

The Introduction of French Symbolism into Modern Chinese and Japanese Poetry

Kuo-ch'ing Tu

Both modern Chinese and Japanese literatures owe much of their developments to the introduction of Western literary trends since the end of the nineteenth century. The effects of the introduction of these trends differed markedly due to national differences in China and Japan. In this paper, I shall take French Symbolism¹ as an example and use a comparative approach to show some major differences in its importation into these two Oriental countries.

I

First Anthology of Western Poems: *Shintaishishō* vs. *Ma Chün-wu Shih-kao*

Generally speaking, Japan began to actively absorb Western civilization after the *Meiji ishin* (明治維新, The Meiji Restoration) in 1868 while in China it began with the *Tzu-ch'iang yün-tung* (自強運動, The Self-strengthening Movement) in 1862, six years earlier than in Japan. As far as the introduction of Western poetry is concerned, the first anthology of Western poems translated into Japanese was *Shintaishishō* (新體詩抄, *A Selection of Poems in New Style*) appearing in 1882, and the first one in Chinese was *Ma Chün-wu shih-kao* (馬君武詩稿, *Ma Chün-wu's Poetic Drafts*)² published in 1902. In this case China was twenty years behind Japan.

Regarding the backgrounds, contents, and authors' intentions, these two anthologies differ greatly from each other.

Shintaishishō consisted of nineteen poems, of which fourteen were translations from English,³ and the rest imitations of Western poems in English. The three authors were professors at Tokyo University: Inoue Tetsujirō (井上哲次郎, 1855-1944), a philosophy scholar; Toyama Masakazu (外山正一, 1848-1900), a sociologist; and Yatabe Ryōkichi (矢田部良吉, 1851-1899), a botanist.

After the Meiji Restoration Japan's star was on the rise. From the beginning, there developed the association between modernism and scientific thought, between the theory of evolution and utilitarianism, between nationalistic spirit and awakening for new literary forms, all of which were strongly reflected in *Shintaishishō*. Its authors claimed, in a tone of strong self-assurance and awakening, that "The songs of the Meiji period should be Meiji's songs, not ancient songs; the poems of Japan should be Japanese poems, not Chinese poems."⁴ Moreover, the title of *Shintaishishō* denotes its innovative intention: to bring forth poetry in new styles. Each of the compilers contributed a preface in which they criticized the limitations of traditional poetic forms and advocated the broadening of subject matters and the use of daily, easily-understood language.⁵ As to the contents, the poems chosen and translated can be divided into three types: didactic poems, poems on nature and war songs. The war songs constituted the greatest number, and the nature poems the fewest,⁶ betraying the striking feature of this anthology which reflects the so-called "Meiji spirit."

In a marked contrast, *Ma Chün-wu shih-kao*, which contained thirty-eight poems from English and German,⁷ appeared seven years after China was defeated in the Sino-Japanese War (1894-95). In contrast to the self-confident assertions of the authors of *Shintaishishō*, Ma Chün-wu in his preface to *shih-kao* explained his efforts in a self-effacing voice:

These few short poems by no means have any lasting value in the field of literature. However, ten years ago when I advocated new trends of thought and claimed to stand for patriotism, they, of course, aided me in my efforts, and I would regard them only as my personal remembrance.⁸

At that time China was at the nadir of her fading empire which was to fall in 1911, and patriots looked to art to revive waning spirits and expected literature to serve patriotic or political ends. Ma Chün-wu adored Byron not simply because he was a literary magnate, but also because he was a great

soldier, a great gallant man, a philosopher and a patriot.⁹ As Kurata Sadayoshi (倉田貞美) observes, the Chinese pioneers'¹⁰ choice of Romantic poets for their translations was not a matter of personal predilection, but rather a reflection of the emotions and thoughts of the young reformers on the eve of the revolution of 1911.¹¹

II

First Anthology of French Poems: *Kaichō-on* vs. *Hsien-ho chi*

As for French poetry, in 1925 Li Ssu-ch'un (李思純) published a selection of translations entitled *Hsien-ho chi* (仙河集, *The Seine*) in remembrance of his days in France. This selection introduced sixty-nine poems from twenty-four French poets, from Charles d'Orléans (1394-1465) of the fifteenth century to the contemporary poet Paul Bourget (1852-1935).¹²

Among Japanese translations, Ueda Bin's (上田敏, 1874-1916) *Kaichō-on* (海潮音, *The Sound of the Tide*) corresponds to *Hsien-ho chi*. *Kaichō-on* was published in 1905, including fifty-seven poems from twenty-nine poets; most of them were Parnassians and Symbolists. However, as far as purpose, nature and influence are concerned, these two anthologies, again, differ markedly from each other.

The author of *Kaichō-on*, dissatisfied with the monotony of form and shallowness of content in poems after *Shintaishishō*, decided to introduce "mysterious, elegant, novel, strikingly new voices" in order to initiate a reform in both poetic form and poetic taste.¹³ In contrast, the author of *Hsien-ho chi* had no other purpose than "trying to use this volume as an example of translating poetry,"¹⁴ because, except for Su Man-shu (蘇曼殊, 1884-1918), he was dissatisfied with the translations of his predecessors like Ma Chün-wu and Hu Shih (胡適, 1891-1962).

Furthermore, *Kaichō-on* not only translated and commented on poems but also introduced the theory of French Symbolism. *Hsien-ho chi* translated twenty-four poets with a short biography and comment on style for each, but only two, Baudelaire and Verlaine, belonged to the Symbolist school, while Symbolist theory was left unmentioned.

With regard to their influence, *Kaichō-on* was generally considered

as the wellspring of Japanese Symbolism as well as the poetry that followed. As Kitahara Hakushū (北原白秋, 1885-1942) claimed, "Ueda Bin's extremely elaborate translation could better be called laborious creation . . . He deserves to be called the father of modern Japanese poetry."¹⁵ In contrast, although *Hsien-ho chi* is mentioned in *Tsui-chin san-shih-nien Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh-shih* (最近三十年中國文學史, *History of Chinese Literature of the Past Thirty Years*) by Ch'en Ping-k'un (陳炳堃, November, 1930), it is generally unknown to the Chinese reader of poetry today. The reason is, aside from questions of poetic value of the selected poems and the workmanship of the translations, that *Hsien-ho chi* was translated into classical Chinese which by 1919 (six years before it was published) had already lost to vernacular Chinese its position as the common medium for poetry. Furthermore, it was published in the magazine *Hsüeh Heng* (學衡, *The Critical Review*) which was one of the last bastions of conservative scholars in their stubborn resistance to the use of vernacular Chinese. Therefore it is hardly surprising that it did not find a wide audience among general readers.

III

Advocators of Symbolism: Ueda Bin vs. Shen Yen-ping

With regard to the introduction of French Symbolist theory into Japan, Ueda Bin was the pathfinder and the periodical *Teikoku bungaku* (帝國文學, *The Imperial Literature*) served as the forum. In its first issue in 1895, Ueda Bin introduced Maurice Maeterlinck (1862-1949) and Emile Verhaeren (1855-1916). In the second issue (March, 1896) there appeared a new column called *Kaigai sōdan* (海外騷壇, Poetic Circles Overseas) in which he published a new article entitled "Pōru Varurein yuku" (ポオル エルレエン逝く, Paul Verlaine dead), and included a Japanese translation of the fourth stanza of Verlaine's *Art Poétique* and a stanza from his "Chanson d'automne." It was in this article that the term "Svmbioïste" itself appeared for the first time in Japan.

