

*Review Article*

**Comparative Literature  
for Scholars and Administrators**

*John J. Deeney*

*Comparative Literature as Academic Discipline: A Statement of Principles, Praxis, Standards.*

By Robert J. Clements. New York: The Modern Language Association of America, 1978, Pp. 342.

**Introduction**

In the course of this review article, I propose to describe the contents of Clements' very valuable contribution to comparative literature studies, in terms of its usefulness to scholars interested in promoting Chinese-Western literary relations. I will quote extensively from the text (*CLAD*) to highlight important sections for the convenience of readers in the East who may not have it readily at hand.

*CLAD* has already received laudatory comments from outstanding scholars in the field:

"I read the work with great interest and general agreement. It contains a mass of information and instruction and would have been very useful to me when I was still an active administrator." René Wellek, Sterling Professor Emeritus of Comparative Literature, Yale University.

"I am very familiar with the various other general books upon the subject which have been appearing during recent years, but I think this one out-tops them in common sense, ecumenical range, and practical exemplification." Harry Levin, Irving Babbitt Professor of Comparative Literature,

Harvard University.

"Clements' survey, covering as it does not only general theory but also pragmatic applications, is indispensable now as a practical tool and will be even more valuable in the future as a work of reference." A. Owen Aldridge, Professor of Comparative Literature, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and Vice President of the American Comparative Literature Association.<sup>1</sup>

*Choice* magazine also gives a succinct summary-evaluation:

As thorough and readable a sourcebook on the academic discipline of comparative literature as is likely to be found, this book fills a specialized need authoritatively and definitively. It will be of great value to administrators and faculty seeking to organize or improve comparative literature departments because it includes not only discussion of the history, philosophy, and practice of that field but also specific course syllabi, suggestions for textbooks, and plans for term papers and thesis projects. Beyond the rather limited group of comparativists, the book offers much to any teacher or advanced student of literature with its precise discussions of literary interrelations, genres, linguistic comparisons, and the like. It is well organized and easy to use as a reference. Good bibliography and appendixes. Graduate and professional level.<sup>2</sup>

These four comments are generous but they are also a bit misleading unless one makes some important distinctions. *CLAD* is, in fact, like a three-layer cake. The first layer for administrators is the most substantial; the middle layer for teachers is rather thin fare; the bottom layer for students, although occasionally containing practical tips, leaves the most to be desired. The author has included all the essential ingredients for a good mix, but there is a certain lack of proportion which scholarly consumers (students as well as teachers) may not find to their satisfaction. On the other hand, *CLAD* is spiced with wit and humour throughout and, if it is not exactly something to be chewed, at least, it should be tasted.

The author is no mere theorist, however; on the contrary, he is an experienced pedagogue in the classroom, a publishing scholar of considerable distinction with eighteen books to his credit, and a master of at least ten languages, five of which he has taught (He has also studied Arabic and Chinese!). But the feature which makes his book most useful for relatively new comparative literature programs (particularly those emphasizing Chinese-Western literary relations), is his very obvious skills in administering such

programs at Harvard, Pennsylvania State, and New York universities for over a quarter of a century. He is very familiar with the problems of academic development under severe budget restrictions and is quite forthright about the pragmatic art of diplomacy necessary to win over deans, chairmen, etc. He has been around long enough not to be over-awed by the latest critical method and adopts a solid and balanced middle-of-the-road stance. What he says of the ideal comparative literature teacher — “He must stand somewhere between a Sainte-Beuve and a Meyer-Lübke, a broad generalist and a concentrating specialist” (219) — is based on Western models, but he is most generous with his references to the Orient (over fifty) and other non-Western literatures.

Such references are not mere tokenism but manifest a professional interest and genuine respect. He frequently berates Western scholars for not widening their horizons on comparative literature's scope and urges them to be more broad-minded about including non-Western literatures in comparative literature curricula whenever possible. Those of us in the East who wish to promote Chinese-Western relations should put ourselves in touch with open-minded authors like Clements and journal editors of comparative literature studies, in order to keep them supplied with accurate information and news about our research and publications, conferences and curricula development, special challenges and problems, etc. Such up-dating would help Clements, for instance, to avoid glaring omissions in his own book such as the neglect of National Taiwan University's Ph. D. program in Comparative Literature in Taipei or the Comparative Literature Association in Hong Kong (27 and 319). Some of the author's more serious inaccuracies or misunderstandings will be dealt with later on in the course of this review.

Clements heads his “Foreword to Teachers, Administrators, and Students” with a quotation from Pichois and Rousseau's *La Littérature comparée*: “Grande serait l'erreur de juger de la littérature comparée par les inévitables défauts pratiques de son enseignement” (xv). Indeed, it would be a serious mistake to pass judgment on the worthwhile discipline of comparative literature simply because of its many inept practitioners in the fields of teaching or writing. One should be very hesitant to embark on such an area of study without having first surveyed several basic guidebooks which introduce the reader to some of the roadmaps and signposts along the way.

Clements gives a good overview of how he sees the entire field in one

paragraph:

This book, therefore, is intended to be what has long been needed in the field but has not as yet been available: a sustained exposition of the principles, practices, and standards of comparative literature. The volume's first two chapters on the origins, definitions, and dimensions of the discipline provide the necessary background to the ensuing discussion. The third, fourth, and fifth chapters address some of the more important questions of establishing and maintaining a department of comparative literature: staffing, budgeting, selecting students, setting up a curriculum, and instituting the foreign language requirement. The next six chapters are devoted specifically to the teaching of comparative literature. Chapters vi through x deal with the major comparative approaches — genres and forms, periods and movements, themes, interrelations of literature, and literary history and criticism — and discuss courses appropriate to each. These are followed by a general chapter on teaching, textbooks, and examinations. Chapter xii treats the subject of the thesis. The sensitive issue of the evaluation of comparative literature departments and programs is presented in Chapter xiii. A chapter on academic diplomacy and politics is followed by our concluding chapter on the future of the discipline. An appendix on the organizational structure of the discipline, a bibliography, and an index round out the book (xviii-xix).

Although comments will be made on each of these chapters, I prefer to take them according to a slightly altered sequence which I divide into three sections: A. For the Comparative Literature Scholar (Chapters I, II, VI, VII, VIII, IX, X) and B. For the Comparative Literature Administrator (Chapters III, IV, V, XI, XII, XIII, XIV) and a Conclusion (Chapter XV and Appendix).

## A. For the Comparative Literature Scholar

### Chapter I. Origins and Definitions of Comparative Literature

There is much controversy over what constitutes the nature of comparative literature. Clements lays down his position in this chapter and since it is the foundation for all that follows, I will state it in the author's words as much as possible.

