

MY JOURNEY THROUGH SIXTY YEARS OF INTERNATIONAL LITERARY SINOLOGY (1953 – 2012)*

Marián GÁLIK
Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia
galikm2@gmail.com

Research into the Chinese Humanities in our global age and their development is not possible without looking back and without a broad Sino-Western dialogue and mutual cooperation. In his 80th year the writer of this essay looks back at his life-long experience and brings forward his and his colleagues results of study and common endeavours from China and the West from October 1953 up to our times in different spheres of scholarly research. The different aspects of modern Chinese literature, creative, critical and comparative, intellectual history mostly of Sino-Western orientation, the development of Sinology in his student years in Prague and Peking (1953 – 1960), the best years of the Prague School of Sinology and the beginning of the study of modern Chinese literature in the West (1961 – 1968), Western and European Studies in modern Chinese literature in the years of the so-called Cultural Revolution and its aftermath (1969 – 1979), Western and European studies in the 1980 and the new beginning in China, the end of the 20th century and the beginning the 21st century. This essay also comprises other realms of study such as traditional literature, and researches into the comparative history as well as biblical studies in relation to China. Many of his teachers, colleagues and friends from former Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union (Russia), Western Europe, the United States, Canada, Australia, Mainland China, Taiwan, Hong Kong, Macao and Singapore are part and parcel of this long journey. To all of them he is indebted for their help, sympathy, criticism and understanding.

Key words: Prague School of Sinology, Soviet (Russian) and Western Sinological literary studies, the beginning and development of Chinese literary studies after 1980, Comparative Literature and the Bible in modern Chinese literature

Student Years (1953 – 1960)

On October 1, 1953 I met a girl in front of the Philological Faculty of Charles University, Prague, with her colleague from Ružomberok, Slovakia. Since they

* This study is published within the grant project VEGA 2/0141/12.

both spoke my native language, I asked them what they intended to study here. She told that she was going to study Chinese and he Japanese. She became my school-fellow and later colleague for nearly 40 years. Anna Doležalová-Vlčková (1935 – 1992) was the first author in the West with her book *Yü Ta-fu: Specific Traits of His Literary Creation*,¹ later translated partly into Chinese by Huang Chuan 黄川 and Huang Xianghui 黄向晖 under the title *Yu Dafu yanjiu* 郁达夫研究 *Research on Yu Dafu*.²

At that time in Prague the well-known Prague School of Sinology still did not exist, although some works by Professor Jaroslav Průšek (1906 – 1980) and his team had started to be written and later published.³ There was also an extensive Lu Xun library with about 50.000 volumes of Chinese books bought by Průšek and consisting also of gifts by PRC institutions from the year 1950, but those books were mostly connected with the traditional China. According to the staff of this library, in the 1950s and 1960s the biggest in Central Europe, up to about 1964 there were only 1762 titles concerning with modern Chinese literature. For me who studied Mao Dun there was only 24 different books and from them only 2 concerned with post-1949 literary criticism. There were only 7 by Yu Dafu studied later by Doležalová-Vlčková. She could write her PhD only on the basis of books I bought for her in the second-hand bookshops in the PRC in 1959! It was not better and sometimes even worse for Průšek's other students writing their M.A. theses: Oldřich Král (Ba Jin), Dana Kalvodová (Ding Ling), Jarmila Häringová (Tian Han), Zbigniew Słupski (Lao She) or Jarmila Boušková (Bing Xin). Only two of us were happy enough to have the possibility to meet the Chinese writers during our stay in Peking and to consult with them on the problems connected with their works: me with Mao Dun and Słupski with Lao She. We had the access to the classical Wang Yao's *Zhongguo xin wenxue shigao* 中国新文学史稿 *Draft of Modern Chinese Literature*⁴ and Liu Shousong's *Zhongguo xin wenxue chugao* 中国新文学初稿 *Preliminary Draft of Modern Chinese Literature*.⁵ Ding Yi's *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue shilue* 中国现代文学史略 *A Short History of Modern Chinese Literature*⁶ was

¹ Bratislava: Publishing House of the Academy of Sciences, 1971.

² URUMCHI. Xinjiang meishu xieying chupanshe, 1993.

³ KREBSOVÁ, Berta. *Lu Hsiün, sa vie et sa oeuvre*. Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1953; Jaroslav Průšek's influential essay: "Subjectivism and Individualism in Modern Chinese Literature". In *Archív orientální*, 1957, Vol. 25, pp. 261 – 286 and some of his essays in Czech.

⁴ Shanghai: Xinwenxue chubanshe, 1954.

⁵ Shanghai: Zuojiā chubanshe, 1957.

⁶ Ibid., 1955. See "Introduction". In PRŮŠEK, Jaroslav (Ed.) *Studien zur modernen chinesischen Literatur* [Studies in Modern Chinese Literature]. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1964, pp. 1 – 2. Better known in the West from LEE, Leo Ou-fan (Ed.) *The Lyrical and Epic. Studies of Modern Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana

mentioned once by Průšek but I doubt whether he ever read it. The Soviet books from the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s on modern Chinese literature were either not good, or reliable only because of much material not obtainable in Prague. From the books accessible from Western sources all were criticized or condemned by Průšek in one lecture at the beginning of 1954 addressed to the students of Sinology, among them H. van Boven's *Histoire de la Littérature Chinoise Moderne*, Peiping: Scheut Editions (普爱堂出版社) 1946, or J. Schyns and others: *1500 Modern Chinese Novels & Plays*, by the same publisher in 1948. It was mainly for their anti-Marxist tendency and their strictly Catholic point of view. More or less, we could learn mostly from the works by Wang Yao and Liu Shousong and from the Czech version of Průšek's most problematic work *Literatura osvobozené Číny a její lidové tradice* [*Literature of the Liberated China and Its Folk Traditions*].⁷ The main source of this most extensive among Průšek's scholarly work analysing the literature of the Liberated Areas was the collection: *Zhonghua quanguo wenxue yishu gongzuozhe daibiaodahui jinian wenji* 中华全国文学艺术工作者代表大会纪念文集 [*Materials of the Conference of All-China Delegates of Literature and Art*], Peking: Xinhua shudian, 1950. It was written according to the spirit of the times reflecting the post-World War!! Soviet Zhdanovian theory and Chinese Mao Zedong's ideas mostly in Zhou Yang's interpretation. According to my opinion it had little impact either among his students, among Czech scholars, or abroad.

The situation in Czechoslovakia changed in the years 1956 – 1959 when Průšek's students began to devote their time to modern Chinese literature. When I asked him in 1957 whom among the famous literary scholars I should read when writing my M.A. thesis, he mentioned only the two "Romans": Roman Jacobson and Roman Ingarden. I decided to write my thesis on Mao Dun's short stories from 1928 – 1937, because they were all collected in the book *Mao Dun duanpian xiaoshuo ji* 茅盾短篇小说集 *Mao Dun's Short Stories, Stories*, Shanghai: Kaiming shudian 1949, which were accessible in the Prague Lu Xun Library together with the book by Wu Benxing 吴本星: *Mao Dun xiaoshuo jianghua* 茅盾小说讲话 *Talks on Mao Dun's Fiction*.⁸ When writing my thesis for the first time I read one essay by Yue Daiyun 乐黛云: "Chuncan' zhong jia minxingxiang de xingge miaoxie" "春蚕"中家民形象的

University Press, 1980, p. 30 and from its Chinese translation: *Pushike Zhongguo xiandai wenxue lunwenji* 普实克中国现代文学论文集 *Průšek's Studies in Modern Chinese Literature*. Changsha: Hunanwenyi chubanshe, 1987, p. 31.

⁷ Prague: Nakladatelství Československé akademie věd, 1953. Its German translation appeared under the title *Die Literatur des befreiten China und ihre Volkstraditionen*. Prague: Artia, 1955.

⁸ Shanghai: Nitushe, 1954.

性格描写 Delineation of the People's Characters in the Family of "Spring Silkworms".⁹ Yue Daiyun was among the first whom I wanted to meet at the beginning of my two years stay at Peking University (1958 – 1960). In the Liuxuesheng bangongshe 留学设办公室 they told me that it was not possible since she was a Rightist. Thank God it was possible to read her works in the journals and in the small booklets published before the end of 1957. I read her essays when she was "cast out from the people", and had to work on the construction of the dam or feeding the hungry pigs in the village of Zhaitang about 40 miles from Peking.¹⁰ My M.A. thesis "Mao Dun Short Stories 1928 – 1937" (1958) remained unpublished just as did another essay of the same title from the year 1960. For some reason unknown to me the volume *Studies in Modern Chinese Literature*, the most typical and the only collective work of the Prague School of Sinology contains six Czech and one East German essays, but no Slovak work, not my study on Mao Dun's or Doležalová-Vlčková on Yu Dafu's short stories.

An English abstract of my M.A. thesis was read by Mao Dun and by my mentor Wu Zuxiang 吴组缜, who both encouraged me to visit Shanghai and Mao Dun's *guxiang* Wuzhen 乌镇 in order to know the local colour of the reality depicted in his stories which did not change much from the end of the 1920s up to the Anti-Japanese War in the 1930s. I followed their advice during the holidays in 1959.¹¹ At Bei da I heard the lectures by Wang Yao, Wang Li 王力 and Yan Jiayan 严家炎 and up to June 1960 I was in presence of some later Sinologists, like Yevgeniy A. Serebryakov, Viktor V. Petrov, Dimitriy N. Voskresenskiy, Elvira S. Stulova (Soviet Union), Jacques Pimpaneau, Michel Cartier (France), Renata Pisu, Filippo Coccia (Italy), Roland Felber, Eva Müller, Irmtraud Fessen-Henjes (East Germany) and the youngest of all Bonnie S. McDougall (Australia). Although we foreign students lived there in a kind of ghetto, I had the possibilities to meet Mao Dun, Lao She 老舍, Ba Ren 巴人, Ge Baoquan 戈宝权, Wang Xiyan 王西彦, Ye Yiqun 叶以群 and Liu Shousong. Especially Ye Ziming 叶子铭, the best expert on Mao Dun at that time was very helpful in my studies. At Nanking University I met Fang Guangtao 方光焘, a member of Chuangzaoshe 创造社 of 1920s and Zhao Ruihong 赵瑞蕻, specialist on Lu Xun's early essays who taught earlier Chinese at Leipzig University. At Fudan University, Shanghai, I met Wang

⁹ *Wenyi xuexi* 文艺学习. [The Studies in Literature and Art], 1956, No. 8, pp. 11 – 13.

