

*SUB AEGIDE PALLAS:*  
FIFTY YEARS DEVOTED TO LITERARY SINOLOGY\*

Radovan ŠKULTÉTY  
Institute of Oriental Studies, Slovak Academy of Sciences,  
Klemensova 19, 813 64 Bratislava, Slovakia  
LeiDuowen@seznam.cz

On February 21, 2003, I had the honour to be present at the festive act in honour of the 70th birthday of my teacher, a well-known Sinologist, Dr. Jozef Marián Gálík, DrSc., held in Zichy Palais, Bratislava, Slovak Republic. It was a stately act of acknowledgement of the life-long work of this eminent scholar and a prelude to the international Sinological conference "Fascination and Understanding. The Spirit of the Occident and the Spirit of China in Reciprocity", organized also in honour of Dr. Gálík. This occasion was a stimulus for me to write the present article.

**Key words:** Chinese literature, literary criticism, intellectual history, cultural impact, literary confrontation

I

Marián Gálík was born on February 21, 1933 in Igram, a small village in the southwest of Slovakia, about 50 km from Bratislava. After finishing classical grammar school in Bratislava, he studied Sinology and history of the Far East at the Charles University, Prague (1953–1958). He started his scholarly Sinological research during his two years' study at Peking University (September 1958 – June 1960). Its most important fruit was the study entitled *Mao Dun biming kao* (*Mao Dun's Pseudonyms*), now deposited in the Archives of Modern Chinese Literature, Peking, with many notes by Mao Dun (1896–1981), along with an unnamed biography of Mao Dun, likewise commented by the writer himself.<sup>1</sup> The study

---

\* The author wishes hereby to express his thanks to Dr. Marián Gálík for kindly providing him with a number of valuable source materials for the compilation of this article, as well as for explaining various circumstances known only to the people involved in the events under description.

<sup>1</sup> Zhu Xiaofeng, "Gao Like wanli xianbao xin shiliao heran beilu" ("Marián Gálík's Valuable Present. New Materials from the Distance of Ten Thousand Miles"). *Zhonghua dushubao* (Chinese Readers Newspaper), July 17, 1996.

appeared under the title *The Names and Pseudonyms by Mao Tun* (Archív orientální, 31, 1963, pp. 80-88). It was the first Sinological study on Mao Dun's pseudonyms altogether and met with a remarkably positive reception.

Originally, Gálik set out primarily to investigate Mao Dun's creative works. After two years of collecting studying materials and after having finished the preliminary research in China, he returned to Prague. Then only he was told by Professor Jaroslav Průšek, the eminent Czech Sinologist and Gálik's teacher, that he should change the focus of his research to Mao Dun's critical works. It was a turning point in Gálik's career that made him later become a renowned literary comparatist.

Gálik's first scholarly monograph *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*,<sup>2</sup> was likewise the pioneering work about Mao Dun as literary critic and theoretician between 1917 and 1936. Through this book Gálik became well-known among the students of modern Chinese literature and it remained up to now the most quoted among Gálik's works. Jaroslav Průšek wrote in his preface: "The work of Mr. Gálik has in my opinion the additional importance (to that mentioned in the text before, being a valuable contribution to modern Chinese literary history) of using the vast amount of material the author was able to collect during his stay in China; he also had the opportunity to discuss many questions with Mao Dun himself. This was in fact the last chance to gather this valuable material together; today it would be impossible and we do not even know whether it has not disappeared altogether. Mr. Gálik thus saved for contemporary research, material which is among the most important in modern history, for it throws light on the birth of a new Chinese culture, one which has claimed a share in the cultural heritage of the world. The work of Mao Tun shows how valuable this culture was, and this in itself obliges us to pay the closest attention to a study of it."<sup>3</sup>

One of the reviewers, Douwe W. Fokkema, recognized in Gálik a literary comparatist when he wrote in another review that his

"study of Chinese literary criticism of the 1920s and 1930s is of great value, both to the sinologist and the student of comparative literature."<sup>4</sup> And further: "From the comparatist's point of view, Mr. Gálik's exposition on the reception of Symbolism, Expressionism, Futurism and other postrealistic currents is of great interest. One might wish a more extensive treatment of the problem than he gives in his book. Part of that wish has been fulfilled by the publication of Gálik's article on Expressionism in *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens*."<sup>5</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> See "List of Publications by Marián Gálik", 1.1, in the *Festschrift* entitled *Autumn Floods (Qiu shui). Essays in Honour of Marián Gálik*, ed. by Raoul D. Findeisen und Rober G. Gassmann. Bern, Peter Lang 1998, pp. 699-740. Henceforth only *LPMG*.