After briefly tracing the history of comparative literature in general, Clements quotes six definitions by twentieth-century scholars which "represent a whole catalog of similar statements concerning comparative

literature as an art or a science" (7). He prefers to treat it as an "academic discipline" which sets up comparative literature as a program or a department rather than to follow the nineteenth-century pattern of creating one single teaching post or chair.

Clements takes a statement from UNESCO's *International Standard Classification of Education* (1976), somewhat simplified, as a starting point for his "composite description of comparative literature as an academic discipline" (9):

Programs in comparative literature generally require as a minimum prerequisite a secondary-level education and lead to the following degrees: Bachelor of Arts, Master of Arts, and the doctorate, or their equivalents. Programs consist primarily of classroom sessions, seminar, or group discussions, and research.

Programs that lead to a first university degree deal with the study of international literary and cultural relationships. Principal course content usually includes some of the following: the currency, reception, and influence of writers and their works in countries other than those of their origin; the transmission and evolution of international literary movements; the characteristics of and relationships between genres, themes, and motifs; folk literature and folklore; criticism; esthetics; intermediaries, and the relations between literatures, as well as those between literatures and the other disciplines. Background sources usually include history, the social and behavioral sciences, philosophy, religion and theology, and the natural sciences.

Programs that lead to a postgraduate university degree deal with the advanced study of international and cultural relations. Emphasis is given to research work as substantiated by the presentation of a scholarly thesis or dissertation. Principal subject matter areas into which courses and research projects tend to fall include the origin and evolution of international literary movements, folk literature and folklore, criticism, esthetics, intermediaries, epics and sagas, tragedy, comedy, modern dramas, the contemporary novel, problems of comparative literature, the comparative method in literary studies, the forces in contemporary literature, and research techniques in comparative literature (8-9).

Clements is rather optimistic about the future of comparative literature as an academic discipline. After an examination of college catalogs from Europe and Asia, he concludes that the "planning and innovating pioneered by our European colleagues have now been taken over by the American universities" (20). This claim is backed up by the startling statistic that the decade 1957-1967 witnessed a 600 percent increase of American comparative literature students, and even this rate eventually accelerated!

He lists five basic approaches to comparative literature as an academic discipline and each of these approaches is considered by him in chapters six to ten. The five approaches and two corollaries are:

The study of (1) themes/myths, (2) genres/forms, (3) movements/eras, (4) interrelations of literature with other arts and disciplines, and (5) the involvement of literature as illustrative of evolving literary theory and criticism. The reading of literature must be in the original language, in conformity with, and to the extent of, the language requirement. A seminar on the nature and methods of comparative literature and another on the history of literary theory and criticism must be incorporated into the curriculum (7).

## Chapter II. The Dimensions of Comparative Literature

In Chapter I, Clements had already made a tripartite division describing the scope and divisions of comparative literature:

The three major dimensions of comparative literature as presently practiced must be firmly understood. . . . The narrowest dimension is the Western Heritage and its traditional minimal components French-English, German-French, Latin-English, etc. This narrowest dimension, when restricted to only two authors or literatures within the Western Heritage, is to be discouraged at the level of academic discipline. The second dimension is East-West, an area in which some exploration has been undertaken. The third dimension is World Literature, a much abused term in America. These three dimensions are not static terms, not passively conjoined, but they must, as fiefs of comparative literature, follow the methodology of Western Heritage comparative literature, utilizing the five approaches whenever possible to achieve meaningful comparison. It is of course logical to predict a future development of other dimensions than these three — conceivably Asian-African (Asian poets are now aware of the freedom movements in Africa . . .), Western Heritage-African, or even an Eastern Heritage dimension within the vast continent of Asia itself, a development hindered by the particular language problems in Asia (7-8).

His use of the phrase, "fiefs of comparative literature" which must "follow the methodology of Western Heritage comparative literature," may strike scholars of Eastern literature as a bit patronizing and condescending. Both expressions seem to smack of Western chauvinism and are completely out of keeping with the otherwise international direction of the rest of the book. He repeats this rather feudalistic idea regarding methodology when he says of the three dimensions, "none of the three commits itself to a

method unless it is recognized as a dimension of the host discipline comparative literature and subject to the host's method"(15). Whatever Clements' intention, it does sound as if the West is playing host to some less fortunate Eastern guests.

The West should avoid giving the impression that it is dictating what critical methodologies are to be followed in the East. Surely, cultures as rich and prolific in long literary traditions as China, Japan, and India (to name just a few), have their own critical methodologies and theories which provide legitimate ways of reading their own literatures and, perhaps, may even illuminae some hidden features of Western literature! An American Comparative Literature Association report on Professional Standards states a more balanced views:

We are still lacking the concepts and tools which will permit us truly to study literature at the global level. These concepts and tools will gradually materialize. While waiting and searching for them, we must beware of ever again confusing "world literature" with the literature of our inherited culture, however rich; conversely, while working toward global perspectives, we will still need the virtues of precision and integrity our inherited culture has taught us (38-39).

Clements is most keen on promoting his understanding of "World Literature" as the attempt to push comparative literature to its outermost limits. East-West literary relations are important, but they too are only part of a greater whole, World Literature, which taken as an academic discipline, "means the study of literature from the maximum geographical extent where major authors are found, taught as often as possible by teams of teachers who read most authors in the original language. Its method must be that of comparatism rather than of random samplings" (30).

There is a whole section on the "Misuse of the Term 'World Literature' " (42-45), and Clements takes both teachers and publishers to task for mislabeling courses or texts "World Literature" (to increase student enrollment or book sales) when, in fact, such materials "tend to follow without method the random Homer-to-Arthur Miller zigzag path through Western literature" (42). Clements scores such fraudulent claims to World Literature because of their total omission of non-Western literatures or their misrepresentation of Eastern literatures. He quotes a sampling of so-called "World Literature" tests used in American high schools and states that out of sixteen such texts, "pages devoted to Asian literature ranged from .02

percent to 14.7 percent; these percentages included such Asians as Rudyard Kipling and Pearl Buck! ” (30).

On the other hand, Clements does not underestimate the difficulties of studying non-Western literatures and presents such a program only to the “most advanced professors and graduate students” as the “most challenging advanced dimension of comparative literature” (28). He quotes the same ACLA report mentioned above:

There has also arisen widespread and growing interest in the non-European literatures — Chinese, Japanese, Sanskrit, Arabic, and many others less familiar, as well as those oral “literatures” of illiterate communities which are not properly described by our most basic term but for which we have no alternative. A new vision of global literature is emerging, embracing all the verbal creativity during the history of our planet, a vision which will soon begin to make our comfortable European perspectives parochial. Few comparatists, few scholars anywhere, are prepared for the dizzying implications of this widening of horizons, but they cannot be ignored (28).