¹⁰ DAIYUN, Yue, WAKEMAN, Carolyn. *To the Storm. The Odyssey of a Revolutionary Chinese Woman*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 54 – 77.

¹¹ More about it in my essay: "Mao Dun and Me." In *Asian and African Studies*, 1995, Vol. 4, No. 2, pp. 121 – 125.

Yongsheng 王永生, a young assistant working in the Department's library who had in his hands Ye Yiqun's "letter of introduction" and helped me to buy about 30 books in the antique bookshops of Shanghai unobtainable in other places in China. Among the teachers Zhu Dongrun 朱东润, the author of *Zhongguo wenxue pipingshi dagang* 中国文学批评史大纲 *An Outline of Chinese Literary Criticism*.¹² At Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou, I met Chen Zeguang 陈则光 who helped me very much in finding Mao Dun's writings published in Hong Kong.

On my way back from China to Czechoslovakia I visited the Institute of Oriental Studies in Moscow, and had the possibility to meet D.N. Voskresenskiy once again and to discuss the problems of common interest with Vladislav F. Sorokin, the best expert on Mao Dun in the country and with Lev Z. Eidlin, Mark E. Shneider and Leonid E. Cherkasskiy, the best experts on modern Chinese literature in the Soviet Union.

The Best Years of the Prague School of Sinology and the Beginning of the Study of Modern Chinese Literature in the West (1961 – 1968)

Most of the works devoted to modern Chinese Literature in Prague were written in the 1950s. The problem was that apart from some exceptions including works by Průšek and Křesková, these works were written in Czech or in Slovak and they could not find publishers. In 1960 for the first time East German Sinologists found the possibility to publish a selection of these works in the series *Ostasiatische Forschungen* by the German (East) Academy of Sciences, Berlin, but it took four years of editorial work and especially of wavering and doubts of the publishers. It appeared under the title *Studies in Modern Chinese Literature* mentioned above. It was the first swallow of the Prague School of Sinology in the field of modern Chinese literature that appeared in this period. Słupski's monograph *The Evolution of a Modern Chinese Writer* on Lao She¹³ appeared in 1966.

In 1961 C.T. Hsia's 夏志清 comprehensive volume *A History of Modern Chinese Fiction, 1917 – 1957*, with an appendix on Taiwan by his brother Tsi-an Hsia 夏济安¹⁴ appeared in the US. At the time when he received it, Průšek had probably already finished his well-known "Introduction" to the *Studies in Modern Chinese Literature*, and armed with his quite impressive general aspects of the political and cultural, of the literary revolution (from the feudal to

¹² Shanghai: Kaiming shudian, 1944.

¹³ Prague: Oriental Institute.

¹⁴ New Haven: Yale University Press.

modern democratic) and the general aspects of new literary creation and his fighting critical mood, he wrote a review that started the fiercest critical debate in the history of modern Chinese literature.¹⁵ According to me it was not necessary. They were both pioneers in the field. C.T. Hsia has a good companion in his extremely intelligent brother, Průšek had nobody comparable or equal to him in Prague, they both had their experience and their reading horizons which were not broad enough, their own views and their prejudices. Their different views divided those, mostly young scholars both in the East and in the West, which was not of much use. Now the works by Průšek are known in the West and C.T. Hsia's works in the East, including the PRC. It seems to me that in recent years more attention has been devoted to him in China than to Průšek.¹⁶ In spite of this Průšek enjoyed high respect in the West and in the East. He met well-known Chinese politicians, writers and scholars from China, such as Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Zheng Zhenduo 郑振铎, Lev Z. Eidlin and nearly all prominent Soviet scholars interested in modern Chinese literature, and many Western Sinologists. Prague was their meeting point. Průšek was an organizer of the XXth Junior Sinologists Conference in Prague which was cancelled because the day before on August 21, 1968, the soldiers of five Eastern European countries led by the Soviet Army invaded Czechoslovakia.

During the 1960's I devoted much time to the translation of modern Chinese literary works into Slovak (Mao Dun, Lao She, Zhang Tianyi 张天翼, Yan Wenjing 严文井) and to writing my PhD on Mao Dun's literary criticism. In 1965 Douwe W. Fokkema, the first European Sinologist interested in comparative literature published his PhD thesis *Literary Doctrine in China and the Soviet Influence*.¹⁷ This first book of a comparative character among the works on modern Chinese literature was one which showed me the way I should go in the future. I have to say that I was already well informed by the American and Soviet theories of comparative literature. In 1968 the book by Tsi-An Hsia *The Gate of Darkness. Studies on the Leftist Literary Movement in China*¹⁸ more than any other influenced the development of the studies of modern

¹⁵ See LEE, Leo Ou-fan. op.cit., pp. 195 – 266. Originally the debate was published in the journal *T'oung Pao*, 1961, Issue 49, pp. 357 – 404 and *ibid.*, 1963, pp. 428 – 474. For obvious reasons the editors of the translations of Průšek's essays in the Chinese version (see note No. 6) did not include C.T. Hsia's reply to Průšek's critique and in this way completely distorted the character of the debate in post-1987 criticism.

¹⁶ Cf. Special Column on C.T. Hsia in the journal *Huawen wenxue* 华文文学 *Taiwan-Hong Kong and Overseas Chinese Literature*, 2011, Issue 1, pp. 26 – 42. It is a pity that only his book, original and translated, are given in the appended bibliography.

¹⁷ The Hague: Mouton & Co., 1965. I received the book some days after its defence on June 2, 1965 with the words: "To my friend and colleague Marián Gálík from the author, June 20, 1965".

¹⁸ Seattle and London: University of Washington Press, 1968.

Chinese literature in the United States. And before him Olga Lang made a great contribution to the study with her extensive monograph *Pa Chin and His Writings. Chinese Youth between the Two Revolutions*.¹⁹ I read it with great interest due to my deeper sympathy for philosophical Anarchism than political Communism.

Western and European Studies in Modern Chinese Literature (1969 – 1979)

In 1969 Průšek's *Three Sketches of Chinese Literature*²⁰ appeared and in the same year (or in the first days of 1970) my PhD thesis *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*²¹ during my stay in Germany. My book was the second in Europe after Sorokin's *Tvorcheskiy put' Mao Duna* [*Mao Tun's Creative Road*].²² Both Průšek's and Sorokin's books analysed partly, or fully Mao Dun's creative works. I followed the initiative of Průšek and devoted myself to Mao Dun's literary and critical ideas. Soon after my book which was well received by the specialists in modern Chinese literature both in Europe and the USA, another of similar character was published by Bonnie McDougall: *The Introduction of Western Literary Theories into Modern China, 1919 – 1925*,²³ a valuable treasury of literary and critical materials necessary for the study of modern Chinese literature of the time of the May Fourth Movement. The real new development in the study of modern Chinese creative literature began with the publication of Leo Oufan Lee's 李欧梵 *The Romantic Generation of Modern Chinese Writers*.²⁴ It was a revised version of his PhD dissertation done under the supervision of Professor Benjamin Schwartz and John K. Fairbank, a really enviable work written under the impact of Průšek's understanding of subjectivism and individualism in modern Chinese literature, but not of his

¹⁹ Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1967.

²⁰ Prague: Academia.

²¹ Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1969. I received a copy in late January 1970.

²² Moscow: Izdatel'stvo vostochnoy literatury, 1962.

²³ Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies 1971, second printing 1977. In the same year Michelle Loi's *Roseaux sur le mur. Le Poètes occidentalistes chinois 1919 – 1949* was published in the famous Éditions Gallimard, Paris. I read it because of the wealth of material, but I did not like its Maoist tendency. Especially the chapter on symbolism, modernism and on the "metaphysicians" was instructive for me. The Hungarian Sinologist Ferenz Tökei in this year published his best work *Genre Theory in China in the 3rd – 4th Centuries*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó. In 1972 probably the best Soviet work on modern Chinese poetry written by L.E. Cherkasskyi appeared under the title *Novaia kitaiskaya poezia 20-30-e gody* [Modern Chinese Poetry of the 1920s and 1930s]. Moscow: Nauka. I wrote a long review article on the books by Loi and Cherkasskyi. See "A Comment on Two Books on Modern Chinese Poetry". In *Asian and African Studies*, 1974, Vol. X, pp. 145 – 167.

²⁴ Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1973.

stress on realism, and many teachers and colleagues at Harvard, after quite a few years of diligent research and consulting with many around him. If I may to say something critical about his work, it is possible to find that his study of European romanticism was not deep enough. Otherwise, I admire his book. Together with T.A. Hsia he was a discoverer of the “alienation” in modern Chinese literature. Of course, he treats only alienation oriented romantically. Although he does not regard himself as a literary comparatist some great characters or *littérateurs* are discussed in his book in extenso: Werther, Jean-Christophe and Byron. In the same year as Leo Lee’s book another monograph by David E. Pollard appeared: *A Chinese Look at Literature. The Literary Values of Chou Tso-jen in Relation to the Tradition*,²⁵ which was of a literary and critical character but more oriented to old Chinese literary criticism and not like Fokkema’s, or my book. It was a pioneering work in stressing the attention to Lu Xun’s younger brother at that time condemned in China as a Japanese collaborator and traitor. It was only after the Cultural Revolution (1966 – 1976) that I dared to devote a few pages to him, although I analysed his contribution to the humanist mission of literature in the then contemporary literature.²⁶

In 1976 Wolfgang Kubin published two works that attracted my attention and probably that of other scholars: his PhD thesis written under the supervision of the famous expert on Chinese traditional poetry and also translator of modern Chinese literature – Alfred Hoffmann entitled: *Das lyrische Werk des Tu Mu (803 – 852). Versuch einer Deutung*,²⁷ and “Tai Wang-shu (1905 – 1950) Ästhetizismus und Entsagung: ein Beitrag zur modernen chinesischen Dichtung vor 1949”.²⁸ I visited Bochum in 1970 but I did not meet this talented young man. The Department of Chinese studies was full of Mao’s admirers at the time and I do not understand how he could study and work on these two subjects under these conditions. Kubin in his later years became one of the best scholars in the field of Chinese literature not only in Europe but in the whole world.