<sup>3</sup> J. Průšek, "In the Margin of M. Gálik's Study of Mao Tun as a Literary Critic and theoretical Writer", p. XV.

<sup>4</sup> *T'oung Pao*, LXII, 1972, p. 241.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 244.

Gálik later followed this suggestion when he published his study on Feng Naichao, the first one on a single Chinese Symbolist poet;<sup>6</sup> under Fokkema's and Roger Bauer's editorship yet another article appeared: *European Literary Trends and Their Metamorphosis*,<sup>7</sup> which was also promptly translated into Chinese and appeared in a journal of Peking University.<sup>8</sup>

Immediately after finishing this book, Gálik started his research on the Chinese reception of Nietzsche which resulted in the most extensive study he produced up to these days. *Nietzsche in China (1918-1925)*<sup>9</sup> was the first literary-philosophical Sinological work after 1945 to address this problem. All other scholars could only follow Gálik's steps, although this study, it seems, remained inaccessible to many, especially to the admirers of Nietzsche in Mainland China. Whereas Gálik's "pioneer study"<sup>10</sup> appeared at the very beginning of the 1970s, the Mainlanders were able to publish their studies as late as in their second half, and these were mostly or wholly concerned with Lu Xun. Raoul D. Findeisen wrote the following about this study: "An extensive research about Nietzsche didn't exist until now, however, the Slovak Sinologist Marián Gálik in 1972<sup>11</sup> presented a pioneering treatise about the most important Chinese recipients' discussion of Nietzsche. He processed and published the results of his research in numerous separate investigations and papers."<sup>12</sup> (*trans. aut.*) A number of Western Sinologists, especially Australians, followed Gálik's example – David Kelly, D. Hall, Mabel Lee and Cheung Chiu-ye, just to name the most important ones.<sup>13</sup>

Before Gálik finished his most voluminous work *The Genesis of Modern Chinese Literary Criticism, 1917-1930*,<sup>14</sup> he wrote or compiled some works which were of importance for further development of European Sinology. His *Preliminary Research-guide: German Impact on Modern Chinese Intellectual History*<sup>15</sup> was the first step in publishing a set of bibliographical books concerned with the Sino-German cultural relations at first in 1969 and overall Sino-German relations after 1979.<sup>16</sup> This vast bibliographical project of Munich University led by Pro-

<sup>6</sup> LPMG, 2.23.

<sup>7</sup> Ibid., 2.65.

<sup>8</sup> Ibid.

<sup>9</sup> LPMG, 2.18.

<sup>10</sup> Cheung Chiu-ye, *Nietzsche in China. An Annotated Bibliography 1904-1992*, Canberra, The Australian National University 1992, p. x.

<sup>11</sup> In reality it was one year earlier (*remark of the author*).

<sup>12</sup> R.D. Findeisen, "Die Last der Kultur. Vier Fallstudien zur chinesischen Nietzsche-Rezeption (Erster Teil), *Minima Sinica* (Bonn), 2, 1989, pp. 18-19.

<sup>13</sup> Ibid., p. 19.

<sup>14</sup> LPMG, 1.3.

<sup>15</sup> Ibid., 1.2.

<sup>16</sup> W. Bauer et alii, *German Impact on Modern Chinese Intellectual History. Deutschlands Einfluss auf die moderne chinesische Geistesgeschichte*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag 1982, *Das chinesische Deutschland-Bild der Gegenwart. Eine Bibliographie (1970-1984)*, 2 vols., Stuttgart, Franz Steiner Verlag 1989 and its continuations with the same title for the years 1985-1986 (published in 1991) and for the years 1987-1988 (published in 1992). Gálik's one year work on the project (October 1969-September 1970), financed by the Volkswagen Foun-