In fact, many institutions and innovative teachers have taken up the challenge (see pp. 43-47, which also contain two sample syllabi). It is refreshing indeed to see the range of materials offered in an attempt at truly global representation, but one cannot help but feel apprehensive that there might be a dangerous drift towards mere dilettantism. Ideally, an integrated program would be offered by scholars trained in comparative literature at the college level, where interested and talented students could get an early start on the necessary language and literature background. These practical questions are taken up in Section B below. Now, attention must be given to Clements’ treatment of the five approaches to comparative literature.

**Chapter VI. Genres and Forms**

**Chapter VII. Periods, Movements, Influence**

**Chapter VIII. Themes and Myths**

**Chapter IX. Interrelations of Literature**

**Chapter X. Literary History and Criticism**

These five chapters are more practical than theoretical and contain very little that cannot be found more adequately treated in current comparative literature manuals.<sup>3</sup> There are many useful documents, however, such as lists of textbooks, syllabi and, especially, checklists (e.g., Elements

of Epic Poetry, European Baroque, Don Juanism, etc.) Most of his references are to Western sources, but non-Western materials do get occasional mention. Unfortunately, he makes some slips such as referring to the European Middle Ages as "the generation of mankind that first adopted rhyme" (131); China had been using rhyme for centuries earlier.

In Chapter IX, *Interrelations of Literature*, Clements manifests himself as a firm advocate of the interdisciplinary approach, but he does quote the ACLA report once more by way of caution. Having approved the new cross-disciplinary trends, the report voices a demurrer:

They have a salutary role to play in reorganizing our patterns of knowledge: we should be able to learn from them as well as contribute our own perspectives. But we must also be alert lest the crossing of disciplines involve a relaxing of discipline. Misty formulations, invisible comparisons, useless ingenuities, wobbly historiography plague all fields in the Humanities including our own: cross-disciplinary programs are not immune from them. As participants, we need to muster the theoretical sophistication, the methodological rigor, the peculiar awareness of historical complexities our special training affords us (181).

It is something of a fashion now to write about Literature and Painting, Literature and Music, etc. but the results are often superficial or downright misleading. And no wonder. Comparing two or more literatures is difficult enough; when one crosses over into another field which has its own critical methodology and technical terminology, the enticing analogies and affinities which surface are often sophistic and deceptive.

The sub-headings in this chapter give some indication of the wide range of interrelations: The Relations with Music and Cinema, Literature and the Fine Arts, Literature and Psychology, Literature and Politics, and Literature and Theology. The most interesting section for those interested in China is Clements' treatment of Literature and Politics.

He views the interrelationship of literature and politics as a bilateral one. Literature can utilize politics merely as a theme, or influence the political climate to arouse the populace (*Uncle Tom's Cabin*, for instance, actually helped to change national attitudes and even policy). Clements supplies a sample syllabus earlier, on worldwide twentieth-century sociopolitical poetry which treats of War and Peace, Political Protest, Xenophilia and Xenophobia, etc. (46-47).

Politics has also shaped literature for better or worse from civilization's

beginnings. In our contemporary society Vosnesensky summarized persecution of writers in a famous poem: "Dear Russian Poesy, how do you do? Would you prefer a knife, or a .22?" (194). "Even literary criticism, as we observe from the writings of Gorki, Lukács, Sartre, and others will try to interpret or manipulate creative literature to political ends. None of course exceeds the Chinese in such interpretation, voiced in their columns of 'criticism and repudiation'" (195). He exemplifies this polemicization of criticism in an earlier section by tracing a Chinese attack on three Russian books (see pp. 36-38).

Another interdisciplinary area which Clements rather illogically treats at the end of Chapter V is Comparative Literature and Linguistics. In any case, he makes some good recommendations:

Somewhere in their training, either in the methods or some autonomous course, students should be taught the relation with literature of phonology, phonetics, phonemics, semantics, semasiology, morphology, syntax, grammar—perhaps even euphonics. . . . The mysterious mutations of meaning in etymology and semantics can make the analysis of a literary text a subtle exercise. Orthography will tell us many things about a literary work, including the dating of the piece. Calligraphy, which also helps us to establish and date texts, is in the Orient a total artistic achievement independent of the content of the writing. Students of comparative literature especially should know about the International Phonetics Alphabet. . . . Students working in comparative drama, epic, and oral folklore would do well to spend a weekend learning these symbols (123-124).

Recent literary criticism methodologies, such as structuralism and semiotics, rely very heavily on linguistics; stylistics, which may be considered a major branch of linguistics, has always been important to literature study of all dimensions. "Comparative stylistics would be a most demanding specialization, involving in plural literatures such basic concerns as prosody, metrics, versification, sentence structure, diction, word order, imagery, metaphor, epithets, coherence, emphasis, standards, and taste. This area of linguistics has been historically as involved with rhetoric as with literature" (124).

Finally, Clements urges the comparativist to opt for a balanced pluralism when dealing with literary history and criticism. A sense of literary history is essential if the student is not to be utterly swamped by fashionable currents in contemporary criticism. Critical methodologies should complement one another and if a work of literature proves resistant

to whatever critical approach—psychological, bardic, Marxist, Chicago-Aristotelian, sacramental, archetypal, or even New Critical—that method should be considered inappropriate or inapplicable. The comparatist should be sensitive to the fact that “there is little to be gained in saddling the *Shakuntala* with Aristotle’s generic approach to drama” (207), but what is he to do when confronted with something like this:

A few words should be said about the coefficient of similarity. Its mathematical definition is:

$$S_{jk} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n |V_{ij} - V_{ik}|}{\sum_{\max}}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{ij} &= \text{value of the variable } i \text{ in period } j \\ i &= 1, 2, 3, \dots, n \\ j, k &= 1, 2, 3, \dots, p \\ \sum_{\max} &= \text{maximum value of } \sum_{i=1}^n |V_{ij} - V_{ik}| \end{aligned}$$

in the novel. In other words the coefficient of similarity between two periods  $j, k$ , is the sum of the absolute differences between the value of the variables. This sum is divided by its maximum value in order to keep the value of  $s$  between 0 and 1 (206).

