

tember schon im 4. Druck vor!), sie wecken aber auch heftige, teils emotionale Abwehr (vgl. etwa YASUMOTO Biten 安本美典: *Chōsen-go-de „Manyōshū“-wa kaidoku dekinai* 朝鮮語で「万葉集」は解読できない [Mittels des Koreanischen kann man das *Manyōshū* nicht entziffern] (Tōkyō Januar 1990).

Die archäologische (oder sich zumindest archäologisch gebende) Literatur zum Thema der frühen koreanisch-japanischen Beziehungen auch nur annähernd erschöpfend zu besprechen, würde den Rahmen einer Buchvorstellung der vorliegenden Art bei weitem überschreiten, so daß ich mich hier lediglich auf eine derzeit im Erscheinen begriffene Serie des Verlages Gakuseisha mit dem Titel *Kodai no Nihon to Kankoku* 古代の日本と韓国 beschränken will. Von diesem auf insgesamt 13 Bände angelegten Werk sind bisher (Ende Januar 1990) sieben Bände erschienen:

1. *Kodai no Kankoku to Nihon* 古代の韓国と日本
2. *Kodai Nihon to torai bunka* 古代日本と渡来文化
3. *Kodai no Kudara. Kaya to Nihon* 古代の百濟。伽耶と日本
4. *Kodai no Kōkuri to Nihon* 古代の高句麗と日本
8. *Minzokugaku kara mita Kodai no Kankoku to Nihon* 民俗学からみた古代の韓国と日本
9. *Shāmanizumu to Kankoku bunka* シャーマニズムと韓国文化
10. *Kankoku to Nihon no bukkyō bunka* 韓国と日本の仏教文化

Diese in der Regel circa 200 Seiten umfassenden Bände, durchweg von bekannten koreanischen und japanischen Autoren verfaßt (KIM Talsu 金達寿, ITÔ Abito 伊藤亜人 u. a.), bieten in leicht lesbarer Form einen brauchbaren Einstieg in das jeweilige Thema. Da allerdings Literaturangaben bei den meisten Beiträgen vollkommen fehlen oder nur sehr knapp angeführt werden, ist mehr als ein Einstieg auch kaum zu erlangen. Dies entspricht aber der Ausrichtung der Serie auf einen breiten Leserkreis, die auch durch den geringen Preis der Bände (im Einzelnen unterschiedlich, aber stets um 1400 Yen) unterstützt wird. Die eher populär gehaltene Gestaltung dieser Veröffentlichungen ermöglicht es auch dem des Japanischen kundigen Wissenschaftler oder Studenten in Europa oder Amerika, ohne allzu viel Mühe einen ersten Eindruck von der vielfältigen Welt der koreanischen Frühzeit zu bekommen, die es fraglos verdiente, sehr viel intensiver zur Kenntnis genommen zu werden, als dies bisher noch außerhalb Koreas und Japans geschieht.

Márian GÁLIK: *Milestones in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation (1898–1979)*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz 1986.

An increasing interest in the comparative approach indicates that the literatures of the world are coming into closer contact. Even in China, where this approach did not take deep roots until quite recently, a Comparative Literature Association (*Chung-kuo pi-chiao wen-hsüeh hsüeh-hui*) has been established in 1985. As for a comparative approach with regards to the literatures of China and the West, however, there are still only very few scholars who can claim to cultivate the field in a sufficient manner. Márian Gálik certainly is one of them. With this book he presents another result of his comprehensive research. He prefers to call the cross-cultural literary process an interliterary – in contradiction to intraliterary – one. The term confrontation in the title of the

book is debatable, since what is called confrontation by Gálík is more encounter or influence. Focussing on a number of important literary works the book is a companion to Gálík's excellent *Genesis of Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*, published 1980.

The book embodies the two important eras, when Chinese literature opened itself towards Western influence, that means the first decades of our century and the 1980s, our decade, however, being represented only in one of the 12 chapters. Within this wide range Gálík gives examples from the main genres of literature. The book starts with a discussion of Liang Ch'i-ch'ao and Wang Kuo-wei, the two important gate-keepers at the entrance from traditional to modern literature. Liang's concepts are traced back by Gálík to their Japanese and European sources. The same is done with Wang Kuo-wei. His indebtedness to – and misunderstanding of – Schopenhauers *Die Welt als Wille und Vorstellung* is shown most lucidly. A short note on a new article has to be added here: WANG Hsiao-p'ing: „Liang Ch'i-ch'ao tui Ji-pen cheng-chih hsiao-shuo li-lun ti ch'ü yü ch'i“, *Chung-kuo pi-chiao wen-hsüeh*. 1988/3, 102–109.

Chapter 2 describes the stories, collected by Lu Hsün in „Call to Arms“ (*Na-han*), and his early literary influences. The central argument is that the early Lu Hsün was not so much influenced by Gogol and Nietzsche than by symbols, ideas and conceptions of Leonid Andreev and V. M. Garshin. Similarities and differences of main topics and symbols (the madman, the iron house etc.) are very clearly displayed. In the discussion of the novel „Medicine“ (*Yao*) and its most difficult symbolism the following essays should be mentioned: Milena DOLEZELOVÁ-VELINGEROVÁ: „Lu Hsün's Medicine“, in Merle GOLDMAN (ed.): *Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era*, Cambridge/Mass. 1977, pp.221–231; TSENG Hua-peng / FAN Po-ch'un: „Lun Yao“, in: *Wen-hsüeh p'ing-lun*. 1979/4; KAO Ch'ang-shu: „Kuan-yü Yao yen-chiu ti chih-i“, in: *Hua-chung shih-fan ta-hsüeh hsüeh-pao*. 1985/2, pp.42–47.