Later in July 1898, in the same column another article by Ueda Bin was published: "*Furansu shidan no shinsei*" (仏蘭西詩壇の新聲, New Voices from French Poetical Circles). In this article, Ueda Bin announced

the arrival of a new voice in French poetry, saying

The style of French poetry after Hugo has changed very much; the influence of the Parnassian school advocated by Leconte de Lisle and others after Hugo has lost much strength recently . . .

Those who take this trend into consideration and try to create a new voice for French poetry are called Symbolistes, and also called Vers-libristes.

He also pointed out what he considered to be the particular nature of the school.

The characteristics of this new school lie in the abhorrence of conventional poetic forms, trying to create poetry in a new style which catches subtle tones of thought with facility, and offers sheer opposition to the strict versification observed by the Parnassian school, especially taking exception to rhyming.

He concluded by asserting that new ideas require new poetic forms for their expression.

Truly, their mystic and elegant thoughts are more than sufficient proof that new poetic forms are required. Just as Wagner's view of life can be exalted only by his particular musical style, the thoughts and emotions of French poets of the new style, in fact, cannot be expressed with picturesque poetic forms, but must rely on the musical style created by Verlaine and others.

With the publication of *Kaichō-on*, the introduction of Symbolism gathered strength. In the preface to *Kaichō-on*, Ueda Bin commented that "The use of symbols in poetry is not necessarily a new idea in modern times; it is probably as old as mountains in this world." However, "to use it as the heart and the first principle of writing poetry and to adopt it deliberately as a platform, probably began with the new French poetry of the last twenty years." And it was Mallarmé and Verlaine who urged the coming of this "tendency toward a new and fresh style."

Ueda Bin further explained the usage of symbols as well as how to appreciate a symbolist poem:

The use of symbols lies in giving the reader a state of mind similar to the poet's contemplation, not necessarily in making efforts to convey the same idea. And yet, those who slowly savor Symbolist poetry are able, according to the stirring of their emotions, to appreciate an indescribable charm which the poet has not yet explicitly touched upon. Therefore, the explanation of a poem should be different according to different people; the main point only lies in evoking a similar state of mind.

Moreover, in a note to Mallarmé's "Soupir," Ueda Bin elaborated Mallarmé's own words on poetic suggestion and commented as follows:

When, in an illusion evoked by the quiet observation of objects, an image soars by itself, then, a "song" is completed. The former Parnassian poets took the entire object and represented it. Therefore their poems were destitute of mysterious charm, and the reader missed the pleasure of participating in creation himself. To express objects plainly is to sink three fourths of the poetic flavor. The charms of reading poetry consist in guessing slowly and gradually. What is suggestion but fancy?

Such a practical use of mysticism is called Symbolism. Namely, in order to express a state of mind, one gradually calls forth objects, or, on the contrary, one takes an object, and, after explaining it once or twice, tries to make a state of mind separate from it.

Although in the preface Ueda Bin reminded his readers that he didn't mean to say that today's Japanese poets should model their poems on these principles, his intention to establish the *seishin-tai* (清新體, fresh and new style) in poetry cannot be disputed.

Aside from Ueda Bin, many scholars contributed to the introduction of Symbolist theory into Japan, including Mori Ōgai (森鷗外, 1862-1922),¹⁶ Andō Mushoshi (安藤無書子),¹⁷ Katayama Koson (片山孤村, 1879-1933),¹⁸ Kakuda Kōkōkakyaku (角田浩浩歌客),¹⁹ Hasegawa Tenkei (長谷川天溪, 1876-1940),²⁰ Iwano Hōmei (岩野泡鳴, 1873-1920),²¹ and Kuriyagawa Hakuson (厨川白村, 1880-1923).²² Each published articles and essays either expounding various characteristics of the theory or polemizing against different opinions. Suffice it to say, Japanese Symbolist poetry was preceded by theories introduced by leading scholars. This introduction became a definite factor in constituting the special character of Japanese Symbolism in its later development. This stands in sharp contrast to the situation in China.

Precisely when the theory of Symbolism was first imported into China is hard to determine.²³ Since the conscious introduction of Western literary theories into China became conspicuous only around the founding of the Republic (1911), especially after the success of the vernacular Chinese literary movement (1919), I believe it was probably no earlier than this time. As Bonnie McDougall has concluded, Japanese works were the second major source for the introduction of early Western literary criticism and history into China.²⁴ The three main critics cited are Tsubouchi Shōyō (坪内逍遙, 1859-1935), Shimamura Hōgetsu (島村抱月, 1871-1918) and Kuriyagawa Hakuson of the late Meiji and Taishō period. Among them Hakuson played a particularly important role with regard to the introduction of Symbolism. According to McDougall, it was through quotations in his *Kindai bungaku jukkō* (近代文學十講, *Ten Lectures on Modern Literature*) (1910) that Arthur Symons (1866-1945) and his famous book, *The Symbolist Movement in Literature* (1899), were known to the Chinese reader.²⁵

Early in 1920, in *Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao* (小說月報, *The Short Story Monthly*) (Vol. 11, No. 2), there appeared an article entitled "Wo-men hsien-tsai k'o-i t'i-ch'ang piao-hsiang-chu-i te wen-hsüeh mo?" (我們現在可以提倡表象主義的文學麼? Shall We Now Advocate Symbolist Literature?) written by Shen Yen-ping (沈雁冰, pseud. Mao Tun [茅盾]). The author's opinion was positive, but not for artistic reasons, rather the concern was for the good of the country. His reasoning was that Realism had been advocated for at least a year and he felt that China ought to "take several roads at the same time." Besides, the advocacy of Symbolist literature, he felt, could remedy the defects of Realism and provide a positive change.²⁶

Realism disheartens and disappoints people; it stimulates human emotion excessively but always in the same way. We advocate Symbolism because we want a change. Moreover, the influence of new Romanticism is becoming stronger day by day. It certainly has the strength to show people the right way, not to disappoint people. We shall certainly go on this road, but before we go, we have to prepare. It is time for us to prepare. Symbolism is the transition from Realism to new Romanticism, therefore we must advocate it beforehand.

In view of the above, it would appear that the advocacy of Symbolism in China began no earlier than this time, although their understanding of it was questionable and the object to which they tried to apply it was the novel,

not poetry.

Three months after this article was published, in the May and June issues of the same magazine, another article appeared with the title "Wen-hsüeh shang piao-hsiang-chu-i shih shen-mo?" (文學上表象主義是什麼? What is Symbolism in Literature?) by Hsieh Liu-i (謝六逸) who was in Tokyo at the time. After having introduced several kinds of Symbolism and some Symbolist writers, such as Paul Verlaine, Karl Huysmans, Leonid Andreeff, M. Maeterlinck, Emile Verhaeren, Georges Rodenbach as well as Remy de Gourmont's and Gustav Kahn's explanations of what Symbolism is, Hsieh Liu-i stated that

The change of Western literary thought proceeded from Classicism to Romanticism, and then to Naturalism and Symbolism (New Romanticism), but China has not yet passed through Realism; if she suddenly adopts Symbolism, the defects of "passing over" are inevitable, because without having been baptized with science yet having a proclivity toward mysticism, without having passed through Realism yet looking forward to Symbolism, we could only expect illusory results.