This excerpt from a published essay purports to be a “Structural Analysis” of a French novel. To some, the very word “literature” seems old-fashioned. At a 1976 comparative literature conference, one semiotician, in a revelatory moment, referred to “what we used to call literature” (208). Comparatists must keep up to date on valuable critical approaches, but they would be well-advised to heed an important caution by Lowry Nelson of Yale:

The breadth of the true Comparatist should reach of course to the present. Since he is committed to the whole phenomenon of literature, to exclude the present would be folly. Yet Comparative Literature must guard itself against being captured by preachers of contemporaneity or purveyors of current fashions. To bend literary study to some eccentric, all-explaining version of Freud or to the latest revival of Heidegger (as in the punning philosophizing of Derrida) is simply to parochialize literary study and to cast away its scholarly moorings. In a small graduate department any such ideological capture or preponderance would be stultifying and quickly outdated (209).

We may conclude this *discursus* on criticism from the point of view of the comparative literature student who often finds himself in a quandary about where he is to draw the line. The following quotation from *CLAD* also serves as an apt transition to problems comparative literature administrators must deal with:

A student who has not embraced the current critical vogues must be protected from enthusiasts espousing them. One of our candidates with a classical training began to be interrogated by a French scholar at an oral examination on how to decode the message of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and had to be rescued by the chairman of the jury. As one graduate student complained of this tendency, "Frequently a course supposedly dealing with a literary work turns out to be a course on the criticism about the work" (210).

## B. For the Comparative Literature Administrator

### Chapter III. Department and Faculty

### Chapter XIV. Academic Diplomacy and Politics

The problems brought up in these two chapters are most pertinent to large, already developed comparative literature departments in America. On the other hand, many of the questions and problems are pertinent to comparative literature programs in the East, both as a means to strengthen such programs and as a warning about developing too quickly.

The biggest single budgetary problem is to provide adequate salaries for the teaching staff. The ideal solution is to hire only those teachers who have been trained in comparative literature as a clearly defined academic discipline according to certain established principles, approaches, dimension, and methods. Other more immediate solutions are for the chairmen to encourage group teaching by drawing on other national literature programs (not always financially feasible; see p. 221), or to go a-begging for outside volunteers as guest lecturers, creative writers, editors, bibliographers, librarians and those old faithful professors *emeriti* (see pp. 67 and 223). Recourse to national literature programs is not restricted to the retired faculty. In fact, the only practical solution to the problem of staffing in even well-developed comparative literature programs, is the use of current faculty from the national literature departments. Another ACLA report urges

every sort of cooperation: cross-departmental freedom of enrollment, cross-listing of course offerings, exchanges of instructors, borrowing of staff for oral examinations as well as their use as cojurors or even codirectors of theses; their assistance in administering language examinations; their participation in colloquia, panel discussions, conferences, and similar activities. The report goes on to say, "Collegiality is implicit in the very term *university* as well as *college*. Without this spirit of fraternal participation in a common humane endeavor, Comparative Literature cannot thrive; indeed it cannot exist as a dynamic enterprise" (269).

It is my personal contention that the ultimate success of comparative literature studies in China will pivot upon active collaboration between Western literature scholars and their Chinese counterparts. There is a sense of urgency here, for scholars schooled in the Chinese classics are a fast-vanishing generation.

Generally speaking, comparative literature departments have fared much better than national literature departments, but even the former cannot but be affected by fluctuating or decreasing enrollments and shrinking budgets. Overstaffed national literature departments with a surplus of tenured faculty feel the pinch even more. At the same time, there are very few comparative literature departments which have a professionally trained staff in the field to cover all the courses they would like to offer in their catalogs. Consequently,

The familiar pattern of staffing is to have two or three professors completely assigned to the department or program with a number of colleagues from neighboring departments offering part-time or occasional teaching and sometimes carrying a dual title (e.g., English and Comparative Literature). In a recent Harvard bulletin, for example, of the twenty-nine professors sharing the teaching, three held full-time appointments in comparative literature. Thus an adequate staff is available to supervise examinations and theses. There must be, as at Harvard, a nucleus of two or three professors dedicated to maintaining without compromise an integrity of principles and methods, *sans peur et sans politique*. This nuclear group must give continuing evidence of its dedication, as, for example, when examiners are lacking during the marginal weeks of the school year and during vacations and sabbaticals of crucial personnel (60).

Such marriages of convenience inevitably lead to some tension and friction, but experience has already demonstrated that the advantages far outweigh the disadvantages. Although a relative newcomer to the humanities,

comparative literature has been quite successful in adapting and establishing itself as a productive member of the academic community. In some cases, unfortunately (and quite unnecessarily), this has taken place at the expense of national literature departments. As Haskell Block has explained, the unprecedented growth of comparative literature in the West came about as a rejection of entrenched patterns of literary study: "The rise of Comparative Literature can be explained in large part by the narrowness of literary study in more traditional disciplines, the sacrifice of breadth for the sake of minute specialization, and the effort to define and systematize the study of individual national literatures as wholly autonomous fields" (267). It would be a tragedy, indeed, if the great riches of Chinese literature were lost for similar reasons when comparative literature could be instrumental in helping to revitalize its intrinsic beauty and to advertise such beauty to the entire academic world. The relationship between comparative literature and other literature departments should be one of close cooperation rather than rivalry. As another ACLA report puts it, "We should not be living up to our standards unless we are also fulfilling theirs; and that, if we succeed, we shall be realizing together the richest potential of the humanities" (266).

A strong comparative literature department can be an unexpected boon to national literature departments whose very existence may be threatened because of substantial drops in student enrollment or mass transfers to other departments. The comparative literature department can bolster up such faltering programs by sending its students to take language and literature courses in the various national literature departments and inviting their professors — perhaps through a joint appointment — to offer courses in the comparative literature department.

Although I have been using the terms comparative literature "program" and "department" almost interchangeably, another ACLA report makes an important distinction in describing an organizational model for comparative literature:

A viable Comparative Literature program can reinforce language departments. To do so effectively, the Comparative Literature program should be as flexible as possible in its institutional organization. This would seem to argue for the program model, rather than the more traditional department. By program, however, we mean a semi-autonomous organizational entity with its own budget and one or two "core" staff members — usually trained comparatists — associated full-time, or a majority of their time,

with the program. They may hold joint appointments with another department (often an FL department). Complementing these core staff members are a variety of other part-time personnel drawn from contributing departments, most frequently FL and English. Such people may have a regular course or courses, or teach one every two years: they generally do not teach more than 2/5 of their time in Comparative Literature. It is here that the flexibility of the FTE (Full Time Equivalency) can be beneficial to Comparative Literature and to contributing departments. Because the FTE is not tied to specific individuals, it is often possible to pool portions of FTE's to make joint appointments between a department and Comparative Literature in cases where neither would have been able to make an appointment alone. In such cases the person hired may well be a recent Comparative Literature Ph.D., another reason for stressing basic FL competence in graduate schools to assure that our graduate students are competitive with FL graduate students in a tight job market (51).