fessor Wolfgang Bauer was originally proposed by Marián Gálík, and he was his first scientific collaborator. Theoretical musings concerned with the basic problems of this project led Gálík to another long study entitled *Studies in Modern Chinese Intellectual History: I. The World and China*. *Cultural Impact and Response in the 20th Century*.<sup>17</sup> This study comprising quite a broad framework of realms was nearly completely neglected, just as the systemo-structural method proposed by Gálík for the study of intellectual history (*Geistesgeschichte*). Maybe it was caused by the simple fact that the study of intellectual history is very rare among Sinologists, and that up to now there does not exist a single monograph presenting modern Chinese intellectual history. Gálík offered five sequels to this study published later between 1976 and 1993 including the intellectual portraits of Wang Guowei (1877-1927), Lu Xun (1881-1936), Qu Qiubai (1899-1935), Guo Moruo (1892-1979) and Xie Bingxin (1900-1999) in their young years.<sup>18</sup> These were received much better, especially the one on Qu Qiubai which induced P.G. Pickowicz to confess that it "has profoundly influenced... his own thinking on the immediate post-May Fourth period of Ch'ü's intellectual development."<sup>19</sup> Jonathan D. Spence, one of the most prominent Sinologists of our time, in "Acknowledgements" to his book *The Gate of Heavenly Peace. The Chinese and Their Revolution 1875-1980* mentions Gálík's study on Qu Qiubai as one of those that helped him to throw light on "the individual Chinese figures whose lives constitute"<sup>20</sup> his book.

In May 1973 Gálík had a rare opportunity for a Sinologist to study rich sources in the Deutsches Zentralarchiv, Potsdam (in the then GDR), and on their basis he wrote two studies: *Two Modern Chinese Philosophers on Spinoza (Some Remarks*

---

dation, was appreciated by Wolfgang Bauer in his "Introduction" to the *German Impact on Modern Chinese Intellectual History* with the following words: "Marian Galik made an essential contribution with his *Preliminary Research Guide* which took shape during the preparatory stages of the Bibliography", p. XVI. Dr. Hartmut Walravens, one of the best bibliographers in Oriental studies among Europeans, made the following remark concerning this work: "A truly voluminous preliminary work within the framework of the project of Professor Bauer was Marian Galik's 1972 as a multiplication of the published *Preliminary Research Guide* that is, in structure and approach, a model for the present bibliography." (H. Walravens, *Indices to Bauer/Hwang: German Impact on Modern Chinese Intellectual History* (Wiesbaden 1982). Hamburg, C. Bell Verlag 1982, p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Ibid., 2.67, 2.60, 2.28, 2.62 and 2.103. Cf. also Gálík's another study *Metamorphosis in Modern Chinese Intellectual (and Philosophical) Consciousness*. *Musings over its "Coming to Be"*. AAS, n.s., 1992, 2, pp. 132-145, where also Liang Sou-ming (1893-1988) is briefly discussed. See LPMG, 2.95.

<sup>18</sup> Ibid., 2.67, 2.60, 2.28, 2.62 and 2.103. Cf. also Gálík's another study *Metamorphosis in Modern Chinese Intellectual (and Philosophical) Consciousness*. *Musings over its "Coming to Be"*. AAS, n.s., 1992, 2, pp. 132-145, where also Liang Sou-ming (1893-1988) is shortly discussed. See LPMG, 2.95.

<sup>19</sup> P.G. Pickowicz, *Marxist Literary Thought in China*, Berkeley-Los Angeles-London, University of California Press 1981, p. 245.

<sup>20</sup> Harmondsworth, Penguin Books 1982, p. 16.

of Sino-German Spinoza's "Festschrift")<sup>21</sup> and *Goethe in China* (1932),<sup>22</sup> the second of which was the first in the series of as yet unfinished studies mostly on Johann Wolfgang Goethe's *Faust* and its reception in China. At that time Gálík partly turned away from the philosopher (Nietzsche, to be exact) with whom a few "if any, since Plato can match the breadth, depth, and passion of his mind",<sup>23</sup> and paid much more attention to the Olympian poet, universal genius and "historian of the Western mankind" from the mythical meeting of God and Satan in the *Old Testament* up to Faust and Mephistopheles.