This was a reaction to the advocacy attempted by the *Short Story Monthly* and it was an unfavorable one, again based more on socio-political concerns rather than on literary ones. Seen from this, it seems that China at that time was so anxious and desperate in trying to grasp all Western literary theories at once. Thus the advocacy of Symbolism in China eventually proved ephemeral.²⁷

IV First Symbolist Poet: Kambara Ariake vs. Li Chin-fa

In the history of Japanese poetry, Kambara Ariake (蒲原有明, 1876-1952) is generally regarded as the first poet who consciously adopted Symbolist techniques in creation. His first two volumes of poetry depicting adolescent sorrows and the dreams of youth continued along the lines of lyricism developed by Shimazaki Tōson (島崎藤村, 1872-1943) and his followers who had been much influenced by English Romantic poets.

However, in his third volume *Shunchōshū* (春鳥集, *The Spring Bird*) published in July, 1905, Ariake extricated himself from the pure romantic style. He attempted “new ways of expression” and pursued “modern mysticism,” as he explained in his preface to *Shunchōshū*:

Since one's feeling and thinking about nature and life are different from those of the past, it is inevitable for one to seek new ways of expression. Summer draws near and spring clothes are to be thrown away. . . . It is truly an outcome of necessity that one strives for rhythms, style, diction and neologisms appropriate to the new ideas, and at the same time, loosen the restrictions of the Japanese language to make it easier to approach modern mysticism.

Moreover, he advocated a mixing of the senses, echoing Baudelaire's “Correspondences”:

Sight and hearing become interwoven with each other, mixed with modern human sentiments, thereupon a sound of silver light exists, thereupon a color of sonorous sound exists. While it is called the mind's eye, the mind's ear, we can use the senses of smell and taste to perceive the fragrant savor of the mind.

Although Ariake explicitly advocated correspondences of the senses and mentioned Baudelaire and Mallarmé in his preface, what he had in mind, as Kubota Hanya (窪田般彌) has pointed out, seemed to have been Sei Shōnagon's (清少納言) “*yūshu*” (幽趣, quiet beauty) or Bashō's (芭蕉) “*genchi*” (玄致, elegant subtlety) rather than French Symbolism.

As *Shunchōshū* was published three months earlier than *Kaichō-on* (October, 1905), it seems to be an anachronism to say that the former was influenced by the latter. However, as I have already pointed out, before *Shunchōshū* was published quite a few articles regarding Symbolism in general or French Symbolism in particular had already appeared. According to Kubota Hanya, Ariake's acquaintance with French Symbolist poetry probably began around 1899, with Ueda Bin's Symbolist introductions, Hasegawa Tenkei's translation of Arthur Symons' *Symbolist Movement in Literature*, and through Tayama Katai (田山花袋, 1871-1930) who gave him an English copy of Verlaine's collected poems in 1904.²⁸ As Ariake

himself could not read French, it seems that his understanding of French Symbolism was based on Japanese or English translations. As a result, Symbolism to him means "impressionism":

An impressionistic description does not mean to describe something as it is (a realistic description). It expresses the feeling of someone who sees things like color, smell, light, which, as reflected in his eyes, have all come together. It aims at creating an atmosphere by expressing one's impressions of the exterior world and one's corresponding inner emotions.²⁹

Moreover, Symbolism is, in Ariake's understanding, "a synthetic arrangement of sensation," which takes "a conscious creation of fantasies" as its content.³⁰ Regarding his own attitude toward writing poetry, Ariake says:

I began my habitual meditation — nay, it was not a meditation, but a queer banquet of fantasies. It was of the same kind as a dream between a cohesion and a diffusion of promiscuous impressions. In so doing, suddenly symbolic ideas like cactuses and fireworks occurred to my mind. These ideas groped for content.³¹

Thus, French Symbolism, after being transported into Japan, has been transformed into a notion of fantastic impressionism.

As mentioned before, the introduction of Symbolist theory in Japan preceded creative writing of Symbolist poetry attempted by Japanese poets, among whom Ariake was a leading figure of his age. His *Shunchōshū* was the first blossom of Symbolism after its transplantation into Japan. The line of Symbolist poets extended from Ariake, through Susukida Kyūkin (薄田泣菫, 1877-1945), Kitahara Hakushū, Miki Rofū (三木露風, 1889-1964), down to Hagiwara Sakutarō (萩原朔太郎, 1886-1942), and their poetic works constituted a treasury of Japanese Symbolism. Although their styles differed and their accomplishments varied, they all sprang from Japanese translations and introductions of French Symbolism undertaken by Ueda Bin and other Meiji scholars. They thus shared a common fountainhead from which they drew their inspirations. This, again, stands in sharp contrast with the situation in China to which we shall now turn.

The first Chinese poet to apply French Symbolist techniques in poetic

creation is generally considered to have been Li Chin-fa (李金髮, 1901-1976). His first collection of poems, *Wei-yü* (微雨, *A Light Rain*), was published in November, 1925, twenty years later than Ariake's *Shunchōshū*, and thus opened the first page of Chinese modern Symbolist poetry. Li Chin-fa recalled in an essay on Chou Tso-jen (周作人, 1885-1966), a contemporary writer, as follows:

I have never met Chou Tso-jen but corresponded with him several times, and it seems that it was he who encouraged me and strengthened my faith in Symbolist poetry. I remember it was in the spring of 1923, when I had just arrived in Berlin for two months, and had written *Shih-k'o yü hsiung-nien* (食客與凶年, *Long-term Visitor and Bad Year*), I presumptuously (at that time he was a nationally-admired professor at Peking University but I was some twenty years old, an unknown young fellow; wasn't that presumptuous?) sent him, together with *Wei-yü* which had been written earlier, these two collections of drafts by registered mail, hoping that his recommendation could enhance my reputation. . . . After two months or more, eventually I received an answer from Chou, who praised me highly, indicating that that kind of poetry had no antecedent in China and opened up a fresh style. . . . In 1925, when I returned to China, *Wei-yü* had been published and eventually aroused a slight reaction. Although most dilettantes ridiculed it as "incomprehensible," young people in general, after reading the book, all "felt it very interesting," and as a result, Symbolist poetry also became fashionable in China.³²

The above reminiscence reveals the fact that Symbolist poetry "became fashionable in China" very accidentally. A twenty-two-year old youth went to Germany and France to learn sculpture and sent his own collections of poems back to China to ask a famous writer to recommend and publish them; with their novelty and singularity they aroused the interest of young people and became fashionable.

The poetic style of *Wei-yü* of course "had no antecedent in China." Before it was published the introduction of Symbolism had been limited to a few enlightening remarks or fragments scattered in periodicals or newspapers. As previously noted, in *Hsiao-shuo Yüeh-pao* (February, 1920), Shen yen-ping attempted to advocate Symbolist literature, mainly novels, but gave up immediately, overwhelmed by cries for Realism. In the history of modern Chinese poetry, a deliberate campaign aimed at promoting Symbolism was probably initiated with *Hsien-tai* (現代, *Les Contemporains*)

monthly magazine founded in May, 1932, and was succeeded by *Hsien-tai shih* (現代詩, *Modern Poetry*) founded in Taipei, in February, 1953, by Chi Hsien (紀弦) who had originally belonged to the Hsien-tai school.