Clements acknowledges that there is a particular problem for comparative literature departments when they try "to absorb untrained and uncommitted — perhaps even unconvinced — colleagues" (273) from national literature departments. The most obvious way of bringing about a marriage of true minds is for both sides to keep the doors of communication open. This is especially true for the development of comparative literature in China, for without the participation of scholars schooled in the long, arduous training of traditional Chinese learning, it will be extremely difficult to study Chinese-Western literatures comparatively in any real depth. Great personal diplomacy and political astuteness is required on the part of the administrator.

If a comparative literature chairman is fortunate enough to solicit successfully the expertise from a literary scholar-linguist in a national literature department who is willing and humble enough to undergo a bit of comparative "retooling," what are the qualities he should look for? In addition to the usual criteria for selecting a teacher (professional pedagogue who prepares his classes conscientiously and has a personality that promotes good rapport among his peers and pupils), the would-be comparatist must have broad interests anchored in specialized competences as well as a mastery of various critical and scholarly approaches to literature. In fact, "retooling" usually amounts to a deepening of one's knowledge of literature by exposure to a more challenging variety of literary works and movements, so that the candidate has as much to gain as he gives.

There is a certain kind of *équipement* the comparatist is expected to possess. F. M. Guyard, for instance, enumerates some of these qualifications:

(1) a knowledge and sense of history, (2) an acquaintance with several literatures, (3) a reading ability of several languages, and (4) a knowledge of such research tools as national bibliographical manuals, comparative literature bibliographies, a chronological repertory (such as Van Tieghem established in 1937) of modern literatures, outlines of comparative literature like that of Friederich (1954), and the bibliographies kept up to date by literary journals themselves. Others in the field would have no quarrel with this list of requirements, although Pichois and Rousseau at one point summarize the comparatist as a tripartite being: polyglot, philologist, and globetrotter (66).

In a later chapter, Clements adds a further *desideratum*. "Comparative literature especially needs publishing scholars to demonstrate the discipline's principles and potentials. . . ; the teacher's books and articles should be part of the students' education and intellectual formation" (221).

#### Chapter IV. Curriculum and Courses

The preceding section stressed the importance of building up a good faculty. A planned curriculum of courses from the undergraduate to the graduate level is of equal importance to achieve the best results. The less experienced the students, the more guidance is required, but this should be according to their real needs in shaping a curriculum rather than trying to accommodate the special interests of particular teachers. Furthermore, in Clements' words, "except for rare coincidences, 'handtailored' should be preferred to 'ready-made' courses" (81).

We have already seen UNESCO's report on the basic components of an undergraduate and graduate degree program in comparative literature (see above, p.83). In addition — and especially for our bilingual (Chinese and English) students interested in Chinese-Western comparative studies — we might expose them to a program which would include: extensive surveys of Chinese, English, and World literatures; solid grounding in language courses and introductory linguistics; an opportunity to minor in or, at least, audit the national literature (Chinese or English) they are weakest in.

Clements next takes up the question of double-listing and cross-listing of courses. An example of the former would be a case of the departments of comparative literature and psychology wishing to offer in common a "Literature and Psychology" course. This would involve sharing staff and budget, each department registering its own students in the double-listed course (the same title and course description would be listed under their

respective catalog code number), thus ensuring candidates in each department that they can apply the credits to their respective majors.

Double-listing can be a dangerous practice if it is just a compromise to please some fiscal administrator who would like to get two courses taught on a single teaching budget or increase student enrollment in a course taught by an unpopular professor. As Clements says, "The solution to such double-listing of a course that must be intrinsically either comparative or national in scope, but obviously not both at the same time, is to assign it ethically to the right department and then permit the two-way, interdepartmental student traffic to move back and forth more freely. With such reciprocity each interested department will sooner or later get its share of registrations" (84).

There have been some experiments made in this regard by scholars who received their training in the West and taught Chinese classical literature from one or other Western critical perspective (e.g., New Critical, Mythological, Structuralist, etc.). Traditional Chinese scholars look upon such experiments with a jaundiced eye (there have been some unfortunate excesses). Perhaps the process should be reversed and Chinese scholars invited to formulate and apply Chinese critical approaches to non-Chinese literatures.

Cross-listing of courses seems more feasible than double listing for it simply means that courses regularly taught in one department can be listed and taken by students in another department.

Cross-listings, as opposed to double-listing, of courses between comparative literature and its neighboring departments is an admirable and sure guarantee of interdepartmental cooperation, widely practiced. Since graduate candidates in comparative literature have an option of taking courses in other literatures — are indeed obliged to do so — the comparative literature pages in the bulletin frequently list a few courses from other department that would be especially valuable for them. As Fred Nichols rationalizes the matter, "The advantage of being a student in comparative literature is that you can take good courses in the national literature departments and avoid the bad. It is a good idea to nudge students in the right directions, selectively cross-listing good courses in other departments." Similarly, the English, French, or other department reciprocates by listing comparative literature courses of general value. Since most national literature departments, for example, have abandoned the traditional course on research methods and bibliography owing to financial retrenchment, this is a comparative literature course that has a universal value for

registrants from other departments and is often taken by them. It is cross-listed, however, rather than double-listed (85).

Clements gives two descriptions of the Methods course (see pp. 70-72). He also simulates an interesting discussion between two chairmen. While a national literature chairman may accuse his comparative literature counterpart of training students to learn less and less about more and more, the comparative literature chairman should counter by indicating a willingness to enroll his students in monographic courses where they can receive the in-depth training that only a national literature department can supply. This is why some comparative literature departments insist that M.A. candidates take two or three of their eight required courses in a national literature department (seven or eight out of eighteen are required for the Ph.D.), even including single authors or works (e.g., Vergil, Cervantes, Dante, Shakespeare, etc.).

On the other hand, the comparative literature chairman may, with some justification, reverse the accusation of the national literature chairman by saying that the latter's students are being trained to learn more and more about less and less, and that comparative literature courses can be a helpful corrective in broadening the views of national literature students.