In Chapter 3 Kuo Mo-jo's poetry collection „Goddesses“ (*Nü-shen*) is analyzed with regards to the influence of Rabindranat Tagore, Walt Whitman, and Goethe. That there were such influences was well known before. But how they worked in detail and how they are demonstrated by Gálík, is simply fascinating. One is also struck by Kuo's indebtedness to Chinese poetic tradition. Out of these manifold influences Kuo rose as a poet, a creator of poetic myth of his own rank.

Mao Tun's opus magnum „Midnight“ (*Tzu-ye*) is inspired by North European mythology and its description of titanic struggle between declining and rising forces. That is a quite new observation, while Mao's indebtedness to Zola's *L'argent* regarding the plot and some characters has been observed before.

The chapter on Ts'ao Yü's „Thunderstrom“ (*Lei-yu*) starts with a detailed study on early Ibsenism in China, as represented by Lu Hsün, Lin Shu and others, before the plot and characters of the play are compared to Ibsen's „Ghosts“. As in other chapters Gálík again is at his best when he takes a close look on the texts. A few minor errors: The first translation of „Wild Duck“ was published 1924, not 1928; P'an Chia-hsün's translation of „When We Dead Awaken“ was published in *Hsiao-shuo yüeh-pao* 1929, not 1928.

Studies on modern Chinese poetry still being quite rare, Gálík enters new territory in the chapters on Feng Nai-ch'ao's and Ho Ch'i-fang's symbolist poems as well as Feng Chih's sonnets.

In the chapter on Pa Chin's „Cold Night“ with its possible relations to Oscar Wilde's *Happy Prince* and Zola's *Thérèse Raquin* we find a most remarkable statement: „It is of no importance to Chinese literary history and to the study of the interliterary process whether Pa Chin came to the idea of a cold night or to the mythologeme of night,

through comparison, experience, unconscious stimuli or a study of the above-mentioned works.“ (p.218) Thus in many cases similarities of topics or characters exist without direct influences. In other cases Gálík makes suppositions lacking clear evidence, which of course is justifiable. Sometimes, however, Gálík is led astray by exactly that feature which qualifies him to write this book: his deep knowledge of Chinese and European literatures. Thus in his eagerness to find influences from European literature in the Chinese works Gálík occasionally goes too far, e.g. when he suggests a possible influence of Hesiod's „Theogony“ on Pa Chin's „Cold Night“ (pp.209–210).

A general and most impressive feature of Gálík's book is the precision and penetration of his search for literary traces of a given work or author. Generalizations are not Gálík's way of thinking. On the contrary, very often he discloses the questionableness of widespread generalizations by a close look into the texts. It is most clearly revealed by Gálík that the works generally considered to be milestones of modern Chinese literature at the same time are milestones of interliterary contact between China and the West. The important novels, dramas, and poems would not have been possible without a close encounter with Western literature. On the other hand, one should not forget that despite all the influences many of these works are genuinely Chinese. As Ts'ao Yü once put it, he accepted that he had „stolen threads of golden yarn from the masters' houses“ in order to mend his own garments, (p.110) Here a sensitive point is touched, the question whether under the impact of the West Chinese literature has lost its unique national features or not. With the present book Gálík has done a great deal to clarify this question. Until today, however, the problem is felt by many Chinese critics to be a fundamental challenge.

Bernd Eberstein, Hamburg

Elisabeth ELDE: *China's Ibsen – From Ibsen to Ibsenism*. London: Curzon Press 1987 (Scandinavian Institute of Asian Studies Monograph Series.55).

Disillusioned by the downfall of their own tradition and looking for road signs towards a modern China the Chinese were looking abroad. Particularly they did so since the May Fourth Movement. Thus Ibsen and Marx became the most influential intellectual heroes as critics of the existing social order – Ibsen as representative of individual freedom and responsibility as well as political liberalism, Marx as representative of an Utopian social order. Chinese Marxism has been studied abundantly. Thus a study of Ibsen and Ibsenism in China was overdue. Ibsen's influence on the Chinese stage has been discussed by Elisabeth Eide in several articles before.<sup>1</sup> In this book she has broadened her approach: Ibsen's influence upon the history of ideas is discussed, not his effect on

---

1 In this context two further bibliographical notes should be added: YI Xinnong / CHEN Pingyuan: „Wanou zhi jia‘ zai Zhongguo de yinxiang“ (The influence of *A Doll's House* in China), in: *Zhongshan daxue xuebao* 1984/2, pp.129–140; XING Mao: „Nuola he Lin Daojing ,Wanou zhi jia‘ he ,Qingchun zhi ge‘ nu zhurengong bijiao fenxi“ (Nora and Lin Daojing A comparative analysis of the heroines in *A Doll's House* and *Song of the Spring*), in: *Liaoning daxue xuebao* 1988/1, pp.58–60.