In *Hsien-tai* (vol.3, no. 3, July, 1933) Su Hsüeh-lin (蘇雪林) wrote an essay on Li Chin-fa, acknowledging that "modern Chinese Symbolist poetry took its origin in Li Chin-fa." At the same time, she pointed out four Symbolist features of Li Chin-fa's poetry: obscure and elusive lines, expression of real characteristics of the nervous temperament in art; a tinge of sentimentalism and decadence; and exoticism. In addition, she indicated three major techniques used by the poet: striking peculiarity in combining ideas; superiority in using "personification"; and application of ellipsis: the secret of French Symbolist poetry.³³

In an introduction to *Chung-kuo hsin-wen-hsüeh ta-hsi, shih-chi* (中國新文學大系, 詩集, *Compendium of Modern Chinese Literature, Poetry Volume*), the editor Chu Tzu-ch'ing (朱自清) commented:

[Li Chin-fa's] poetry does not have ordinary structural patterns; part by part it is understandable, but all parts combined make no sense. What he tries to express is not meaning but feeling or sentiment; they are like a string of beads of different sizes and colors, but he has hidden the string; you have to string them by yourself and see. This is the technique employed by the French Symbolist poets; Mr. Li is the first to introduce this in Chinese poetry.³⁴

In this anthology, Chu Tzu-ch'ing selected nineteen poems of Li Chin-fa's, in quantity only exceeded by Wen I-to's (聞一多) (twenty-nine), Hsü Chih-mo's (徐志摩) (twenty-six) and Kuo Mo-jo's (郭沫若) (twenty-five), among the fifty-nine poets included. There is no doubt that Li Chin-fa's poetry was quite affirmatively accepted by Chu Tzu-ch'ing, and was also appreciated by Su Hsüeh-lin. Nevertheless, Li Chin-fa himself, probably owing to the fact that Chinese modern poetry had shifted to a different direction, denied all his own achievements. In "*Wen-i sheng-huo ti hui-i*" (文藝生活的回憶, *Recollections of My Literary Life*) published in a later period, he wrote,

A lady, Su Hsüeh-lin, wrote an essay analyzing my poetry, discussing the source and sequence of my thought, more clearly than I can. In fact, my poems were only a young man's game of words with hardly any

thought; some of them were only childish fantasies, with awkward technique. I still feel shamed today when I read them.³⁵

The first Symbolist poet in the history of modern Chinese poetry had at last repudiated himself and his creation: this was to be the fate of the first wave of French Symbolism in China.

In addition to Li Chin-fa, the three poets of the later period of the *Ch'uang-tsao she* (創造社, The Creation Society) were also inclined to the French Symbolist school: they were Wang Tu-ch'ing (王獨清, 1898-1940), Mu Mu-t'ien (穆木天, 1900-) and Feng Nai-ch'ao (馮乃超, 1901-).

According to Chu Tzu-ch'ing, Wang Tu-ch'ing's poems were mainly patterned after Byron and Hugo; his Symbolist poems were unrestrained, rather than mysterious; explicit, rather than obscure. Mu Mu-t'ien expressed his feelings in a subtle, profound and remote way. His syllables were regular, with no particular labor exerted for color effect. Feng Nai-ch'ao used resounding syllables, obtaining a hypnotic power, and sang of decadence, gloom, dreamy visions and fairylands. His poetry was rich in color sensations.³⁶

On January 4, 1926, Mu Mu-t'ien sent a letter from Nagano, Japan, to Kuo Mo-jo who was also a member of the Creation Society. In this letter, he wrote that he himself was influenced by Jules Laforgue (1860-1887) in the use of reiterative phrases, and at the same time he mentioned that he and Feng Nai-ch'ao were talking about "the exotic fragrance they deeply breathed, and the decadent mood of decayed ponds and ruined castles," and their opinions were "generally similar." Both aspired to the creation of "pure poetry," and demanded "a sheer demarcation between poetry and prose." Furthermore, he said,

... Poetry should be suggestive, and avoid explanation. Explanation belongs to the world of prose. Behind poetry there should be great philosophy, but poetry cannot explain the philosophy . . . If you read Lamartine, Vigny, and the poetry after the Symbolist movement, you always feel that an infinite world encompasses your surroundings. It is an instinct of poetry to use rhythmical finite words to reveal an infinite world.³⁷

It goes without saying that the above views of pure poetry, suggestion or revelation of an infinite world, exotic fragrances, decadent moods, etc. are no more than platitudes to French Symbolists.

At that time Kuo Mo-jo gave this letter to Wang Tu-ch'ing who had just come back from France to Shanghai. This was in 1926. On February 4, Wang Tu-ch'ing wrote a reply to Mu Mu-t'ien discussing his own poetic views:

No sooner had I arrived in Shanghai than Mo-jo took out your letter and showed it to me. I was surprised that your poetic ideas were so similar to mine! You were talking about J. Laforgue and Laforgue happened to be my spiritual maître.

Once I had his book of poems by my bed and read them carefully day and night; once I carried his book of poems to cafés, to promenades to accompany me. . . . I think the only work we have to do at present is to perfect ourselves in language. I am very interested in following French Symbolist poets in including *couleur* and *musique* in expression, and in bringing language completely under our control. . . .

If I were allowed to judge the value of poets in the past only on the basis of my own personal preference without regard to periods or schools in literary history, then among all French poets, I would like most the works of the following four poets: first, Lamartine; second, Verlaine; third, Rimbaud; fourth, Laforgue. Lamartine expressed *emotion*; Verlaine expressed *musique*; Rimbaud expressed *couleur*; and Laforgue expressed *force*.³⁸

He also compared his own poem "I came out of a café" with Verlaine's "Chanson d'automne"; apparently the former was an echo of the latter. He also admitted that his poem "The Last Sunday" bears "some resemblance to Laforgue's."³⁹

In *Hsien-tai* magazine (Vol. 5, No. 1, May 1934), Mu Mu-t'ien wrote an essay on Wang Tu-ch'ing and pointed out that Wang was much influenced by French Romanticism and Symbolism:

In the past he joined with aristocratic Romantic poets (Musset, Byron) and now he has an intimate relationship with decadent Symbolist poets. . . [and therefore] he sang out his two main motivations: first, mourning for the past, ruined aristocratic world; second, a fascination with and sadness for the decadent, pleasure-seeking life of the modern city.