In 1974 an international conference entitled: Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era was held at Endicott House, Dedham, Massachusetts, August 26 – 30, 1974. It was a milestone in the study of modern Chinese Literature. Most of the participants were Americans or Chinese Americans and the conference showed that American Sinology was playing a leading role in this field. The proceedings published later were dedicated “to Jaroslav Průšek,

²⁵ Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1973.

²⁶ GALIK, Marián. *The Genesis of Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*. Bratislava-London: Veda-Curzon Press, 1980, pp. 17 – 24.

²⁷ Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz Verlag, 1976.

²⁸ KUBIN, Wolfgang et alii. *China, Kultur, Politik, Wirtschaft. Festschrift für Alfred Hoffmann zum 65. Geburtstag*. Tübingen: Erdmann, 1976, pp. 71 – 88. Professor L.Z. Eidlin was one who very highly appreciated Kubin’s work on Du Mu during our meeting in Moscow in 1978.

whose work made this possible”, but the spirit of the book was more that of the two Hsias. From the Prague School of Sinology two scholars were present: Milena Doleželová-Velingerová with her essay “Lu Xun’s ‘Medicine’”²⁹ and Zbigniew Ślupski. Lu Xun’s work was the main object of consideration, no essays were published on Guo Moruo, Lao She, Ba Jin and also non-leftist writers. Shen Congwen, who later came to be regarded as at least such an outstanding writer as Lu Xun, or Zhang Ailing, often compared to his greatness, were not discussed as yet. William A. Lyell, Jr. supplemented the essays on Lu Xun as a “chief commander of China’s cultural revolution” whose way “he took was the very road of China’s new national culture” (Mao Zedong) in the impressive book *Lu Hsün’s Vision of Reality*³⁰ two years after the Dedham conference. Why Mr. Lyell, otherwise a socially committed scholar, took as a motto of his book just these words, I do not know. Later in 1998 wrote an essay “Down the Road that Mei Took: Women in Yin Fu’s Work” for a *Festschrift* for my 65th birthday.³¹

One year after the Dedham conference a small international conference organized by Göran Malmqvist was held in Stockholm: Nobel Symposium 32: Modern Chinese Literature and its Social Context, Nov. 4 – 9, 1975. Six scholars, three from “capitalist” and three from “socialist” countries, were to discuss the question of common interest: Michelle Loi, Irene Eber, Bonnie Mc Dougall, L.E. Cherkasskyi, Zbigniew Ślupski and me. Cherkasskyi did not come because of sudden illness, but as Boris L. Riftin told me during my later visit to Moscow, Cherkasskyi was “sovershenno zdorov” (in best health). At that time Stockholm University was full of Mao’s fans (Malmqvist was not among them) and I was regarded as an “enemy of the Chinese people” when I proclaimed the following words partly citing here:

“We, who have assembled here, and others who elsewhere study modern Chinese literature of these years, plough in fact the field of a “repudiated heritage”. The legitimate heirs, especially in the People’s Republic of China, are outside its impact. From the twenties and thirties, nobody whose words would be tolerated, with the exception of Lu Xun, has remained... Is it not, in this case, a certain type of “critical treason” to propagate precisely Lu Xun as a standard-bearer, to make of his works best-sellers? Will not Lu Xun be one of the grave-diggers of the Chinese literary life now being created and especially of the critical atmosphere which controls that life, although it does so by distorting and falsifying Lu Xun. There is real hope that the day will come when also other

²⁹ GOLDMAN, Merle (Ed.) *Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1977, pp. 221 – 231.

³⁰ Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1976.

³¹ See FINDEISEN, Raoul D., GASSMANN, Robert H. (Eds.) *Autumn Floods 秋水. Essays in Honour of Marián Gálik*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1998, pp. 335 – 350.

works, not only Lu Xun's, will reach the book counters, book shelves and readers."³² In September 1976 Mao Zedong died and two or three years later the situation in Chinese literature changed. But I had to pay for my denunciation of the extreme leftist cultural policy. For nearly five years I could not represent Czechoslovak Sinology abroad.

On November 6 – 8 1978, a small international conference "Women in Imperial and Republican China" was held on the San Giorgio Island in Venice. Among the 13 speakers were the famous Sinologists: Kazuo Enoki (Tokyo), Herbert Franke, Lionello Lanciotti and "Chronicler of the Empress" Roxane Witke, at that time a media star after publishing her bestseller *Comrade Chiang Ch'ing*.³³ At this conference I read a paper "La letteratura scritta dalle donne chinesi prima del 1917,"³⁴ Women's problems *Fieber* came in the 1980s and this conference was one of its first swallows. My essay was one of the first studies in English concerning the traditional Chinese women's poetry, but it remained unnoticed by the researchers³⁵ later, since they could find more material in the works by Chinese experts such as Liang Yizhen, Tan Zhengbi, Tao Qiuying, Jiang Liangfu from the time between the two World Wars, which I read at Peking University in 1958 – 1960.

The year 1979 witnessed the highest development of the literary Sinology of the whole Soviet Era. Three monographs appeared that represented the *apogée* of Russian endeavours, certainly in the second half of the 20th century: L.S. Lisevich's *Literaturnaia mysl' Kitaia na rubezhe drevnosti I srednykh vekov* [*The Literary Mind of China at the Turn of the Ancient Times and the Middle Ages*],³⁶ B.L. Riftin's *Ot mifa k romanu. Evoliutsia izobrazhenia personazha v kitaiskoi literature* [*From Myth to the Novel. The Evolution of Character Description in Chinese Literature*]³⁷ and V.F. Sorokin's *Kitaiskaia klasicheskaia drama XII – XIVvv. Genesis, struktura, obrazy, siuzhety* [*Chinese Classical Drama. Genesis, Structure, Images and Plots*]³⁸ Lisevich's book is

³² GÁLIK, Marián. "On the Social and Literary Context in Modern Chinese Literature of the 1920s and 1930s." In MALMQVIST, Göran (Ed.) *Nobel Symposium 32: Modern Chinese Literature and its Social Context*. Stockholm: no names of Publishers is given, pp. 32 – 33.

³³ Boston-Toronto: Little, Brown and Company, 1977.

³⁴ LANCIOTTI, Lionello (Ed.) *La donna nella Cina imperiale e nella Cina repubblicana*. Firenze: Leo S. Olschki Editore, 1980, pp. 147 – 160. Its English version appeared under the title: "On the Literature Written by Chinese Women prior to 1917." In *Asian and African Studies*, 1979, Vol. XV, pp. 65 – 100.

³⁵ Sharon Shi-juan Hou. "Women's Literature." In NIENHAUSER, William H. Jr. (Ed.) *The Indiana Companion to the Traditional Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986, p. 193.

³⁶ Moscow: Nauka, 1979.

³⁷ Ibid.

³⁸ Ibid.

concerned with an elucidation of the philosophical and conceptual issues connected with the most important categories of traditional Chinese literary criticism (usually inseparably bound with philosophical thinking), with certain basic concepts of old Chinese literary criticism that have played an inseparably weighty role in the history of Chinese literature of the traditional period. This was, at least as far as I know, the first attempt in world literature at a scholarly examination of a larger number of terms from the domain of Chinese literary criticism in close connection with Chinese philosophical and aesthetic thought. First of all there was the question of *Dao* 道 (The Way), its phenomenal manifestation *de* 德 (virtue or energy), and its literary transformation *wen* 文 (mainly the works of literature). More attention than to other concepts is devoted to *bi* 比 and *xing* 興. These two belong among the most problematic concepts of European poetics in general. European scholars commit an error if they try in their explanation to bring the terms closer to the European reader with the aids of concepts of European poetics, for they thereby tear them out of the system of traditional Chinese poetics, which is considerably different from its European counterpart. Traditional Chinese poetics is not primarily concerned with an investigation of the verbal texture of a work, with an exact differentiation or definition of poetic tropes or figures of speech, but is interested in understanding essential phenomena standing behind the work, or such as make its origin possible, in determining the philosophical and ethical hot-bed on which or from which it originates.³⁹

Riftin in his book began with the Chinese mythological age in the centuries B.C. and finished with the initial development of Chinese historical romances in the 15th – 16th centuries. *From Myth to the Novel* shows some degree of connection with his outstanding book *Istoricheskaia epopeia i folklornaia traditsia v Kitaie. Ustnye i knizhnye versii "Trojetsarstvia"* [*Historical Romance and Folklore Tradition in China. Oral and Literary Versions of "Romance of the Three Kingdoms"*].⁴⁰ Riftin was one of the most outstanding experts on Oriental mythology in Russia and in the first part of this work he devoted much place to the literary and artistic "signs" of Fuxi, Nüwa, Shennong, Huangdi, Yao, Shun, and "dragon's face" and other characteristic features of the Chinese

³⁹ GÁLIK, Marián. "A Comment on Three Soviet Books on Traditional Chinese Literature." In *Asian and African Studies*, 1981, Vol. XVII, pp. 202 – 203. It is a pity that the book by Lisevich remained unknown to the Sinologists outside the former Soviet Union and only on the basis of my article "Marginalia to the Contemporary Situation in Chinese Comparative Studies," became known to the readers of the short-lived journal *Chinese/International Comparative Literature Bulletin*, No. 3, 1992, pp. 2 – 3. See also Tse Yiu-man 謝耀文. "Fu, Bi, Xing". In *Tamkang Review*, 1994, Vol. XXIV, Nos. 2 – 4, pp. 65 – 66.