#### Chapter V. Foreign Languages and Linguistics

A kind of linguistic isolationism invaded American colleges in the seventies and seems likely to continue into the eighties. At a time when foreign languages are being phased out or even abolished from many curricula, it may seem unreasonable to burden comparative literature candidates with the obligation constantly to cultivate a continuing interest in several foreign languages. But as Clements observes, "Since airline stewardesses on SAS and other international airlines must learn three foreign languages, it seems a modest requirement to impose on a Ph. D. in our discipline" (102).

Some languages — such as French or German — often have to be studied as auxiliary languages even if the student is not specializing in their literatures, because of the vast bibliographical scholarship found in these languages. This might also be said of Japanese scholarship for many Eastern literatures, notably Chinese. Clements urges comparative literature students to go beyond the minimum requirement for languages so that their work will be more than a comparison or contrast of two literatures in different

languages. But it is only the very exceptional student who can do more than a good binary study. It is certainly more important that there be a solid grounding in two languages and literatures (e.g., Chinese and English) than an elementary introduction to French or German. Learning a language from an entirely different cultural tradition is vastly more difficult than adding one more Romance language to one's list of linguistic achievements. And as Dean Herbert Weisinger (whose familiarity with classical languages was apparent in his writings) has pointed out, "Indeed, many comparatists, having managed to emancipate themselves from the thrall of nationalism, promptly enslave themselves in the larger, but still confining concept of the Western literary tradition. They insist that without mastery of Greek, Latin, German, French, and English, the study of comparative literature cannot be pursued" (108).

There is another side to this question, however, and Clements states it at some length in an earlier chapter on how the "Asian Language Problem" makes it difficult for World Literature to work:

The greatest problem for World Literature courses in this area is that there are almost no Asian specialists able to participate who know Asiatic languages other than their own — or even other Asian literatures, which is still more serious for literary internationalism. Fortunately the linguistic imperialism of English and French still clings in Asia, though less than in Africa, of course, and this enables Asians to have indirect access to their continental literatures. Thus, at a recent triennial meeting of the Asian Writers' Conference, the Korean Ko Yo Sup complained that Koreans wishing to translate Asian works must get hold of the English, French, or German versions of such works before turning them into Korean. So complicated are Asian languages even to close neighbors that Ryoto Sato of Tokyo claimed that it takes him an entire year to translate one Chinese novel into Japanese.

Thus Americans and Asians face the identical problem in mastering Asian literatures. This problem of linguistic intercommunication within Asia, where more natives know English or French than the *Sprachräume* of their neighbors, has reduced Indian comparative literature courses to feature English-Indian literary relations and led the University of Tokyo to emphasize English-Japanese relations. (Similarly, a dean of Cairo University recently boasted that his teachers were secular pioneers in comparative literature through their Hispano-Arabic researches.)

As suggested above, the inability of Asians to read Asian languages other than their own parallels an ignorance of their neighbors' literatures. Thus the aforementioned joint NYU-Indian program of East-West Literature, although finalized on paper and assured a subsidy from the Fulbright Commission, lurched to a sudden halt. It was only during the FILLM congress in Australia years later that DasGupta explained what had gone

wrong: he could find no Indian colleagues who could or would read in the original (or conceivably even in translation) the various Asian epics and drama that were to constitute the Asian component of the projected courses. It is possible that projected World Literature courses in America may be partially staffed by the young comparatists of Asian birth now being trained in our own graduate schools. Their course work makes them familiar with the great texts of the Western Heritage, while their theses often encompass Indian, Chinese, Korean, or Japanese authors (34).

Such a state of affairs makes it all the more clear why Japanese, for instance, would be the logical choice if a third language were required for a student of Chinese-Western or Chinese-Asian comparative studies. In fact, comparative studies in the East might develop most significantly if more intra-Asian studies were done in an Eastern cultural context before invoking critical terminology and conceptual frameworks imported from the West.

Clements' enthusiasm for promoting World Literature as the outermost reach of the comparative literature scholar, leads him to push quite hard for more language requirements. But he concludes the discussion with a fairly reasonable compromise:

Despite all attempts to legislate the nature of the language requirement, candidates' needs will depend on the subject and compass of their theses, and the corpus of criticism on those subjects. Common sense, shared by students and advisers, can dictate the choice. Thus, paving the way toward theses in East-West or World Literature, Wisconsin had legislated by 1968 that the classical language could be replaced by Sanskrit, Tamil, Chinese, Arabic, Persian, or other Asian language (108).

Clements realizes that his zeal for promoting World Literature, has to be tempered by the fact that no single individual can possibly master all the world's literary languages. Hence, the importance he attaches to literary translation.

Fortunately, the number of literary translations has increased remarkably in recent years, including those from the East, and the bibliographical tools for tracing such translations as well as for investigating the theory and methodology behind translation are readily available.<sup>4</sup> Not enough bilingual editions of literary works exist yet nor has anyone taken a census of useful texts from all over the world for a pilot program in World

Literature. How many translations should be permitted in comparative literature courses is a question that Clements handles in a reasonably balanced manner:

It must be conceded that in comparative literature (and especially World) there will be frequent cases when an instructor will have to discuss a book he cannot read in the original, whether an assigned text or a background commentary. As the first Report on Professional Standards of the American Comparative Literature Association put it, "It would be highly puristic to exclude some reading from more remote languages in translation."

Paradoxically, this point is often raised by carping nonlinguists as yet another objection to comparative studies. It is a logical and facile argument, like the insistence that no graduate student in fine arts should work from slide projections but only from studying the original paintings or sculpture, or that historians, philosophers, anthropologists, and theologians should not use sources they cannot read in the original. We all stand behind the principle of linguistic versatility, but it is of course a question of degree. For someone to teach a course, graduate or undergraduate, on Dante without knowing Italian and Latin is unethical and reprehensible. Yet we should not suggest that the planner of the course on world epic described above abandon it. Many English or joint departments that administer the undergraduate literature-in-translation courses impose the *quot opera, tot linguae* on graduate literature departments while their instructors abandon it totally at the undergraduate level. When we have developed several World Literature graduate programs in several major universities, we shall have a good idea of what constitutes an ethical compromise on this issue (41).

## Chapter XI. Teaching, Textbooks, Examinations

The discussion of Clements' ideas in this section will be confined to the textbook problem, since I have already touched on other pertinent points above (see my text, pp. 90-94). It is quite clear to people in the field that there is a desperate need for appropriate readers and anthologies for both undergraduate and graduate courses in comparative literature. In referring to drama, for instance, Clements states: "It would seem that the one anthology we look forward to as comparatists is an East-West if not World collection of dramas selected to establish common aims, interests, and attitudes" (136).