In the early period, from his stay in France to the first two or three years after he returned to China (February, 1926), Wang Tu-ch'ing was steeped in Romantic, aristocratic, fantastic aestheticism and aspired to unite like-minded poets of the Creation Society: "Let us strive harder, exert ourselves to the perfection of art, learn from Baudelaire, learn from Verlaine, learn from Rimbaud and become aesthetic poets!"⁴⁰

Nevertheless, after he returned to China, he found "in our China, where is there not the ragged, the dirty, the outworn and the wasted? What place is not crowded with poor men, child laborers, beggars and street girls?"⁴¹ "I feel that all my thoughts before coming back to China were but dreams."⁴² In addition, on the third of May, 1928, the bloody Tsinan Incident occurred, and proved a great eye-opener, revealing to him the intrigues and brutality of the Chinese war-lords and foreign imperialists. Consequently, in June, 1928, Wang Tu-ch'ing came out of Axel's Castle and left on the road of revolution, propagandizing wherever he went that "the background of literature is 'politics,' and literary men are the spokesmen of political struggle!"⁴³

Following the same road were Mu Mu-t'ien and Feng Nai-ch'ao. Mu Mu-t'ien recalled his early days under the influence of French Symbolism in a self-condemning voice, saying:

When I was in college, I sank completely into the world of Symbolism. Living on the air of Symbolism, more and more I was isolated from the reality. Indeed I read many French Symbolist works. The aristocratic Romantic poets, the *fin-de-siècle* Symbolist poets, were my teachers. Although from a subjective aspect, I was faithful in the respect that I deserted my public moral duty, I wronged the people.⁴⁴

As to Feng Nai-ch'ao, even before his single symbolist collection; *Hung-sha-teng* (紅紗燈, *The Red Gauze Lantern*) came out in print (in 1928), he was already converted to the left and disowned his symbolist works because the "scenes" of his heart had been entirely changed. At that time he was intensely influenced by the Japanese Marxist Fukumoto Kazuo (福本和夫, 1894-) and became a very active fighter for proletarian literature.⁴⁵

This was to be the fate of the second wave of French Symbolism in China.

Another modern poet who adopted Symbolist techniques was Tai Wang-shu (戴望舒, 1905-1950), one of the three editors of *Hsien-tai* magazine. In a preface to *Wang-shu ts'ao* (望舒草, *Wang-shu's Drafts*) (1932), Tu Heng (杜衡), the poet's intimate friend, said,

From 1925 to 1926, Wang-shu was learning French. He read Verlaine, Fort, Gourmont, James, and, of course, they have influenced him. From the first, the poetic schools he read and loved were not limited to French Symbolism. However, Symbolist poets seemed to have some particular attraction for him. The reason is probably that the technique of Symbolism happened to be in conformity with his poetic purpose of neither concealing nor expressing oneself in writing. At the same time, the characteristic musical rhythm of Symbolist poetry had a great attraction for him and caused him thereafter not to be so particular about following the tone and rhythm patterns of Chinese classical versification.⁴⁶

In 1932, Tai Wang-shu went to France, returning in 1935.

"Shih-lun ling-cha" (詩論零札, Fragmental Comments on Poetry) was appended to *Wang-shu ts'ao*; many of these comments reverberate with French Symbolist influences, for example:

No. 4. Symbolist poets say, 'Nature is a prostitute who has been violated one thousand times,' however, who can tell whether a new prostitute would not be violated ten thousand times. The number of times she is violated does not matter; we must have a new instrument and a new way of violating her.

No. 5. The rhythm of poetry does not consist in rising or falling of words, but in rising and falling of poetic emotions, namely in the degree of poetic sentiment.

No. 6. In modern poetry, the aspect is the nuance of poetic sentiment not the nuance of words or phrases.

No. 7. Rhyme and regularity of words can preclude poetic sentiments or cause poetic sentiments to be of the same type. To make the poetic emotions conform to the old, dull, outward rules is the same as to adjust your own feet to another's shoes. Stupid people cut their own feet to fit their shoes; clever people choose suitable shoes; but wise people make the most suitable shoes for themselves.

No. 8. Poetry is not an enjoyment in one sense, but something of all senses, or supersensory.

Although Li Chin-fa broke new ground for Symbolism in modern Chinese poetry, and although he claimed "young readers in general felt it interesting," his *Wei-yü* in fact received hostile criticism and the condemnation of most readers as being "incomprehensible." In the above-quoted preface, Tu Heng said that Tai Wang-shu "also thinks it is utterly impossible to find any of the excellent merits of Symbolist poetry in all the Chinese Symbolist poets of that time. Therefore he himself tries to avoid the same abuses when he writes. . . . His poetry, a friend living far away in Peking once said, is in Symbolist form with classic contents."⁴⁷

In *Hsien-tai Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh shih-hua* (現代中國文學史話, *Talks on History of Modern Chinese Literature*), Liu Hsin-huang (劉心皇) also remarked that "When Tai Wang-shu appeared, he made masterly and smooth use of Li Chin-fa's merits, that is to say, French Symbolist merits. And wherever Li Chin-fa failed to be comprehensible, Tai Wang-shu made it possible for people to understand. Therefore, Chinese Symbolic poetry reached its zenith in the work of Tai Wang-shu."⁴⁸

The zenith of Chinese Symbolism attained by Tai Wang-shu was, ironically, the kind of poetry which "people were able to understand," and which had "Classic contents." Granted that his famous early poems, "Yü-hsiang" (雨巷, *The Alley in the Rain*), abounds in Verlainian lyricism, the suggestiveness of music emphasized by French Symbolists was denied by Tai Wang-shu in his later period when he said, "poetry cannot enlist the help of music; it should get rid of the musical component."⁴⁹ The infinite or ideal world behind the mundane aspired to by French Symbolists was neglected or displaced by the poet's personal emotions when Tai claimed that "poetry should express your own emotions."⁵⁰ The pure and absolute language pursued by French Symbolists was ignored or even misunderstood; poetic language was reduced to the ordinary language of daily life, which everybody could understand. Tai Wang-shu's self-proclaimed masterpiece, "My Memory" (我底記憶), beginning with "My memory is faithful to me, more faithful than my best friend" (我底記憶是忠實於我的, / 忠實得甚於我最好的友人), was in fact a thirty-two-line allegorical narrative poem, which, except for free poetic form, is nearly devoid of any Symbolist characteristics!

This is the fate of the third wave of French Symbolism in China.

V Conclusion

The rise, flourishing and decline of a literary trend never happens abruptly or without reason. We may therefore ask, why must French Symbolism, after having been introduced to Japan and China – apart from the question of proper understanding and sound practice of the theory, occupy a page in their literary histories? This question can be answered from different viewpoints. Viewed from the poetical situation in Japan and China at that time, the introduction of Symbolism, in a sense, can be considered to have happened at just the right moment. In Japan, the world of poetry before *Kaichō-on* continued following the romantic-lyrical route started and established by Shimazaki Tōson, and could not break away from simplicity and monotony in form and content. For example, the so-called “*Shin-pa no uta*” (新派の詩, Poetry of the New School) in *Myōjō* (明星, The Morning Star) magazine, in spite of its wild and free emotions and daring imagination, expressed simple and narrow poetic worlds, with naive techniques such as parable and description.⁵¹ In China, before *Wei-yü* was published, the whole world of poetry was occupied by *Hsin-yüeh p'ai* (新月派, The Crescent School) whose romantic lyricism and regular poetic forms had become fixed, if not stiff. Therefore, whether it was Japan about 1905 or China about 1925, whether the understanding of Symbolism was proper or not, the imitative works expressing nervous, morbidly sensitive feelings and sensuous moods opened a new path to the course of poetry, and enjoyed a vogue with young readers at that time.