⁴⁰ Moscow: Glavnaia redaktsia vostochnoi literatury, 1970.

mythical heroes. In the second part he analysed the portraits of characters in medieval Chinese narrative prose, particularly in *pinghua* and in the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*. Especially narratological aspects were stressed and carefully studied which up to that time were neglected in the study of mythology, apart from a little study by Japanese scholars, and this book is the first of its kind in the study of narrative methods in medieval Chinese fiction.⁴¹ At the time of its publication, V.F. Sorokin's monograph was the best of its kind in European Sinology concerning the dramas of the time of the Mongol Dynasty. It appeared three years after Shih Chung-wen's *The Golden Age of Chinese Drama: Yüan Tsa-chü*.⁴² Professor Shih's monograph was more addressed to the broad audience. Its best part is concerned with the language of the dramas for which she was an excellent expert. Sorokin's best work in his scholarly career was written for specialists. For me as a non-specialist the most interesting and useful part were the abstracts of all 162 dramas on the basis of two collections published in the PRC: *Yuanqu xuan*, 4 vols. from the year 1958 and *Yuanqu xuan waibian*, 3 vols. from the year 1959. The best known Soviet work in the West by Vladimir Semanov *Lu Siñ I ego predshestvenniki* from the year 1967, translated into English by Charles J. Alber as *Lu Xun and His Predecessors*⁴³ had a considerable impact on the research in the West,⁴⁴ but although it could be characterized as major work, it does not have such value as the three just mentioned and his later monograph *Evoliutsia kitaiskogo romana. Konets XVIII- nachalo XX. v. [Evolution of Chinese Novel. The End of the 19th to the Beginning of the 20th Century]*.⁴⁵

Western and European Studies in the Years 1980 – 1989

The last mentioned book by Semanov was positively cited in the studies by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová and Jean Duval in *The Chinese Novel at the Turn of the Century*,⁴⁶ otherwise the result of a project carried out in the 1970s at the University of Toronto. It was done under the guidance of Doleželová-Velingerová and her husband Lubomír Doležel, well-known theorist of the

⁴¹ On the day when I was writing this passage, B.L. Riftin died in Moscow on October 3, 2012 in his 80th year.

⁴² Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1976.

⁴³ White Plains: Sharpe, 1980.

⁴⁴ See the excellent paper by EBER, Irene. "The Reception of Lu Xun in Europe and in America: The Politics of Popularization and Scholarship." In LEE, Leo Oufan (Ed.) *Lu Xun and His Legacy*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985, pp. 259 – 261 and pp. 266 – 270.

⁴⁵ Moscow: Izdatel'stvo "Nauka". Glavnaia redaktsia vostochnoi literatury, 1970.

⁴⁶ Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1980, pp. 3 – 4, 16, 39, 42, 55 – 56 and 187.

Prague Linguistic Circle. It is a good example of a joint venture of Prague Structuralists and Western Sinologists. My essay entitled “On the Influence of Foreign Ideas on Chinese Literary Criticism (1898 – 1904)” was also mentioned and briefly characterized in the essays by Doleželová-Velingerová, my colleague from the Prague School of Sinology in the 1950s and 1960s.⁴⁷

I do not know what time exactly the book edited by Doleželová-Velingerová was published in 1980. I know only that my most cited monograph both in the West and in China: *The Genesis of Modern Chinese Literary Criticism, 1917 – 1930*⁴⁸ appeared in the first days of that year. This book seems to be my most influential work with its 13 reviews and nearly 150 citations from foreign scholars. It was the first work concerned with modern Chinese criticism from the comparative point of view in the West since Amitendranath Tagore’s *Literary Debates in Modern China*,⁴⁹ which was more or less a “child” of Li Helin’s 李和林 *Jin ershi nian Zhongguo wenyi sichao lun* 近二十年文艺思潮论 *The Chinese Literary Mind in the Last Twenty Years*.⁵⁰ Li Helin’s book was a rich material source helping us to create the history of modern Chinese literary criticism, but not its scholarly history. Merle Goldman’s *Literary Dissent in Communist China*⁵¹ analysed the conflicts between the CCP and China’s more liberal writers in the 1940s and 1950s.

Probably the best book by Edward M. Gunn *Unwelcome Muse. Chinese Literature in Shanghai and Peking 1937 – 1945*,⁵² analysed the works of a period to a great extent not studied before him. I personally enjoyed Chapter Four of his book: The Resurgence of Tradition: The Familiar Essay (pp. 151 – 191). The specificity of the Chinese essay was not studied deeply enough up to our days. His attention to the essays by Zhou Zuoren brought interesting results.

One year later Perry Links published a book *Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies. Popular Fiction in Early Twentieth-Century Chinese Cities*,⁵³ where he took as an object of his study the realm of the entertainment fiction and love stories criticized and sent to hell in the time of the May Fourth Movement. It seems that in the 1970s the taste and opinion of the American Sinologists changed as may be seen from the Preface where many well-known experts are mentioned as the mentors and readers in the time when preparing the manuscript for

⁴⁷ Ibid., pp. 16, 28 and 36 – 37.

⁴⁸ Bratislava-London: Veda-Curzon Press, 1980. Upon recommendation by Yue Daiyun it appeared in Chinese translation under the title: *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue piping fasheng shi* 中国现代文学批评发生史. Peking: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe, 1997, 2nd Ed., 2000.

⁴⁹ Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Studies, 1967.

⁵⁰ Shanghai: Shenghuo shudian, 1940.

⁵¹ Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1967.

⁵² New York: Columbia University Press, 1980.

⁵³ Berkeley, Los Angeles: University Press, 1981.

publication. A comparative tendency like Xu Zhenya's 徐枕亚 Li Niang 梨娘 and Samuel Richardson's Clarissa,⁵⁴ not very common among his American colleagues, is typical of this book. A similar book on one outstanding writer of the Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies literature by Hsiao-wei Wang Rupprecht *Departure and Return. Chang Hen-shui and the Chinese Narrative Tradition*⁵⁵ was written within the interliterary framework. The stress on the traditional literary technique especially narrative methods is one of the most precious achievements of this woman scholar. Professor Chow Tse-tung highly appreciated her work in his "Preface".⁵⁶

In 1983 the first great work on modern Chinese drama by Bernd Eberstein *Das chinesische Theater im 20. Jahrhundert*⁵⁷ appeared in Germany. This comprehensive meticulous research from the first writings about the Chinese traditional theatre in the 16th century (Juan Gonzales de Mendoza) up to the Jiang Qing's eight "revolutionary masterpieces" (geming yangbanxi 革命样板戏) is according to my knowledge unsurpassed up to now.

In 1986 my *Milestones in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation (1898 – 1979)*⁵⁸ was published having its "logotype" on the cover page Lu Xun's pseudonym Ling Fei 令飞 which I have translated as in Martin Luther's German Bible: "Vögel sollen fliegen" from the *Genesis, 1, 20*: And God said, "Let the waters bring forth swarms of living creatures, and *let the birds fly* (underscored by me, M.G.) above the earth across the firmament of the heavens." Liang Qichao and Wang Guowei's essays on the modern literary ideas, Lu Xun's *Call to Arms*, Guo Moruo's *The Goddesses*, Mao Dun's *Midnight*, Cao Yu's *Thunderstorm*, Hong Shen's *Zhao-the King of Hell*, Feng Naichao's *The Red Gauze Lantern*, He Qifang's *Paths in Dreams*, Feng Zhi's *Sonnets*, Ba Jin's *Cold Night*, Lao She's *Looking Westward to Chang'an* and Lu Xinhua and others about the "Odyssey of Cultural Revolution". The analysis of Sha Yexin's comic play *If I Were Real had to be* be omitted from this book due to its critical tendency toward the political cadres after the Cultural Revolution, who did not change their style of life in the new situation. Upon the recommendation of Yue Daiyun the book was translated into Chinese by Wu Xiaoming, Zhang Wending and others and published into Chinese in 1990 and

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, pp. 56 – 57.

⁵⁵ Hong Kong: Joint Publishing Co., 1987.

⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. XV – XVII.

⁵⁷ Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz, 1983.

⁵⁸ Bratislava-Wiesbaden: Veda-Oto Harrassowitz 1986. My treatise of Sha Yexin's work appeared as a part of the study: "In Footsteps of the Inspector-General: Two Contemporary Chinese Plays." In *Asian and African Studies*, 1984, Vol. XX, pp. 49 – 80.

reprinted in 2008.⁵⁹ Together with the Chinese version of *The Genesis of Modern Chinese Literary Criticism (1917 – 1930)* it is on the list of recommended books for the Universities and PhD students of the PRC.

In 1985 a volume dedicated to the centennial of the birth of Lu Xun was published with thirteen papers from the conference held at Pacific Grove California, August 23 – 28, 1981.⁶⁰ From the papers in the proceedings I liked most David E. Pollard's "Lu Xun's *Zawen*"⁶¹ not much studied before him in the West and I appreciated two contributions by Irene Eber: "The Reception of Lu Xun in Europe and America: The Politics of Popularization and Scholarship"⁶² and "A Selective Bibliography of Works by and about Lu Xun in Western Languages".⁶³ I am very indebted to Irene Eber that she mentioned my first article about Lu Xun from my student years on the occasion of 20th anniversary of Lu Xun's death which was my birthday as a future Sinologist.⁶⁴ At the beginning of her first paper there are the names of ten scholars who supplied her with the materials and bibliographical items. I supplied her with articles she needed, but my name does not appear. I asked her in our secret correspondence not to mention me. "Wild goose" who served us as an intermediary in sending and receiving the letters was Ellis Tinios, an art historian at the University of Leeds. Every correspondence with the citizens was strictly forbidden for the employees of the Universities and Academies of Sciences in Czechoslovakia up to the end of 1989.