Unusual was the reception of Gálík's works published in the annual *Asian and African Studies*, X, 1974. Its reviewer, Burton Ruffel (University of Denver), devoted to him a whole passage appreciating it as follows: "Marian Galik's, all on Chinese topics, are in my view the book's outstanding contribution. Her (M.G.'s first name is somewhat confusing for foreigners so he is sometimes mistaken for a female) "*Main Issues in the Discussion on National Forms in Modern Chinese Literature*" is an excellent, informed and clear summary, with sensitively chosen illustrative material. "*The Red Gauze Lantern of Feng Naichao*", though perhaps less felicitous, is a useful presentation of the brief, confused career of a symbolist poet of the 1920s. And her review article "*A Comment on Two Books on Modern Chinese Poetry*" – one by a French author, the second by a Russian – is a sturdy, well-informed discussion. Her several book reviews, too, show an inquiring and remarkably open mind."<sup>24</sup> M. Gálík would probably be pleased with Ruffel's criticism except for his evaluation of the article on Feng Naichao. The reason was the reviewer's ignorance of the fact that before the publication of Gálík's article, Feng Naichao (1900-1983) was a completely unknown Chinese poet, both in China and abroad, but became highly evaluated later as a result.

In twelve chapters of the *Genesis* mentioned above, Gálík endeavoured to analyse the rise and development of modern Chinese literary criticism up to 1930. The imposing personality of Lu Xun constituted the approver of the book. The pioneers of literary criticism, Hu Shi (1891-1962), Zhou Zuoren (1885-1967) and Chen Duxiu (1879-1942) are introduced there, as well as the critics of the Creation Society, Guo Moruo, Yu Dafu (1896-1945), of the Sun Society, Jiang Guangci (1901-1929), Qian Xingcun (1901-1977), a critic of the Crescent Moon Society, Liang Shiqiu (1902-1987), then Mao Dun, Qu Qiubai and a few others, mostly left-wing oriented and less important. The analysis was done against the background of the Euro-American literary criticism beginning with Aristotle and ending with Lunacharsky on the one hand and the indigenous Chinese literary criticism mostly of the classical period (Confucius, Mengzi, Zhuangzi), of the Six Dynasties (Liu Xie) and of the Ming-Qing period on the other. Quite a few Japanese literary critics, who served as intermediaries between Euro-American criti-

<sup>21</sup> *LPMG*, 2.25.

<sup>22</sup> *Ibid.*, 2.32.

<sup>23</sup> W. Kaufmann, "Preface to the Meridian Edition". In: *Nietzsche. Philosopher, Psychologist, Antichrist*. 11th Printing. Cleveland and New York, Meridian Books 1966, p. 7.

<sup>24</sup> *Books Abroad. An International Literary Quarterly*. January 1976.

cism and their Chinese recipients, are also analysed in this book. The conviction of the existence of the interliterary process and of the world literature runs like an unbroken thread throughout it, just as throughout the whole period under analysis.

Professor Dionýz Durišin, one of the world's most prominent theorists of comparative literature, pointed out in Gálik's monograph

"the consistent comparative aspect implemented through the whole book. This aspect, in reality, formed the purport of the research program. The author was not so much interested in informing readers about the outcome of his research. His aim was not to make a pioneering deed in making discoveries in the material hardly known in European or non-Chinese circles, but most of all to put it into relations with the European tradition beginning with Aristotle's *Poetics*, through classicist literary thought and ending with modern literature and literary criticism."<sup>25</sup>

Foreign reviewers, outside of former Czechoslovakia, characterized this book in a similar way. According to Ng Mau-sang, this work was "a major pioneering effort from which one learns a great deal about the controversy-ridden literary world of the twenties, the critical dimensions of the individual authors, and their immense sensitivity to European literary thought."<sup>26</sup> Bernd Eberstein pinpointed Gálik as the only Western Sinologist "who has applied himself for a longer time to this (i.e. literary criticism) for the understanding of the so very important area of modern Chinese Literature – or, when we observe it correctly, the area of literature itself."<sup>27</sup> Eberstein does not refrain from using the high evaluations, as "in an outstanding way",<sup>28</sup> or "highly impressive"<sup>29</sup> when analysing the different aspects of Gálik's book, or when giving the advice how "on the basis of the present volume several shorter studies could lead even further".<sup>30</sup> (trans. by R.Š.) Vladislav F. Sorokin from Moscow, who had known Gálik since his student days in Peking, wrote in his long review that the author of *The Genesis* owns "enviable erudition and mastery in commanding the principles of comparative analysis".<sup>31</sup>

## II

Sooner or later, a pressing question would probably come to the reader's mind: How was it possible for a scholar in a communist country to remain faithful to his ideals and advance his research at the same time? It was never an easy task indeed to reconcile the irreconcilables. Thanks to their place of work being a little off the centre of power, Sinologists in Bratislava were not so heavily forced into cooperation with the regime. Moreover, Gálik expressed his ideas in articles mostly in

<sup>25</sup> *Slavica Slovaca* (Bratislava), 2, 1980, p. 201.