Owing to the translators' propensities for appreciation and expression as well as imitators' understandings refracted through translations, French Symbolism arrived in Japan and became Japanized Symbolism, *viz.*, fantastic impressionism, just as Western Realism was Japanized and gave birth to *watakushi shōsetsu* (私小説, I-novels).

As a historical fact, Ueda Bin was the introducer of Parnassianism and Symbolism at the same time. In other words, these two naturally opposed schools were introduced by the same writer whose “sympathy, probably due to disposition, was for the Parnassian.”⁵² Consequently, as Professor Muramatsu Takeshi (村松剛) observed, “in fact, the Symbolist poems translated by Ueda Bin, whether or not they can be called Symbolist poems of the Parnassian school, had, at least, a very strong, picturesque, objectively

descriptive, static flavor.”⁵³ French Symbolist poetry originally attempted to “regain its own wealth from music,” but in Japanese translation, “the world of Mallarmé which originally spread out in accordance with the flowing of consciousness, without distinction of subject and object, was remodeled into a lyrical picture.”⁵⁴

French Symbolist poets often appealed to etymological usage of the equivocal nature of language in order to enhance suggestiveness. To achieve this effect, Ueda Bin resuscitated archaic or elegant words or even adopted new Chinese classical phrases, therefore his translation was tinged with a classical and antique grace. This kind of style was continued by later translators and writers of Symbolist poetry, and flowery language became a conspicuous stylistic feature of Japanese Symbolist poetry.⁵⁵ Except for Hagiwara Sakutarō, all Japanese major Symbolist poets were in the main writing in the literary language in irregular lines. The so-called “*bungo jiyūshi*” (文語自由詩, Free Verse in literary language) in Japan lasted about fifteen years but was absent in China, because modern Chinese poetry began simultaneously with the vernacular Chinese movement.

The introduction of Symbolist theory and works in China was not as enthusiastic or effective as in Japan. Before Li Chin-fa's *Wei-yü*, there was no intentional advocacy of Symbolism, except for some occasional articles or translations. Major Chinese Symbolist poets, such as Li Chin-fa, Wang Tu-ch'ing, Mu Mu-t'ien and Tai Wang-shu were all well versed in French, and stayed in France for years. Their understanding of Symbolism was developed from their direct reading in French, not from translations. Major Japanese Symbolist poets like Kambara Ariake, Kitahara Hakushū, Miki Rofū, or even Hagiwara Sakutarō were not competent in French, and their understanding of Symbolism probably came chiefly through translations. Such being the case, in China those who really understood Symbolism might have been limited to a few scholars or poets who could read French or, at least, English or Japanese translations. We may well wonder whether Chinese readers in general really had a sound understanding, both in depth and in breadth, of French Symbolism. Chinese Symbolist poets, in fact, did not have a common fountainhead for their poetical backgrounds, except that all went to France to absorb their knowledge individually. This contrasts with Japanese Symbolists who all took *Kaichō-on* as a starting point. Japanese readers and writers of Symbolist poetry were at least able to enjoy together the same sound of the new tide, and shared a common basis of understanding.

Among other Western trends in literature and art, Symbolism was, historically considered, a movement directed against the Parnassian school in the world of French poetry toward the end of the nineteenth century. In European literature it was a new Romanticism that sprang up after the anti-Romantic Parnassian school had come to an end. Literary trends in Japan, however, unfolded themselves in a different sequence, namely, from Romanticism to Symbolism, and then to Naturalism or Realism.⁵⁶ In China Romanticism, Realism and Symbolism were all introduced at almost the same time.⁵⁷ The temporal sequence of these different literary "isms" in Japan and China was unnatural in French terms, and this contributed to the short-lived and underdeveloped character of the Symbolist movement in the Far East.

Thus, Japanese or Chinese Symbolism, from the first, suffered from the saturation of Naturalism or Realism, and the Symbolist poets met with reproach or even denunciation and became discouraged until they gave up silently. The originators of Japanese and Chinese Symbolist poetry, Kambara Ariake and Li Chin-fa, shared the same fate. However, in May, 1919, Japanese Symbolist poets brought out *Nihon Shōchōshishū* (日本象徴詩集, *An Anthology of Japanese Symbolist Poems*) including 120 poems of 32 poets, in order to cope with the growing trend toward Realism. In January, 1922, *Nihon shakaishijin shishū* (日本社會詩人詩集, *An Anthology of Japanese Socialist Poems*) came out. These two anthologies represented the confrontation of the aesthetic and socialistic groups of the Taishō period (1912-1926).⁵⁸ In China, in 1925, the May 30 Incident at Shanghai awakened national consciousness and stimulated, along with other factors, the advance of revolutionary literature. After 1927, proletarian literature came to the fore, and "Leftist League of Chinese Writers" was established on February 16, 1930. On September 18, 1931, the Mukden Incident heralded all-out Japanese aggression and the slogan of "Literature for National Defense" was shouted out in 1935. On July 7, 1937, the outbreak of the Sino-Japanese War stimulated all Chinese writers to unite in resistance to Japanese aggression. Meanwhile Chinese Symbolist poets like Wang Tu-ch'ing, Mu Mu-t'ien and Feng Nai-ch'ao, who originally stood on an aesthetic ground, shifted to socialist, revolutionary positions and also became patriotic poets writing anti-Japanese poems. After the war, in 1949, mainland China fell into the hands of "pragmatic" materialistic Communists, and Axel's Castle was completely destroyed

Since their cultural, linguistic and racial backgrounds as well as political and social conditions were different, it is only natural that Japanese and Chinese Symbolism should differ from the original French movement, and so should Japanese Symbolism differ from Chinese Symbolism, and it is unfair to judge Chinese or Japanese Symbolism by French Symbolist criteria or *vice versa*. Although it is difficult to find counterparts in Japanese or Chinese Symbolists to the French Symbolists' conscious vying with music, aspirations toward the infinite world, and pursuit of pure language, it remains undeniable that the introduction of French Symbolism has increased understanding of Western poetry, and has helped modern Japanese and Chinese poetry to attain further growth — at least, the improvement of the use of language, the use of “symbols” as an element of poetry and “suggestion” as a poetical technique; all these Symbolist characteristics today generally permeate modern Japanese poetry and modern Chinese poetry in Taiwan.

