien 沈謙, *Wen-hsin tiao-lung chih wen-hsueh li-lun yü p'i-p'ing* 文心雕龍之文學理論與批評 (Taipei, Hua-cheng shu-chu 華正書局, 1981), pp. 211-20. My interpretation at places differs, although only slightly, from Shen Ch'ien's.
13. Throughout this paper, I have relied heavily on Vincent Yu-chung Shih's translation of Liu Hsieh's book. See Shih, tr., *The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragon* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1983), p. 437.
14. *Ibid.*
15. *Ibid.*, pp. 439, 441.

16. Ibid., pp. 361, 363.
17. *The Well Wrought Urn*, p. 141.
18. John Crowe Ransom, *The New Criticism* (Norfolk, Connecticut: New Directions, 1941), p. 221.
19. Ransom, "Criticism as Pure Speculation," in Hazard Adams, ed., *Critical Theory Since Plato* (New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1971), p. 886. In Chapters III & IV (respectively entitled "Yvor Winters: the Logical Critic" and "Wanted: an Ontological Critic") of *The New Criticism*, Ransom also discusses the concept of structure-texture.
20. Ibid., p. 886.
21. *The New Criticism*, p. 254.
22. Allen Tate, *Essays of Four Decades* (New York: William Morrow, 1968), p. 64.
23. Robert W. Stallman, "The New Critics," in Stallman, ed., *Critiques and Essays in Criticism 1920-1948* (New York: The Ronald Press, 1949), p. 501.
24. G.N. Giordano Orsini, *Organic Unity in Ancient and Later Poetics* (Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975), p. 90.
25. Ibid., p. 34.
26. Ibid., p. 78.
27. Ibid., p. 92.
28. Ibid., p. 98.
29. This is my translation of Li Yü, *Li Li-weng ch'ü-hua* 李笠翁曲話 (Hunan: Jen-min ch'u-pan she 人民出版社, 1980), p. 7. As regards remarks on structure by other traditional Chinese critics, one famous term *chi-li* 肌理 could perhaps be mentioned. The interested reader is referred to Li Feng-mao 李豐楙, "Weng Feng-kang chi-li shuo te li-lun chi ch'i ying-yung 翁方綱肌理說的理論及其應用," in *Wen-hsueh P'ing-lung* 文學評論, No. 2 (Taipei: Shu-p'ing shu-mu 書評書目, 1975); this essay was later incorporated in his *Weng Fang-kang chi ch'i shih-lun* 翁方綱及其詩論 (Taipei, 1978). See also Ku T'ien-hung 古添洪, "Weng Fang-kang chi-li shuo yü Lan-sen (Ransom) tzu-chih chieh-kou shuo chih pi-chiao 翁方綱肌理說與藍森字質結構說之比較," in *Chung-wai Literary Monthly* 中外文學, 5: 2 (July 1976).
30. René Wellek, "The New Criticism: Pro and Contra," *Critical Enquiry* (Summer, 1978), 615.
31. Ibid., p. 614.
32. Ibid., p. 624.
33. Ibid.