In 1986 on the occasion of the 50th anniversary of Lu Xun's death an international workshop was held at the University of Bonn, October 17 – 19. Scholars from different European countries took part in this workshop organized by Wolfgang Kubin. The experts invited from the PRC, Canada and Soviet Union did not join the fourteen scholars from both German states, Czechoslovakia, Holland, Norway and Austria. In this workshop mainly the literary creative or literary theoretical works were studied, and political and revolutionary aspects were partly put aside. For me the most interesting was the paper presented by Fritz Gruner (Humboldt University, Berlin) "Lu Xun's frühe Schrift *Über die Kraft der romantischen Poesie (Moluo shili shuo)* that was probably at least partly prepared under the guidance of Professor Zhao Ruihong 赵瑞蕻 who was a teacher in Leipzig where Gruner studied and worked

⁵⁹ *Zhongxi wenxue guanxi de lichengbei* 中西文学关系的里程碑 (1898 – 1979). Peking: Peking University Press.

⁶⁰ LEE, Leo Ou-fan (Ed.) *Lu Xun and His Legacy*. Berkeley-Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1985.

⁶¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 54 – 89.

⁶² *Ibid.*, pp. 242 – 273.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, pp. 275 – 285.

⁶⁴ GÁLIK, Marián. Lu Sün – priateľ mládeže [Lu Xun – a Friend of Youth]. In *Smena* [Shift], September 20, 1956.

before.⁶⁵ My paper “Interliterarische Aspekte. Lu Xuns *Die ewige Lampe* (Changming deng) und W.M. Gáršins *Die Rote Blume* (Krásnyj cvetók) appeared both in German and in Chinese versions.⁶⁶ The interliterary aspects of Lu Xun’s creative writings were also stressed in the papers by Klaas Ruitenbeek⁶⁷ and Lutz Bieg.⁶⁸

The same year in the first week of June another more international conference organized by Helmut Martin (Ruhr University) and Joseph S.M. Lau (University of Wisconsin) entitled: The Commonwealth of Chinese Literature. I have argued that the “commonwealth may well be inappropriate for both semantic and geopolitical reasons”⁶⁹ and I preferred the term “community” instead, C.T. Hsia was for the “commonwealth” possibly because of the British Commonwealth of Nations as an ideal political unity. The “star” of the conference was Leo Lee with his “Beyond Realism: Thoughts on Modernist Experiments in Contemporary Chinese Writing”.⁷⁰ Mostly written on the materials from Taiwan and outside the PRC he spoke about a problem very much in vogue, he attracted the attention of the participants, and many positive comments. In contrast to him my paper “Interliterary and Intraliterary Aspects of the Study of Post-1918 Chinese Literature”,⁷¹ read on the first day just after him, did not provoke one word from the audience, either positive or negative, and was put as an “Appendix” to the published proceedings. The participants included the *élite* of American, Canadian, Australian, German and Spanish Sinology as well as Sinologists from New Zealand and Hong Kong.

One year later Jeffrey C. Kinkley published his up to now best work *The Odyssey of Shen Congwen*.⁷² Written under the guidance of Professor Benjamin Schwartz at Harvard, he used many years of preparation. At that time not much has been written about Shen Congwen and frank talk about him was “hard to publish in Chinese”.⁷³ Kinkley had patience to interview some scores of the people who knew or studied Shen Congwen, and to visit many Universities, libraries and archives in China and the United States. His work is a treasury of

⁶⁵ See KUBIN, Wolfgang (Ed.) *Aus dem Garten der Wildnes. Studien zu Lu Xun (1881 – 1936)*. Bonn: Bouvier Verlag, 1989, pp. 19 – 27.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, pp. 125 – 137 and *Lu Xun yanjiu yuekan* 鲁迅研究月刊 In *Lu Xun Studies Monthly*, 1993, No. 5, pp. 35 – 41.

⁶⁷ *Lu Xun und Der kleine Johannes*. In KUBIN, Wolfgang (Ed.), *op.cit.*, pp. 111 – 123.

⁶⁸ Unkraut oder vom verzweifelten Widerstand gegen das Nichts. Vorläufige Bemerkungen zu Lu Xuns Prosadichtung *Yecao*. *Ibid.*, pp. 149 – 164.

⁶⁹ GOLDBLATT, Howard. “Introduction”. In GOLDBLATT, Howard. (Ed.) *Worlds Apart. Recent Chinese Writing and Its Audiences*. Armonk, New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1990, p. 3.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, pp. 64 – 77.

⁷¹ *Ibid.*, pp. 231 – 245.

⁷² Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 1987.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, pp. vii – ix.

materials. One may see that he started as a historian and his interest in Shen Congwen was originally connected with the study of nonfiction materials concerned with West Hunan and its special flavour. He devoted less attention to analysis of the literary aspects of Shen Congwen's works than to the hotbed of the local, social, religious, and ethical institutions necessary for their creation. Also later in his comprehensive books *Chinese Justice, the Fiction, Law and Literature in Modern China*⁷⁴ and the rather similar *Corruption and Realism in Late Socialist China. The Return of the Political Novel*⁷⁵ are faithful to the historical tendency in contemporary society in the "over harmonized" *bei hexie de* 被谐和的 Chinese society. More than any American scholars he actively participated in the Sinological literary conferences at Smolenice Castle (Slovakia), Bratislava and Vienna (1989, 1993, 1999 and 2003) organized by me or my friends.

In 1989 another excellent monograph appeared comparable to Kinkley's *chef d'oeuvre* by Gregory Lee Dai Wangshu. *The Life and Poetry of A Chinese Modernist*,⁷⁶ dedicated to Shi Zhicun 施蛰存. It is similar to Kinkley's "Shen Congwen" in wealth of material, mainly interviews, correspondence, manuscripts, translations, the analyses of the works by Dai Wangshu and the studies about him. I wonder why there is not an interview with René Etiemble who was the best French friend of Dai Wangshu and later in the 1950s up to 1980s the most prominent representative of the French School of Comparative Literature. In our private meeting Etiemble mentioned only Dai Wangshu as his Chinese friends and even asked from me a copy of *Wang Shu cao* 望舒草 (1933). He had received it once from Dai Wangshu as a present but somehow he lost it.

In 1989 I received permission to organize the first Sinological symposium and to invite Chinese and Taiwanese citizens. The conference entitled "Interliterary and Intraliterary Aspects of the May Fourth Movement 1919 in China"⁷⁷ was held at the romantic Smolenice Castle near Bratislava on March 13 – 17, a few days before the 70th anniversary of this great event in modern Chinese political and literary history. This was the first conference devoted to this anniversary of the May Fourth outside China. The proceedings of this conference of the same name were regarded as an "appeal", provided that they were not among 67 participants from the PRC, USSR, USA, Canada, both German states, Austria, Italy, Norway, Switzerland, West Berlin, Hong Kong and Czechoslovakia. A

⁷⁴ Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000.

⁷⁵ Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2000. I received a copy of this book with the author's dedication: For Marián, The Uncorrupted (even if Decadent!) – with utmost admiration and respect. Jeff

⁷⁶ Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1989.

⁷⁷ Bratislava: Veda. Publishing House of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, 1990.

specific feature of this conference was the relatively high number of Hong Kong participants: Jao Tsung-I, Kwok-kan Tam, Chan Wing-ming, Kwong Kin Hung, C.S. Chan and Leung Pui Kam, who were usually not invited to the Sinological conferences in the Western countries. The USA was represented by Jeffrey C. Kinkley, Ng Mau-sang, Michelle Yeh, John Kowallis and Yu-shih Chen (with Taiwanese passport) with her husband HaoWang, mathematician and interviewer of Kurt Gödel. From the PRC came Ge Baoquan, Ni Ruiqin and my friend Ye Ziming. Wang Meng was invited but due to his responsibility as Minister of Culture he could not participate. From the 25 papers, in a few cases slightly abridged, read at the symposium, I mention only two: Yu-shih Chen's "Image of the Fallen Woman and the Making of the Chinese Proletarian Consciousness: Mao Dun's *Shizao xing* (1936),"⁷⁸ because I like this short story by Mao Dun, and Goat Koei Lang-Tan's "The European Literature of Decadence and the So-called Modernist Chinese Short Stories from the 1920s and 1930s: Interliterary Study of Arthur Schnitzler, Shi Zhecun and Ling Shuhua,"⁷⁹ because I am a Decadent (see Kinkley's opinion) and because her research at that time was up-to-date and completely new for me.

The study of modern Chinese literature of the first half of the 20th century ended after 10 years of preparation and writing with publication of *A Selective Guide to Chinese Literature 1900 – 1949*,⁸⁰ edited by Göran Malmqvist with the help of Milena Velingerová-Doleželová (novels), Zbigniew Słupski (short stories), Lloyd Haft (poems) and Bernd Eberstein (dramas). Ten years of work was not a waste of time and energy and this unusually long project sponsored by the Research Programme in Chinese Studies of the European Science Foundation with the researchers from many countries brought a treasury of information facilitating the initial stage of research of a great number of modern Chinese men of letters and the studies (books and articles) about them. I contributed to the volumes on novels and short stories.

The End of the 20th Century (1990 – 2000)

The international conference "Contemporary Chinese Fiction and Its Literary Antecedents," sponsored by the John King Fairbank Center for East Asian Research, with support from the National Endowment for Humanities and *The China Times* took place in the Good Hall, Room 111, Harvard University, May 11 – 13, 1990. Its aim was "how Chinese literature since the Cultural

⁷⁸ Ibid., pp. 155 – 166.

⁷⁹ Ibid., pp. 139 – 153.

⁸⁰ MALMQVIST, Göran (Editor-in-Chief) *A Selective Guide to Chinese Literature 1900 – 1949*. 4 vols. Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1988 – 1989.