Notes

1. The term “symbolism” has been used in various ways. In this paper, by French Symbolism I mean the second definition in René Wellek's *Discriminations: Further Concepts of Criticism*, namely, the French literary movement that rose and declined during a period of about sixty years, from Baudelaire's *Les Fleurs du Mal* (1857) to Valéry's *La Jeune Parque* (1917), a period represented by five major poets: Baudelaire, Verlaine, Rimbaud, Mallarmé and Valéry.
2. In China the earliest translators of Western works are generally considered to have been Yen Fu (嚴復, 1853-1921) and Lin Shu (林紓, 1852-1924). Yen Fu was celebrated for his introduction of classics of modern Western thought; his translation of Thomas Henry Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* (天演論, *T'ien-yen-lun*) was published in 1897. Lin Shu was renowned for his translation of novels, his *Ch'a-hua-nü i-shih* (茶花女遺事, *La Dame aux Camélias*) (1848) by Alexander Dumas fils appearing in 1899. With regard to the translation of Western poetry, the precursors were chronologically Wang T'ao (王韜, 1828-1897), Yen Fu, and Liang Ch'i-ch'ao (梁啟超, 1873-1929). In 1873, Wang T'ao published *P'u-Fa chan-chi* (普法戰紀, *A History of the Franco-Prussian War*), which included a Chinese translation of French and German national anthems. Yen Fu's *T'ien-yen-lun* included six lines from Alexander Pope's “Essay on Man” and five lines from Alfred Tennyson's “Ulysses.” Liang Ch'i-ch'ao translated Byron's “Giaour” and a canto of *Don Juan* in his “Hsin Chung-kuo wei-lai chi” 新中國未來記, *The Future of New China*) published in 1902. All these, although only fragments, preceded Ma Chün-wu's anthology.

3. The English and American poets translated were: Robert Bloomfield (1766-1823), Thomas Campbell (1777-1844), Alfred Tennyson (1809-1892), Thomas Gray (1716-1771), H. W. Longfellow (1807-1882), Charles Kingsley (1819-1875) and William Shakespeare (1564-1616).
4. See the prefatory remarks written by Inoue. Sangu Makoto (山宮允) ed. *Nihon gendaishi taikai* (日本現代詩大系), Vol. I (Tokyo: Kawade, 1974), p. 41.
5. See Ōta Ziburō (太田三郎), "Shintaishishō gaisetsu" (新體詩抄概説) in *Kindaishi no seiritsu to tenkai* (近代詩の成立と展開) (Tokyo: Yūseidō, 1969), pp. 20-21. Robert E. Morrell, "A Selection of New Style Verse," *Literature East & West*, XIX, 1-4 (Dec. 1975), p. 10.
6. Kawaguchi Akira (川口朗), "Shintaishichō no eikyō" (新體詩抄の影響) in *Kindaishi no seiritsu to tenkai*, p. 47.
7. It included sixteen poems from Byron, eleven from Goethe, and another eleven from Thomas Hood.
8. Quoted by Ch'en Ping-k'un (陳炳堃), *Tsui-chin san-shih-nien Chung-kuo wen-hsüeh-shih* (最近三十年中國文學史) (Shanghai: T'ai-p'ing-yang shu-tien, 1930), p. 61.
9. See Ma Chün-wu, "Erh-shih-shih-chi erh-ta wen-hao" (二十世紀二大文豪) in *Hsin-min ts'ung-pao* (新民叢報), No. 28. Quoted by Kurata Sadayoshi (倉田貞美) in *Shinmatsu Minsho o chūshin to shita Chūgoku kintaishi no kenkyū* (清末民初を中心とした中國近代詩の研究) (Tokyo: Taishūkan shoten, 1969), p. 291.
10. Another pioneer was Su Man-shu (蘇曼殊, 1884-1918), the author of *Pai Lun Lun shih-hsüan* (拜輪詩選, Selected Poems of Byron) which appeared in 1906. Su was inspired not by the poet's artistic qualities, but rather by his noble character and patriotic spirit, namely, by his "striving for the nation and not claiming credit for himself after having succeeded." See the preface to *Pai Lun Lun shih-hsüan* in *Man-shu ta-shih chi-nien-chi* (曼殊大師紀念集) ed. Liu Wu-chi (柳無忌) (Shanghai: Cheng-feng ch'u-pan-she), 1949, p. 115.
11. Kurata Sadayoshi, *Chugoku kindaishi no kenkyū*, p. 296.
12. *Hsien-ho chi* was published in *Hsüeh Heng* (學衡, The Critical Review), No. 47 (Dec. 1925).
13. "Preface" to *Kaichō-on*.
14. "Preface" to *Hsien-ho chi*.
15. Kitahara Hakushū, *Meiji Taishō shishi gaikan* (明治大正詩史外觀) quoted by Kubota Hanya in *Nihon no shōchōshijin* (日本の象徴詩人) (Tokyo: Kinokuniya, 1963), p. 15.
16. Mori Ōgai considered Symbolism to be Naturalism carried to the extreme. In *Shinbi shinsetsu* (審美新説, A New Theory of Aesthetics), an introduction to Johannes Volkelt's *Aesthetische Zeitfragen*, published in 1900, under the item "Naturalism," he explained: "Modern people have a nervous temperament. Their reactions toward things are over-sensitive, and in addition to the ordinary senses of sight, hearing, smell and taste, they have imaginary sight, imaginary hearing, imaginary smell, and imaginary taste. Their feelings of pleasure or

- displeasure aroused by the senses are more highly developed. The characteristics of the so-called Symbolist school lie here."
17. In an essay entitled "Dekadan-ron" (デカダン論 On Decadents) published in *Teikoku bungaku* in 1903, Andō Mushoshi ascribed "the beginning of the decadent tendency in modern literature" to Pre-Raphaelism and pointed out what he considered to be its four special features: "consciousness of ego," "affinity" with Romanticism, holding to "the free and easy, the nebulous and mystical," and a "suggestive, elegant taste" and a "feminine quality."
 18. At almost the same time that Ueda Bin introduced French Symbolism, Katayama Koson, a scholar of German literature, published his "Shinkeishitsu no bungaku" (神經質の文學, Literature of Nervous Temperament) in *Teikoku bungaku* (June-September, 1905), in which he introduced Austrian and German Symbolist poets, such as Herman Bahr (1863-1934), Hugo von Hofmannsthal (1874-1929) and Stefan George (1868-1933).
 19. Kakuda Kōkōkakyaku published an essay entitled "Hikyōshi o ronjite genkon no shifū ni oyobu" (比興詩を論じて現今の詩風に及ぶ, Poetry Composed in Accordance with *Pi* and *Hsing* Principles and Today's Poetic Style) in *Yomiuri shimbun* (讀賣新聞) (Nov. 1905). He considered all poems composed in accordance with *pi* and *hsing* to be symbolic poems.
 20. Hasegawa Tenkei's "Hyōshōshugi no bungaku" (表象主義の文學, Symbolist Literature) was published in *Taiyō* (太陽, The Sun) (Oct. 1905).
 21. Iwano Hōmei's "Shizenshugiteki hyōshōshiron" (自然主義的表象詩論, Naturalist Symbolist Poetry) was published in *Teikoku bungaku* (Mar. 1907).
 22. Kuriyagawa Hakuson's *Kindai bungaku jukkō* (近代文學十講, Ten Lectures on Modern Literature) was published in March, 1912. See Bonnie S. McDougall, "Kuriyagawa Hakuson in China," *The Introduction of Western Literary Theories into Modern China, 1919-1925* (Tokyo: The Center for East Asian Cultural Studies, 1971), pp. 108-109.
 23. The term "symbolism" was first translated into Japanese as "shōchō" (象徴) by Nakae Chōmin (中江兆民, 1847-1901) in his *I-shi bigaku* (維氏美學), the Japanese translation of Eugene Véron's (1825-1889) *L'esthétique*, published in 1883. Later on, major translators like Mori Ōgai and Ueda Bin adopted this term and it gradually became the most common word used to translate "symbolism" or "symbol." Apart from this, Shimamura Hōgetsu translated it as "hyōshō" (標象), and Hasegawa Tenkei and Iwano Hōmei translated it as "hyōshō" (表象). When was the term "shōchō" (象徴, "hsiang-cheng" in Chinese) imported into China? Who was the first to borrow this term from Japanese and use it in Chinese? At present, with limited materials at hand, I cannot trace it.
 24. McDougall, *op. cit.*, p. 251.
 25. *Ibid.*, p. 67.
 26. One month earlier, in a statement of editorial policy in the January 1920 issue of *Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao*, what Shen Yen-ping advocated was Realism. As Bonnie