<sup>26</sup> *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 2, 1982, p. 384.

<sup>27</sup> *Nachrichten der Gesellschaft für Natur- und Völkerkunde Ostasiens* (Hamburg), 127-128, 1980, p. 141.

<sup>28</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>29</sup> Ibid., p. 142.

<sup>30</sup> Loc. cit.

<sup>31</sup> *Problemy Dalnego Vostoka* (*Problems of the Far East*) (Moscow), 3, 1980, p. 203.

foreign languages which partially protected him from the vigilant eye of the Party inquisitors. However, not even he was able to remain completely intact by the era in which he was living.

A few months after the *Genesis* was published, the comrades of the Central Committee of the Slovak Communist Party (CCSCP) intervened in Gálik's work and life. Through the "speaker" in the Institute he was informed about the "instruction" of the powers that be, implying the strict prohibition to represent Slovak Sinology. The reason was Gálik's criticism of the policy of the "Cultural Revolution" in China towards intellectuals and writers. This was never cancelled and for the last time it was applied for the conference *Konfuzianismus und die Reform Politik Chinas* held in St. Augustin in 1988. This ban was precisely timed. Gálik was notified of it on April 10, 1980, three days after the death of his beloved teacher Prof. J. Průšek.

Gálik's reply, after a few days of a psychic shock, was not to follow the advice of writing priceless propaganda articles demanded from the Party. Instead of conformation, he started working even harder and produced some of his best articles: a series of studies in intellectual history, mainly the one on Lu Xun (published later in the series *Studies in Modern Chinese Intellectual History*<sup>32</sup>), and another book monograph *Milestones in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation, 1898-1979*,<sup>33</sup> just to name a few. In the latter Gálik analysed the important works of modern and premodern Chinese literature and tried to show the impact of world literature (or, if you prefer, of foreign literature) on Chinese fiction, poetry and drama, and in the first chapter of the book, on the beginnings of modern Chinese criticism at the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries. *Milestones* consist of 12 chapters (just like the Biblical *Genesis*), in which Gálik introduces to the readers seventeen prominent writers of modern Chinese literature on the background of the literatures of the world and of the different periods. These involved the classical European mythology, Greek tragedy, European neoclassicism, German *Sturm und Drang*, classicism and romanticism, French realism (and naturalism), Russian realism and *fin de siècle*, English and Japanese political novel, Ibsen's and Wilde's dramatic works, Rilke's poetry, and some other works.

*Milestones* were appreciated mainly by the Chinese. The reason may have been that the Gálik's book showed them more than those written by themselves, and in any case in a different way. A literary scholar from a small Central European country – for a long time a part of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, geographically situated between the Danube River and the High Tatras mountain range – following spiritual sources springing from the Greek and Latin antiquity, born in an old Slovak village, who at that time could not leave his country to study abroad, and only rarely abandoned his study on the slopes of a mountain over Bratislava, was able to conjure up on their own geoliterary map many points connecting modern Chinese literature with the prominent representatives and important works of world literature.

---

<sup>32</sup> Cf. note No. 22.

<sup>33</sup> *LPMG*, No. 307.

When at the opening ceremony of the 32nd International Congress of Asian and North African Studies (ICANAS) in Hamburg 1986 Gálik met for the first time Yue Daiyun, Professor of Peking University and later the Vice-President of the International Comparative Association (ICLA), she declared her resolution to translate *Milestones* into Chinese. She kept her promise and the Chinese version of the book appeared in Peking University Press in 1990.<sup>34</sup> In her introduction to this translation Yue Daiyun wrote that this monograph presents a "great orchestral composition"<sup>35</sup> of literary Sinology.