Revolution (1966 – 1976) shows continuity with what is commonly known as ‘May Fourth’ literature, that is, literature from 1918 to approximately 1930.”⁸¹ I was invited to visit the United States by Leo Lee for a lecture tour and had the possibility to visit 7 Universities and I used this opportunity to present a lecture at this important conference entitled “Wang Meng’s Mythopoeic Vision of Golgotha and the Apocalypse.” Patrick Hanan was Chairman of the session and Bonnie McDougall as a commentator appreciated it positively as contribution to the new topics in the study of modern Chinese literature. The editors may have had a different view, or they regarded it, as in the case of other non American and Canadian scholars, as including Yue Daiyun, Rudolf Wagner and Eva Hung, as not good enough to appear in the proceedings of the conference. In any case the conference may be regarded as a beginning in the study of the new literature of the end of the century outside the PRC and Taiwan. Among the papers read at the conference I especially appreciated Heinrich’s Frühauf’s “Urban Exoticism in Modern and Contemporary Chinese Literature”⁸² and Lydia H. Liu’s “Invention and Intervention: The Making of a Female Tradition in Modern Chinese Literature”.⁸³ At this conference David Der-wei Wang with his paper “Imaginary Nostalgia: Shen Congwen, Song Zelai, Mo Yan and Li Yongping” started “triumphant journey” as one of the most representative scholars of modern Chinese literature outside China. On May 3 I visited Sacramento, California, met Lewis S. Robinson who presented me his PhD dissertation *Double-Edged Sword. Christianity & 20th Century Chinese Fiction*,⁸⁴ which changed my orientation in the study of modern Chinese and partly also classical literature (*Zuo zhuan* 左传). Other places of my visit in the USA were: Chicago, Boulder, Berkeley, Stanford, San Francisco, San Diego and New York.

In the same year two international conferences were held in Taiwan: a smaller one: The third International Conference on Modern Chinese Literature, June 24 – 26, 1990, Tsinghua University University, Xinchu, organized by the New Land Literature Foundation and later: The International Conference on Translation of Chinese Literature, November 16 – 18, 1990, Taiwan National University, organized by the Council for Cultural Planning and Development. The first one was not so much “international” since apart from Chinese living in America (Xu Daran 許達然, Chen Ruoxi 陳若曦) and Japanese 山田敬三 no foreigners came. Professor Yan Jiayan, Peking University, did not participate for

⁸¹ See the proceedings of the conference: Ellen Widmer: “Preface”. In WIDMER, Ellen, and Der-wei Wang David. *From May Fourth to June Fourth. Fiction and Film in Twentieth-Century China*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1993, p. ix.

⁸² *Ibid.*, pp. 133 – 164.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, pp. 194 – 220.

⁸⁴ Hong Kong: Tao Fong Shan Ecumenical Centre, 1986.

the obvious reasons. I was the only one Westerner there with a contribution “Mao Dun xiaoshuo zhongde shenhua shiye” 茅盾小说中的神话视野. The famous Taiwanese writer of leftist orientation Chen Yingzhen 陳映真 who should have been the Chairman of my session, did not come and my paper like all the others was printed separately⁸⁵ as a small brochures. The larger conference at Taiwan National University was really international with the students of translation and translators of Chinese literature, traditional and modern from the USA, Europe, Taiwan, Hong Kong, South East Asia, South Korea and New Zealand. Nobody came from the PRC. From the foreign guests probably the keynote speaker Cyril Birch and Göran Malmqvist, as a Chairman of the panel “The Auditorium” with the three representatives of the International Comparative Association (CCLA): José Lambert (Leuven), Theo Hermans (London) and Theresa Hyun (Seoul) were most interesting for the audience. I liked most Rudolf G. Wagner’s “Translating Chinese Philosophical Texts, “because it helped me understand this extremely important problem in the heaps of bad translations of Chinese philosophical texts we find around us. Similarly to the proceedings of the Harvard conference from the year 1990, the proceedings⁸⁶ included no papers, apart from American, English and John M. Minford’s (New Zealand) and Ching-hsi Peng (Taiwan). Are other European and Asian scholars so bad they are not worthy of the attention of the international Sinological community and American Publishers?

After his comprehensive and very solid researches into the Chinese poetics from *Shijing* up to Xie Lingyun and Tao Yuanming and partly later in relation to Nature,⁸⁷ Wolfgang Kubin decided to organize some new international conferences (before 1986 I was not allowed to participate in some of them). Especially three of them were important in the 1990s: “200 Jahre *Traum der Roten Kammer (Honglouloumeng)* in 1992, the proceedings of which were published only in 1999 because of financial reasons, ten years after the first “call for papers” was sent to the later participants. The conference took place on April 21 – 23, 1992 at the Festive Hall of Bonn University. All participants and their papers were read and published in German and were from both German states, Chinese residents in Germany, two scholars from Czechoslovakia and one from Switzerland. The conference had not only to pay homage to this work

⁸⁵ Its Chinese version was published under the same title in *Dongbei shida xuebao*, 1993, No. 2, pp. 15 – 18 and its English version “The Mythopoeic Vision in Mao Dun’s Fiction, 1929 – 1942”. In *Bulletin of the International Southern Society*, 1993, No. 4, pp. 169 – 178.

⁸⁶ EOYANG, Eugene, YAOFU, Lin (Eds.) *Translating Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1995.

⁸⁷ KUBIN, Wolfgang. *Der durchsichtige Berg. Die Entwicklung der Naturanschauung in der chinesischen Literatur*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1985.

and its author, but also to “to end the silence of German-speaking Sinology in relation to this most important Chinese novel”.⁸⁸ My paper of interliterary character “Melancholie und Melancholiker” analysed two melancholic literary characters (Lin Daiyu and Jia Baoyu) and two real personalities (Friedrich Nietzsche and Paul Réé) and their literary and real partners (Xue Baochai and Lou Andreas-Salomé).⁸⁹ The poet Gu Cheng wanted to participate, but could not since the official language of the conference was German only, but on April 24 morning I met him and his wife Xie Ye in their flat in Berlin, Storkwinkel Street 12, and we discussed together the problem of the Eternal Feminine in *Honglouloumeng* and in Johann Wolfgang Goethe’s *Faust*.⁹⁰ Gu Cheng did not believe in the Eternal Feminine but he was an admirer of “maidenhood” just as Jia Baoyu a part of his Jinling shier chai 金陵十二钗 Twelve Beauties of Jinling. For Jia Baoyu it was especially Qingwen 晴雯 and for Gu Cheng Ying’er 英儿.

Exactly two years before on May 21 – 23, 1990, the “workaholic” Kubin organized another conference “Mein Bild in Deinem Auge. Exotismus und Moderne: Deutschland – China im 20. Jahrhundert with the aim of studying some neglected aspects of modern Sino-German intellectual history. Only the German speaking scholars participated in this conference with me as the only exception as Satan at the Heavenly Assembly in the biblical *Book of Job*, 2, 1 – 7, or Mephistopheles in “Prologue in Heaven” in *Faust*, Part One. My opinions on exoticism contradicted to some extent those of my good friend Rolf Trauzettel, Kubin’s colleague from Bonn University. Therefore I decided not to publish it in the proceedings entitled just as the conference.⁹¹ My paper appeared later in English in a Slovak university journal.⁹² From eleven papers in the proceedings I most liked “Das Deutschland in der chinesischen Literatur des zwanzigsten Jahrhunderts” by Yuan Zhiying, teacher of the Chinese language at Bonn University and “Deutschland in der chinesischen Reiseliteratur der zwanziger und dreissiger Jahre” by Heiner Frühauf, one of the best students of Leo Lee and an excellent expert on Exoticism who, alas, very soon left Chinese studies.

The most important and the last of Kubin’s international conferences was one with the original title: “Melancholy and Society in China”, July 1 – 6, 1995,

⁸⁸ Wolfgang Kubin. “Einleitung”. In KUBIN, Wolfgang (Ed.) *Honglouloumeng. Studien zum “Traum der roten kammer”*. Bern: Peter Lang, 1999, p. 7.

⁸⁹ Ibid., pp. 193 – 210.

⁹⁰ Cf. GALIK, Marián, Gu CHENG. “Der Tag nach der Konferenz. Ein Gespräch”. Ibid., pp. 277 – 294 and its Chinese version in *Shanghai wenxue* [Shanghai Literature], 1993, No. 1, pp. 65 – 68.

⁹¹ The proceedings appeared in Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1995.

⁹² GALIK, Marián. “The Exotic and Creative in the European Cultural Area”. In *Graecolatina et Orientalia* (Bratislava), 1993, Vol. XXI – XXII, pp. 117 – 130.

Bonn University. More than 40 scholars from different fields of scholarship from all over the world participated in it. The idea to study more the problem of melancholy in relation to China came to Kubin after reading the monograph by Wolf Lepenies *Melancholie und Gesellschaft*,⁹³ the work on the history of melancholy in Europe comparable to the classical *The Anatomy of Melancholy* by Robert Burton.⁹⁴ It was also his “inner desire” being himself melancholic of a violently choleric kind, as is quite obvious especially in the first decade of our century. He dedicated the proceedings of this conference *Symbols of Anguish; In Search of Melancholy in China*⁹⁵ to Helmut Martin (1940 – 1999), but could devote the comprehensive volume to himself. His “Introduction” to the volume is a piece which should be looked at before reading the whole proceedings or a part of it where are the contributions concerning the origins of melancholy in the traditional China, in classical Chinese philosophy, melancholy and literature in traditional and in modern China. My contribution was concerned with literature both old and new. As in the last case, readers will not find it in the proceeding because I did not want to wait up to a decade for the publication. “Melancholy in Europe and in China: Some Observations of a Student of the Intercultural Process” traces the concept of melancholy since Greek times: Hippocrates, Democritus, black bile (*melaina chole*), Homer’s *The Iliad* (Bellerophon), in China from Qu Yuan’s 屈原 *Lisao* 離騷 *Encountering Sorrow*, through ancient Chinese philosophy and literary criticism, “*shi... ke yi yuan*” 詩...可以怨 poetry as a vehicle of grief, Ban Jieyu’s *Yuan shi* 苑詩 *Melancholic Poem*, Li Qingzhao’s *Sheng shen man* 聲聲慢 *To the Tune Andante*. In the West we may observe it from Euripides’ *Medea* through the whole of ancient, medieval and modern literature, art, Romantics, George W. F. Hegel’s “unhappy consciousness”, Søren Kierkegaard, and in China up to Wang Duqing.⁹⁶ In these days of the new *Lu Xun-Fieber* I would recommend people to reread Bonnie S. McDougall’s “Lu Xun Hates China, Lu Xun Hates Lu Xun,” the idea of which had its origin in Bratislava and Smolenice Castle in March 1989 in her discussion with Wolfgang Kubin (I was not present at their discussions) and Lu Xun’s *melancholia* “(whether by temperament or circumstance) might be the best-known case in modern China”.⁹⁷ Maybe the

⁹³ Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp, 1969.