- McDougall has observed, "Up to this point, in early 1921, it seems that Shen Yen-ping's own preference in literature was for humanistic idealism with a strong message, written in either a realistic or a symbolist style." *op. cit.*, p. 182.
27. One more article about Symbolism appeared in *Hsiao-shuo Yüeh-pao* in 1921. It was a news item by Shen Yen-ping introducing Arthur Symons' *Symbolist Movement in Literature*. Liu Yen-ling (劉延慶) also published an article entitled "Fa-kuo shih chih hsiang-cheng-chu-i yü tzu-yu shih" (法國詩之象徵主義與自由詩, Symbolism and *Vers Libre* in French Poetry) in *Shih* (詩, Poetry) magazine, April, 1922, two years after Shen Yen-ping's advocacy of Symbolism. Although McDougall holds that "Liu Yen-ling's account of symbolism is in fact one of the most precise and appreciative of this period," (*op. cit.*, p. 119) this and other articles about Symbolism sporadically appearing in later literary magazines seem to have been written only as studies without the particular intention to promote Symbolism.
 28. Kubota Hanya, *Nihon no shōchōshijin* (日本の象徵詩人) (Tokyo: Kinokuniya shoten, 1963), pp. 35-36.
 29. Kambara Ariake, "Inshoshugi no keikō" (印象主義の傾向, The Tendency of Impressionism), quoted by Yano Hōjin in "Kambara Ariake ron" (蒲原有明論, On Kambara Ariake). *Gendai Nihon bungaku zenshū* 58 (現代日本文學全集) (Tokyo: Chikuma shobō, 1957), p. 404.
 30. Yano Hōjin, *op. cit.*, p. 404.
 31. Kambara Ariake, "Saboten to hanabi no kansho" (仙人掌と花火の鑑賞, An Appreciation of Cactuses and Fireworks), quoted by Yano Hōjin, *op. cit.*, p. 405.
 32. Li Chin-fa, *I-kuo ch'ing-tiao* (異國情調, An Exotic Mood). (*Ch'ung-ch'ing*: Commercial Press, 1942), pp. 34-35.
 33. Su Hsueh-lin, "Lun Li Chin-fa ti shih" (論李金髮的詩, On Li Chin-fa's Poetry), *Hsien-tai*, Vol. III, No. 3 (July, 1933).
 34. Chu Tzu-ch'ing, *Chung-kuo hsin-wen-hsüeh ta-hsi* (中國新文學大系), Vol. VIII (1935, rpt. Hong Kong: Wen-hsüeh yen-chiu-she, n.d.), pp. 7-8.
 35. Included in *P'iao-ling hsien-pi* (飄零閒筆, Random Essays of Wonderings) (Taipei: Ch'iao-lien ch'u-pan-she, 1964), p. 1.
 36. Chu Tzu-ch'ing, *op. cit.*, p. 8.
 37. Mu Mu-t'ien, "T'an shih" (譯詩, On Poetry), *Ch'uang-tsaο yüeh-k'an* (創造月刊, Creation Monthly), No. 1 (July, 1927).
 38. Wang Tu-ch'ing, "Tsai t'an shih" (再譯詩, On Poetry Once Again), *Ch'uang-tsaο yüeh-k'an*, No. 1 (July, 1927).
 39. *Ibid.*
 40. Mu Mu-t'ien, "Lun Wang Tu-ch'ing" (論王獨清, On Wang Tu-ch'ing), *Hsien-tai*, Vol. V, No. 1 (May, 1934).
 41. Wang Tu-ch'ing, "Hang-hai t'ung-hsin" (航海通信, Correspondence on a Voyage), *Tu-ch'ing wen-i lun-chi* (獨清文藝論集) (Shanghai: Kuang-hua shu-chü, 1932), p. 31.
 42. Wang Tu-ch'ing, "Hsi Shih" (西施, Hsi Shih), *Tu-ch'ing wen-i lun-chi*, p. 38.

43. Wang Tu-ch'ing, "Shih-chieh hsin-wen-hsteh ti chi-tiao" (世界新文學的基調, The Keynote of the World's New Literature), *Tu-ch'ing wen-i lun-chi*, p. 75.
44. Mu Mu-t'ien, "Wo yü wen-hsteh" (我與文學, Literature and I), *P'ing-fan chi* (平凡集, Commonplace Essays) (Shanghai: Hsin-chung shu-chü, 1936), p. 143.
45. See Marian Galik, "The Red Gauze Lantern of Feng Nai-ch'ao," *Asian and African Studies* (London: Curzon Press, 1975), pp. 92-93.
46. Tai Wang-shu, *Wang-shu ts'ao* (Shanghai: Fu-hsing shu-chü, 1936), pp. 6-7.
47. Tu Heng, "Preface" to *Wang-shu ts'ao*.
48. Liu Hsin-huang, *Hsien-tai Chung-kuo wen-hsteh shih-hua* (現代中國文學史話). (Taipei: Cheng-chung shu-chü, 1971), p. 700.
49. No. 1 of "Fragmental Comments on Poetry" in *Wang-shu ts'ao*.
50. No. 15 of "Fragmental Comments on Poetry."
51. See Yano Hōjin, "Kaichō-on gaisetsu" (海潮音概説 An Introduction to Kaichō-on), *Kindaishi no seiritsu to tenkai*, p. 90.
52. "Preface" to *Kaichō-on*.
53. Muramatsu Takeshi, "Nihon no shōchōshugi — kindaishi no kussetsuten" (日本の象徴主義—近代詩の屈折點), *Bungaku* (文學, Literature). Tokyo: Iwanami, (September, 1961), pp. 38-39.
54. *Ibid.*, p. 40.
55. *Ibid.*
56. Shimazaki Tōson's book of Romantic poems, *Wakanashū* (若葉集, Young Leaves) appeared in August, 1897, before Ueda Bin's *Kaichō-on* (Oct. 1905), which was immediately followed by Tōson's Naturalistic *Hakai* (破戒, Apostasy) in February, 1906.
57. Kuo Mo-jo's volume of Romantic poems, *Nü-shen* (女神, Goddess) was published in August, 1921; Lu Hsün's (魯迅) collection of Realistic stories, *Na-han* (吶喊, Call to Arms), in August, 1923; the Romanticist Hstü Chih-mo's *Chih-mo ti shih* (志摩的詩, Chih-mo's Poems), in September, 1925, and the Symbolist Li Chin-fa's *Wei-yü*, in November, 1925.
58. See Itō Shinkichi (伊藤信吉), "Kindai shōchōshi no tenkai" (近代象徴詩の展開), *Bungaku*, (September, 1961).