It could be argued that the library is the scholar's textbook but, while this may be true for a particular national literature, it is not so for comparative literature which lacks texts with suitable annotations of

appropriate selections from a strictly comparative point of view. Consequently, Clements proposes a whole new series of annotated bilingual editions of great books. There should also be representative textbooks on specific genres, periods, and themes. As Clements notes, "The ideal textbooks for courses that touch several literary bases do not exist — such as an anthology on European romanticism presenting bilingually crucial passages from Goethe, Manzoni, Chateaubriand, Lamartine, Rivas, Pushkin, along with the already English texts of Byron, Wordsworth, and Irving" (225-226).

The greatest need, at least on the undergraduate level, is the "Western Heritage or Great Books anthology that is to initiate students, including majors or minors in comparative literature, to the comparative study or method of literature" (226). This is even more demanding if one wishes to include as well the Great Books of the Eastern World.

Although Clements has some reservations about the selected-text or *morceau choisi* type of collection, which facilitates the teaching of literature through textual explication and criticism (see pp. 226-228), he sees it as the only practical solution at present to fulfill the comparativist's needs. To be sure, such a text would have to be carefully edited and would certainly have to be reinforced with occasional paperback editions of complete works.

What is most important, however, is that the controlling idea which shapes the anthology is comparative. It is not enough to wander through two thousand years of literary texts presented chronologically rather than comparatively, for the texts chosen should be illustrative of the principles and methods of the comparativist. Clements presents a formidable list of *desiderata* for the editor to keep in mind as he pioneers in this new type of anthology for comparative literature courses:

1. A course structure to acquaint students with the four most common approaches to the comparative study of literature.
2. An editorial apparatus encouraging the actual comparison of texts as a major activity in the classroom.
3. A content of major and lasting texts, not sacrificing quality for lesser works that might lend themselves to a more obvious exercise in comparison and contrast.
4. A very wide number of avenues to units within these approaches so that instructors unable to assign all the contents could select those approaches and units with which they are most familiar or which they most enjoy teaching.

5. A book that would not be so intent on presenting a method that it might overlook the other objectives of entertaining and edifying students and giving them texts conforming to their current interests and tastes.
6. In this collection, a selection of some texts whose appearance in the most popular current college anthologies attests to their appeal to both teachers and students. If the method is an unfamiliar one, some of the texts at least will remain familiar ones with which the instructor is comfortable.
7. An anthology with simple and clear editing so that instructors from any literature department need not hesitate to teach from it and the less experienced could know in advance what they may profitably do in the classroom. Yet a method flexible and varied enough that inexperienced teachers may depart from it or disregard some of the apparatus in favor of their tried-and-true techniques.
8. An anthology that, even though the texts be short ones, will make concessions to those instructors loyal to the ideal of the "complete text." That is, probably a majority of the selections will be brief forms, and therefore "complete."
9. An anthology that, for the benefit of those same instructors, will allow for substitute or complementary readings in complete text paperbacks within each unit (228-229).

### **Chapter XII. The Thesis**

This chapter takes up some practical administrative details on preparing a thesis and has a few words of advice about what constitutes and does not constitute a legitimate topic for a comparative literature thesis; for instance, Clements lists the arguments pro and con for the single-author type of thesis (see pp. 240-242). The complaint of national literature students that there are no more thesis topics left, does not apply to comparative literature whose breadth allows for many unexploited meaningful topics, especially East-West and intra-Asian studies. At the end of this chapter, Clements gives sixteen counsels for the graduate term paper in comparative literature, many of which apply to thesis writing as well (see pp. 248-251).

### **Chapter XIII. Evaluation and Standards**

In publicly-funded universities in the United States, each department has to go through a periodic evaluation process. During times of recession, near-panic sets in as state-appointed professionals descend on various departments and threaten their budgetary life-lines. Many departments try to anticipate and correct deficiencies in their programs before the outsiders step in. Clements provides one such Checklist of Elements for Departmental

Evaluation, which may also serve as a voluntary self-evaluation for comparative literature chairmen in the East (see pp. 261-262) as well as a special "Decalogue of Principles for Evaluation," which are a kind of summary of experience in administering comparative literature programs (see p. 264).

Before concluding this section for administrators, something should be said about the elitism controversy which permeates *CLAD* throughout. Clements points out that there are two schools of thought in structuring comparative literature programs: the more traditional elitist school and the more innovative school. The latter school encourages rapid growth, a swing to undergraduate teaching, libraries with modest holdings, erosion of foreign language requirements, and large lecture courses teaching literature in translation which tend to blur the distinction between world literature and comparative literature. The former school is described by Clements as it developed and was challenged: "The 1976 Report of the ACLA's Committee on Professional Standards recalled the elitism of the 1965 Report: 'It did not of course minimize the strenuous sweep of its aspirations and it did not perceive itself to be available to all students or even universities. It defined itself as a discipline appropriate only to institutions endowed with excellent libraries, with consistently strong foreign language departments, and with gifted students'" (18).

Clements concedes a certain degree of elitism is necessary, for only "gifted and motivated graduate students" (43) would dare undertake the comparative literature program he advocates. In discussing the relative merits of large classes over small classes ("tutorial sessions that the more affluent universities used to feature"), Clements says, "The fact remains clear that the limited knowledge of many literatures, and indeed languages, found among students in a small class is less desirable than the many languages and bodies of literature known to a large cosmopolitan class in comparative literature" (222). This notion should be a source of encouragement to students coming from non-Western backgrounds; they often bring with them a whole new cultural and linguistic world which is a positive enrichment to a comparative literature department.

In this debate over elitism, it is only fair that those who have the most at stake, the students, should have the last word:

The Nichols Committee Report would reassure us that often the maintenance of standards at the college level is more securely upheld by the students than by the faculty, the latter perhaps motivated by registration statistics. In any case, the student sentiment seems to be such as to invoke the disputed word "elitist":

If this report has tended to stress standards which make the undergraduate discipline more, rather than less rigorous, the inspiration for that thrust has come from the students themselves at institutions as diverse in orientation as large State Universities, such as Wisconsin and Kentucky, and small liberal arts colleges, such as Beloit and Dartmouth (263).

Clements goes on to say, "The Report concludes that our students, presumably like ourselves, have chosen the discipline for its challenge, and the faculty members must neither disappoint them nor compromise themselves by courting expediency" (263-264).