⁹⁴ Originally published in 1621. For modern edition, see London: Everyman’s Library, 1961.

⁹⁵ Bern: Peter Lang, 2001.

⁹⁶ *Asian and African Studies*, New Series, 1996, Vol. 5, No. 1, pp. 50 – 69.

⁹⁷ KUBIN, Wolfgang (Ed.) *Symbols of Anguish: In Search of Melancholy in China*, pp. 385 – 440.

title of McDougall's contribution is a bit rhetorical, Lu Xun was not the kind of the writer Mao Zedong imagined.⁹⁸

In 1998 on my 65th birthday on February 21, Raoul Findeisen presented to me a *Festschrift* by him and Robert H. Gassmann entitled: *Autumn Floods*. 秋水 *Essays in Honour of Marián Gálik* 慶祝高利克先生六十五壽辰論文集⁹⁹ with 56 contributions in 6 different languages by my old and young friends from 15 countries of the world containing the essays about me and my work, on Chinese traditions and Asian context, studies concerning Mao Dun, modern Chinese literature and intellectual history. I am very much indebted especially to my friend Raoul for the painstaking work necessary for finding the contributors and for doing all the editorial work. The same holds also for Professor Gassmann who was responsible for finding the money for such a splendid and expensive publication.

Otherwise the years from 1990 to the beginning of the 21st century were filled with work concerned with the study of the impact of the Bible on modern Chinese literature (more about this in the next section of this paper) and the Literary Decadence in modern Chinese literature of the 1920s and 1930s. I would like to speak about the symposium “*Fin de siècle* (Decadence) in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation” in another essay presenting to the interested readers my reminiscences from the realm of comparative literature.

The Beginning of the 21st Century (2001 – 2012)

Kubin's conference from 1995 found its reflection and continuation in the first of a few organized by Paolo Santangelo, Istituto Universitario Orientale Napoli. The international conference: “Emotions and the Analysis of Historical Sources in China”, held in Cortona, in November 5 – 10, 2001, with 24 participants from different countries of Europe, the USA, Australia, Japan, South Korea and Hong Kong. Qing jiaoshou 情教授 Professor Feeling, as Santangelo is nicknamed in China, was and still is the best expert on Chinese emotions in the West and the Editor-in-Chief since 1992 of the yearbook *Ming Qing yanjiu* 明清研究 (without English title), was able to invite to the beautiful medieval city some of the best experts in the field. I mention here only: Andrew H. Plaks, Wolfgang Kubin, Katherine Carlitz, Ulrike Middendorf and Angelika C. Messner as the most prominent among equals. The proceedings of the

⁹⁸ Mao Zedong, “Xin minzhuzhuyi lun” 新民主主义论 *On New Democracy*. In *Mao Zedong xuanji* 毛泽东选集 *Selected Works of Mao Zedong*. Peking: Renmin wuxue chubanse, 1969.

⁹⁹ Bern: Peter Lang, 1998.

conference: *Love, Hatred and Other Passions. Questions and Themes of Emotions in Chinese Civilisation*¹⁰⁰ is the best title the Editors could choose for the comprehensive volume. The first two words “love” and “hatred” also reflect to some extent the content of my contribution: “Some Remarks on Deviant Love and Violence in Three Modern Chinese Decadent Plays”,¹⁰¹ analysing Xiang Peiliang’s 向培良 *Annen* 暗嫩 *Amnon*, Xu Baoyan’s 徐葆炎 *Daji* 妲己 *Da Ji* and Su Xuelin’s 蘇雪林 *Jiunaolu de yanjing* 鳩那落的眼睛 *Kunāla’s Eyes*. From the following conferences organized by Paolo Santangelo I may mention one with the Italian title “Passioni d’Oriente” (Oriental Emotions), at “La Sapienza” University in Rome, held on May 29 – 31, 2003, where mostly Italian scholars participated, I read a paper: “The Song of Songs and a New Vision of Love in Modern Chinese Literature; an Essay in Hebrew-Chinese Interliterary Process”.¹⁰² The next one “Perception of bodily Sensations in South and East Asian Cultures” held at the University of Venice “Ca Foscari”, May 27 – 28, 2004, was more international, and especially the contributions of Ulrike Middendorf¹⁰³ and Paul S. Ropp,¹⁰⁴ probably the best expert on the emotions of Chinese women among the contemporary Sinologists *masculini generis*, as well as all the others, are well worth reading. My contribution published at the end of the proceedings “Bi Gan’s Heart in the Intra- and Intercultural Process” analyses the story of Bi Gan 比干, Minister of Zhou Xin 紂辛, the last King of the Shang-Yin Dynasty, who had Bi Gan disembowelled and his heart cut out in the 11th century B.C., through the Chinese philosophical and literary works up to 1920s in China, including the poetic drama *Srdce Pikangovo* (Bi Gan’s Heart) by the Czech decadent writer Julius Zeyer (1841 – 1901) published in 1886.¹⁰⁵

At the occasion of my 70th birthday, namely February 21 – 25, 2003 in the Zichy Palace, Bratislava, and Smolenice Castle, a reception and an international conference was held organized by Professor Roman Malek and his team from the Institute Monumenta Serica, Sankt Augustin, Germany, entitled “Fascination and Understanding. The Spirit of the Occident and the Spirit of China in Reciprocity”, where scholars from 14 different countries

¹⁰⁰ SANTANGELO, Paolo, GUIDA, Donatella (Eds.), op.cit., Leiden-Boston: Brill, 2006.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., pp. 331 – 341.

¹⁰² *Passioni d’Oriente. Eros ed.*

¹⁰³ Ulrike Middendorf. “Ecstasy, Recession. Pain: Images of Suffering in the *Classic of Poetry*”. In SANTANGELO, Paolo, MIDDENDORF, Ulrike (Eds.) *From Skin to Heart. Perceptions of Emotions and Bodily Sensations in Traditional Chinese Culture*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz, 2006, pp. 67 – 129.

¹⁰⁴ ROPP, Paul S. “The Price of Passion in Three Tragic Heroines of the Mid-Qing”, *ibid.*, pp. 203 – 228.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., pp. 261 – 278.

participated and later their 28 essays were published in two instalments in the prestigious journal *Monumenta Serica. Journal of Oriental Studies*, Vol. LIII, 2005, pp. 246 – 458 and Vol. LIV, 2006, pp. 151 – 415. The aim of the conference was to promote the necessary proper *understanding between East and West in our global age and to avoid the “fascination” on one side and “misunderstanding” on the other*. Of course, “misunderstanding” may be useful in the course of history. It depends on its kind and its results. It is a “pity” that the *laudatio* of which I am not worthy remained unpublished. Malek tried to show his view on my contribution to this effort over more than a half of a century in my contacts with Chinese and Russian, with West European and American or Canadian scholars. Kubin’s paper “The Importance of Misunderstanding Reconsidering the Encounters between East and West,”¹⁰⁶ was the most important answer to Malek’s challenge.

On March 24, 2006 on the occasion of the conferment of the Alexander von Humboldt-Foundation Prize Certificate I was happy to read another *laudatio*, quite flattering as they usually are, that I am “one of the founders of the field of modern Chinese literature studies. One of his findings concerns the role of modern European literature in establishing modern Chinese literature. He has in recent years especially been focusing on the influence of Christianity and the Bible making original contributions to the field. In contrast to many Sinologists in East and West he has his home in many languages and traditions.” I am proud of this decoration since in Europe it is regarded as second only to the Nobel Prize and I was told that before me only three Sinologists were honoured with it. I was the first among the first from Human Sciences in Slovakia.

In 2004 my book: *Influence, Translation, and Parallels. Selected Studies on the Bible in China*¹⁰⁷ with an Introduction by Irene Eber appeared. It was welcome among the foreign Sinologists although in China it has remained unknown up to this time. One of the reviewers Beatrice Leung characterized it as a “monumental work,”¹⁰⁸ another Christian Cochini as a “goldmine in terms of its richness of information, inspiring comments and stimulating ideas”.¹⁰⁹ I accept these evaluations with thanks, but I am not sure whether I am worthy of them. In the PRC the publication of the translated volume was put aside for the last three years. Nobody knows when it will be published. It should appear in the *Haiwai Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu yicong* 海外中国现代文学研究译丛 *Series of Foreign Translations of Studies in Modern Chinese Literature*. It consists of my 17 essays written from 1992 – 2001.

¹⁰⁶ *Monumenta Serica*, 2005, Vol. LIII, pp. 249 – 260.

¹⁰⁷ Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica Institute, 2004.

¹⁰⁸ See *China Perspectives*, January – February 2006, No. 63, p. 56.

¹⁰⁹ *Chinese Crosscurrents*, January – March 2005, Vol. 2, No. 1 p. 161.

In 2004 the 1st bi-annual International Workshop of the Literatures of the Far East and South East Asia was held at the Saint Petersburg State University from June 22 – 26, and it has been repeated every two years during the white nights. It is a Sino-Russian joint venture and mostly Russians, and Chinese are participants, usually with a few Westerners. It is a good opportunity especially for Russian and Ukrainian Orientalists to meet together with their foreign colleagues. Its disadvantage is that practically all the Russians read their papers in Russian and the Chinese in Chinese. This is the main reason why these meetings (5th one in June 2012) are not attractive for Western scholars. I have actively participated at the 1st and 2nd and I have recommended, together with Rina Fujita 藤田梨那, granddaughter of Satō Tomiko that the 5th workshop was partly dedicated to the 120th anniversary of Guo Moruo's death.

In 2005 the *magnum opus* by Wolfgang Kubin: *Die chinesische Literatur im 20. Jahrhundert* was published as Vol. 7 of a mammoth collection *Geschichte der chinesischen Literatur*. Its appearance reminded me of a “great voice, as of a trumpet” of *Apocalypse*, 1, 10. According to him contemporary Chinese literature is the weakest in the whole history of Chinese literature, although not all works, as in the case of Mian Mian 棉棉 or Wei Hui 卫慧, whose works he denounced as *laji* 垃圾 rubbish. It seems that I have nothing to do with this work, but before beginning to write it, Kubin asked me to do it. I declined (with thanks) because I do not have his talent, broad knowledge, *élan vital*, and material at my disposal. Probably the contemporary Chinese literature is not so bad when China at the end of 2012 has got two Nobel Prize Laureates (Gao Xingjian is more a Chinese than a French writer). Kubin's criticism should be taken into account. Many Chinese writers agree with him, many do not. In the discussion led by Yang Hengda at the 1st International Conference of World Sinology, Renmin University, Peking, March 25 – 28, 2007, round-table session, Kubin and Chen Pingyuan exchanged their opposite views on the problems of values in Chinese literature of the 20th century. I expressed my opinion that Kubin is not a “devil” like in Christianity, but as in the Old Testament, an “adversary” whose aim is to help with his critical remarks the Chinese men of letters to write better literary works. Kubin is a German Goethean Mephistopheles,” the Spirit that Denies:

“Part of that Power, not understood,
Which always wills the Bad, and always works the Good.”¹¹⁰

¹¹⁰ *Faust. A Tragedy by John Wolfgang von Goethe*. Translated, in original metres, By Bayard Taylor. The First Part. London: Strahan & CO., Publishers, 1871, p. 65.

In 2008 together with Richard Trapp, University of Vienna, with the help of my student Martin Slobodník I organized a symposium in Bratislava and Vienna to discuss the problems of Chinese literature and culture in the first decade of this century. The aim of the conference, Bratislava-Vienna, April 11 – 15, was to follow the idea *yi wen hui you, yi you fu ren* 以文會友, 以友輔仁 to share the culture with friends and in this way improve their humanity. More than one third of the 27 active participants representing 9 countries came from Mainland China. The oldest of the participating scholars Professor Tang Yijie pointed in his contribution to the necessity of further development of “modern” Chinese philosophy in reference to the Western models. According to him new Chinese philosophy should be more systematic similarly to the Western philosophy since the time of the Greeks and later from Descartes. Contemporary Chinese philosophy would need a serious absorption and systematic digestion of Western philosophy, but also it has to influence European philosophy. His wife Yue Daiyun followed the tradition of the American New Humanism of Irving Babbitt (1865 – 1933), a teacher of her father-in-law Tang Yongtong, but with new accents surpassing human egoism, exalting ecological consciousness, aesthetic wisdom, spiritual ideals and helping to form a new *Weltanschauung* and philosophy of life. Apart from Tang Yijie and Yue Daiyun my other Chinese good friends participated: Yan Jiayan, Yang Jianlong, Xie Tianzhen, Zhu Shoutong, Mabel Lee, Chen Peng-hsiang, Zhang Weding, Huang Zhuoye, Li Ling and Ye Rong. My other foreign and domestic friends will, I hope, forgive me that I do not mention their names. This symposium in my 75th year was my “last supper”. I decided, because of high age, not to organize the symposia with friends anymore. It is a pity that proceedings of the symposium could not be published up to now because of financial reasons. I was very happy that my Chinese friends with help and influence in the Peking University Publishing House brought for me the second printing of my *Milestones in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation (1898 – 1979)* from the same year as a most precious gift.¹¹¹

Although April 13, 2008 was my “last supper”, I tried to work as much as possible on Chinese literature within its broader framework. I have devoted most of the time to my project concerned with the Bible, Christianity and Chinese literature modern and partly also ancient.

In 2009 I had the opportunity to stay at the National Library, Taiwan, February 1 – April 30 searching for material concerning the Bible and modern Chinese literature. By chance, I received a letter from Professor Ji Jin 季进, Suzhou University (PRC) to finish up to the end of my stay correcting the

¹¹¹ I am not editor of the Proceedings of this conference which were not published as yet.

Chinese version of *Zhongguo xiandangdai wenxue yu “Shengjing”*: *jieshou yu fanyi* 中国现当代文学与《圣经》：接收与翻译。I finished it two months later, sent it to the editors, but up to now it has not appeared. I have, of course, worked on my project and a part of my research will be published soon both in the Chinese and also in the English version.

In 2010 I was happy to be granted an Andrew W. Mellon fellowship for three months and stayed at the W.F. Albright Institute of Archaeological Research, Jerusalem, March 1 – May 31. My project was focused on the material mostly connected with King David (ca. 1037 – ca. 967 B.C.) and the Duke Wen of Jin (ca. 698 – 629 B.C.) and with the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 *The Commentary of Mr. Zuo* and the Hebrew Deuteronomistic history and their narrative methods together with socio-political institutions which were to some extent similar up to the 6th and 5th centuries B.C.¹¹² Another study on the *Zuozhuan* as the first Chinese narrative history and the Hebrew history from King David up to the Babylonian Captivity in 576 B.C. has been done in the same time.¹¹³ In the same year I was invited to participate in the High Level Cultural Forum on the occasion of the 13th EU-China Summit on October 6 – 7, in Brussels, where the representatives of the PRC and European Union in the field of culture met to discuss the questions of contemporary and future cooperation. I was there as the only Sinologist from the European Union.¹¹⁴

¹¹² Its English version appeared as “King David (ca. 1037 – ca. 967 B.C.) and Duke Wen of Jin (ca. 697 – 628 B.C.): Two Paradigmatic Rulers from the Hebrew Deuteronomistic and Early Chinese Historiography.” In *Asian and African Studies*, 2010, New Series, Vol. 19, No. 1, pp. 1 – 25 and in Chinese: “Dawei wang yu Jin Wengong: Xibolai shendian lishixue he Zhongguo zaoqi Rujia biannianshi zhong de liangwei tongzhizhe fanlie” 大卫王与晋文公：希伯来申典历史学和中国早期儒家编年史中的两位统治者范例。 *Jidujiao sixiang pinglun* [Regent Review of Christian Thoughts], 2011, Vol. 12, pp. 4 – 24.

¹¹³ “Hebrew Deuteronomistic and Early Chinese Confucian Historiography: A Comparative Approach.” In *Frontiers of History in China*, 2012, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 343 – 362 and “Xibolai shenming jipai shixue yu Zhongguo Rujia zaoqishixue – yi zhong bijiao yanjiu fangfa” 希伯来申命派史学与中国儒家早期史学 一种比较研究方法, *Shijie hanxue* 世界汉学. In *World Sinology*, 2010, Spring issue, pp. 50 – 62.

¹¹⁴ “Report on the First EU-China High Level Cultural Forum in Brussels. Reflections of a Participant.” In *Asian and African Studies*, 2011, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 135 – 142 and “Bulusaier Zhonggou shoujie wenhua gaogfen luntan huiyi baodao. Yi wei yu huizhe de fansheng” 布鲁塞尔中欧首届文化高峰论坛 会议报道 – 一位与会者的反省。 In *Hanxue yanjiu tongxin* 汉学研究通讯, Vol. 30, No. 2, 2011, pp. 61 – 65.

In 2011 I participated in the 1st Conference of the World Cultural Forum, Taihu-Suzhou, May 18 – 19, where I was present as the only one Sinologist from Central and Eastern Europe, and Asian Russia.¹¹⁵

In 2012 I devoted myself mostly to my “confessions”, a part of which is also this contribution, and to writing the papers for the five international conferences held in November in the PRC, Singapore and Macao.

My review presented in this contribution shows that in about the last ten years I have not devoted much attention to American Sinology. On the other hand, it seems to me that American Sinologists have not been interested in my work, although with some exceptions such as Robert H. Hegel, Leo Lee, Jeffrey Kinkley, David Wang and Kirk Denton. It is necessary to agree with David Wang that American Sinology of the end of the last years of the 20th and the first years of our century is not always of high value.¹¹⁶ I paid much greater attention to the part of European, Mainland China, Hong Kong, and in the last years to Macao, where the possibilities of stay, studies, buying of books and interest for my work was deeper, and the cooperation much easier.

At eighty I looked behind... What I have seen and done (and what other people had achieved) in the field of international literary Sinology, is in brief to be seen on the pages above.

*Featuring lecture read at the International Symposium: “The Status and Future of the Chinese Humanities”, Macao University, November 25 – 27, 2012.

¹¹⁵ “*Quo vadis cultura sinica?: Some Remarks on the First World Cultural Conference, May 18 – 19, 2011.*” In *Asian and African Studies*, 2011, New Series, Vol. 20, No. 2, pp. 289 – 297.

¹¹⁶ WANG Dewei 王德威 (David Wang). “Yingyu shijie de xiandai wenxue yanjiu zhi baogao 英语世界的现代文学研究之报告 Report on the Study of Modern Chinese Literature in English Language.” Available at <http://www.chinese-thought.org/whyj/005009.htm>

It is the paper originally published in *Hainan shifan daxue xuebao (Shihui kexueban)* 海南师范大学学报. In *Social Sciences*, 2007, Issue 3.