## Conclusion

### Chapter XV. The Future of a Discipline

Clements opens this chapter with the ominous warning that "the increase of international understanding is not keeping up with the increased tensions and dangers" (279). But he nourishes the hope that comparative literature is one of the few on-going media which has a potential for in-depth international understanding to take place. He quotes Professor Guyard to stress this point:

Everyone knows that cultural exchanges are one of the fragile hopes for humanity. Comparatism, as it writes the history of international literary relations, shows that no literature has ever been able to isolate itself without becoming atrophied and that the finest national masterpieces have always leaned on foreign contributions, that these masterpieces assimilate them or affirm their own identity more clearly either in juxtaposition to them or thanks to them. At the same time, comparatism helps every people to trace within itself the birth of those mirages that it may too often take for faithful images — a lesson of lucidity and humility as valid as the lessons of history: little known, but certain (280).

Professor Aldridge extends Guyard's notion of "mirage" beyond the self to include

the impression which one national culture makes upon another through literature. Like the mirage in the desert, this impression may or may not resemble reality. Going beyond the portrayal of national types, such as the stolid Englishman, the volatile Frenchman, or the materialistic American, which are mainly caricatures, the mirage comprises the total effect which one nation makes on individuals of another (280).

To help work towards international understanding, Clements had earlier suggested the possibility of establishing an Institute of World Literature (see pp. 35-36). I would suggest that the formation of such an Institute be preceded by the formation of Institutes of National Literatures with a world literature consciousness. Each National Institute's main function would be to select and disseminate its literary masterpieces through translation. A good beginning in this area has already been made by Anne Paolucci, the executive director of the Council on National Literatures. The CNL is a forum for scholars concerned with comparative study of the established, emergent, and neglected national literatures that make up the written and oral artistic legacy of the diverse contemporary peoples of the world. It aims to facilitate communication among specialists as well as comparatists and the indispensable base for this is two-way translation work. The CNL publishes an annual *Review of National Literatures* and the *CNL/Quarterly World Report*. Both Paolucci and Clements stress the increasing importance of good translation work for fruitful cultural exchange, especially for comparatists moving in the more remote areas of World Literature. Clements would prefer to see translation "taught by trained comparatists and linguists" (284) and would certainly agree with André Gide's exhortation that every creative writer owes it to his country to translate at least one foreign work into his native language in order to enrich his own literature and vice versa (see pp. 302-308 for more on translation and the comparatist).

The "Future of a Discipline" is also measured by the uncertain job market. Clements reports that translation majors are finding jobs without difficulty in the United States and quotes from a report which gives hope to Chinese-Western literary comparatists: "Career opportunities in East-Asian studies are plentiful at the present and there is every indication that they will increase markedly in the next decade as cultural exchanges with Asia develop further" (289). In 1978, Clements reports, only four out of seventy Ph. D. graduates from his institution were momentarily unemployed, and even the prospects for M.A.'s are bright (see pp. 87-88).

For comparative literature studies to develop in the future there is a critical need to improve our pedagogical and research tools. Undoubtedly, the most valuable of these resource materials has been the increasingly international bibliographical coverage. The Office of Research Programs of the MLA made six suggestions about projects that might be undertaken:

an updating of the Baldensperger-Friederich bibliography of comparative literature; guides to research on newer areas of study (mannerism, structuralism, semiotics), each volume to contain essays and bibliographies, including one computer-produced; a bibliography of bibliographies; a series of volumes on interdisciplinary topics (literature and society, etc.); guides to the teaching of masterpieces of world literature (readings, bibliography, teaching aids, sample questionnaires, term paper projects); options for the teaching of comparative literature and interdisciplines—pedagogical approaches solicited from scholars and teachers from around the nation (233).

Some of the projects proposed by comparative literature scholars were:

a bibliographical guide for students of comparative literature (to be undertaken by George A. Thompson, librarian at NYU, who prepared the Selective Bibliography of Bibliographies at the end of this volume); a history of the teaching of comparative literature; a bibliography of comparative literature doctoral dissertations in the United States; a more complete annual bibliography of comparative literature; a volume updating or replacing an earlier book on literary interrelations, with syllabi and bibliographies, prepared by a team of collaborators directed by Jean-Pierre Barricelli and Joseph Gibaldi; guides to teaching masterpieces like the Norton Critical Editions, but with greater emphasis on the works' international sources and influences; reprints of bilingual editions of masterpieces (233).

#### **Appendix: Organizational Structure of the Discipline**

In this last section, Clements gives some descriptive sketches of important organizations related to comparative literature; namely, the International Federation of Modern Languages and Literatures (FILLM), the International Comparative Literature Association (ICLA), the PEN Club International (PEN), the American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA), the Modern Language Association of America (MLA), and many other National Associations and Research Institutes of Comparative Literature. He also indicates the times when different conferences and

congresses are held (including Taiwan's quadrennial East-West comparative literature meeting), and praises the organizers of a recent ICLA meeting for their openness to non-Western comparativists: "The inclusion of Asian and African literatures in the program of the meeting at Bordeaux indicated a centrifugal trend in interest and parallels a similar trend in the parent organization, the FILLM" (313).

It is fitting to conclude this review-summary of *CLAD* from the Chinese perspective, by referring to another exciting development in cosmopolitan Hong Kong; namely, a master's level program in Comparative Literature at The Chinese University of Hong Kong which will get underway in Fall, 1980. This program, along with its sister program at National Taiwan University, bodes well for the future of Chinese-Western comparative studies.

## Notes

1. Flyer distributed at annual MLA Conference (December, 1978).
2. Vol. 15, No. 11 (January, 1979), pp. 1508 and 1510.
3. Some of the more common introductions in English are: Francois Jost. *Introduction to Comparative Literature*. Indianapolis: Pegasus, 1974. Ulrich Weisstein. *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1973. S. S. Praver. *Comparative Literary Studies*. N. Y.: Barnes & Noble, 1973. Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz. *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*. Rev. ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois Univ. Press, 1971. Henry Gifford. *Comparative Literature: Concepts of Literature*. London: Routledge, 1969. A. Owen Aldridge, ed. *Comparative Literature: Matter and Method*. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1969. Jan. Brandt Corstius. *Introduction to the Comparative Study of Literature*. N. Y.: Random, 1967. René Etiemble. *The Crisis in Comparative Literature*. East Lansing: Michigan State Univ. Press, 1966.
4. For two helpful reference books published recently see, Stefan Congrat-Butlar (ed.), *Translation and Translators: Encyclopedia/Index/Register* (Epping, Essex: R. R. Bowker Co., 1979) and John J. Deeney and Simon S. C. Chau (eds.), *ECCE Translator's Manual: An Annotated Bibliographical Handbook on English-Chinese Chinese-English Translation with Documentation and Organization Information* (Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Extramural Studies, 1980).