According to the American comparatist of Chinese origin, Eugene Eoyang from Indiana University, Bloomington, "many of the central themes in Chinese literature in the twentieth century are addressed here with rare erudition and infectious enthusiasm,"<sup>36</sup> and "Gálik's *Milestones* is eminently worth reading, particularly for the comparatist, who will find here stimulation and speculation that could inspire half a dozen dissertations."<sup>37</sup> As to Eoyang's suspicions of Gálik's "analogy hunting" in the case of Ba Jin's (1904- ( *Hanye* (*Cold Night*) and Emile Zola's *Thérèse Raquin*, Ba Jin acknowledged to Gálik in the presence of Professor Dana Kalvodová of Prague, during their visit to his apartment in Shanghai, on April 18, 1986, that he read the novel *Thérèse Raquin* in his younger years, although he did not like it.<sup>38</sup> Was this Ba Jin's case not a good example of a creative literary confrontation?

The third reviewer, Irene Eber (The Hebrew University of Jerusalem), while admitting that *Milestones* is "an erudite and rich book", states that

"it is marred by numerous typographical errors and it is sorely in need of an English language editor. Awkward phrasing abounds which at times obscures the author's intended meaning. The index is too simple and one would have wished for more thorough cross referencing. A Chinese glossary of terms and titles would have been helpful."<sup>39</sup>

Gálik certainly agreed with these critical words, quite a few times repeated by the reviewers. Little did they know what a tremendous task it was to compile such a book for a writer relying only on his language skills acquired through self-teaching, without a possibility of a final retouch by a native English speaker... Except for that, in the case of *Milestones*, according to the valid contract between him and the publisher, Gálik could not exceed 500 double-spaced type-written pages.<sup>40</sup> Therefore the terseness of the text, simple index and no thorough cross-referencing.

---

<sup>34</sup> Ibid., No. 378. It is necessary to say that the *Genesis* was also translated into Chinese, and appeared under the title *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue piping fasheng shi* in the Social Science Documentation Publishing House, Peking, November 1997. Its second printing followed in January 2000.

<sup>35</sup> Yue Daiyun, "Xu" (Preface). In: *Zhongxi wenxue guanxi de lichengpei* (*Milestones in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation, 1898-1979*), Peking, Peking University Press 1990, p. 3.

<sup>36</sup> *Journal of Asian History*, 21, 1987, 1, p. 98.

<sup>37</sup> Ibid., p. 99.

<sup>38</sup> It ensues from the diary made during Gálik's and D. Kalvodová's China journey.

<sup>39</sup> *Monumenta Serica*, 37, 1986-1987, p. 404.

<sup>40</sup> Gálik's personal information.

A connecting link between Irene Eber and Marián Gálík consists of a more than twenty five years of correspondence. They exchanged letters through an intermediary in England, since it was forbidden for scholars in Czechoslovakia to have any connections whatsoever with Israel before the end of 1989. In the last ten years it was also Eber's and Gálík's unusual interest for the *Bible* and its connection with modern Chinese literature and intellectual history.<sup>41</sup> It was mostly due to this interest, together with the longer stays in Hong Kong, Venice, Berlin, Bonn and Taipei, the "lecture tours" in the U.S.A., Germany and Italy, as well as his active participation at different congresses, conferences and workshops abroad and in his country, that made Gálík temporarily stop working on the book concerned with the modern Chinese intellectual history and devote much time instead to the comparative research into different aspects of the relationship between the *Bible* and Chinese literature.

Two symposia held at the Smolenice Castle near Bratislava in the year 1989 and 1993, organized by Gálík should be mentioned here: *Intraliterary and Interliterary Aspects of the May Fourth Movement 1919 in China and Chinese Literature and European Context*. The proceedings of them appeared in 1990 and 1994, respectively.<sup>42</sup> Especially the second one was important within the framework of interliterary study. Mabel Lee (University of Sydney) wrote in her review that the symposium and the resulting papers introduced a shift from the position of regarding China as the passive, non-discriminating recipient of Western cultural influences while at the same time attempted to redress another intersecting feature in the intercultural process: the global hegemony of Anglo-American culture.

She further said: "... there is a need to consider and to understand the predominantly European sources which began the process of Sino-Western confrontation".<sup>43</sup> Another reviewer, Simon Man-Ho Wong (Hong Kong University of Science and Technology), added a similar statement:

"Marian Galik's 'Chinese Literature and European Context. Some Remarks', introducing the proceedings of the second conference, serves as a good introduction to the symposium. Not only are we given a list of recent important contributions to the field of Sino-European comparative literature, but we are also reminded, and especially those of us who consciously or unconsciously have strong pro-American tendencies in our inter-cultural studies, that there are in Europe sources of one of the most valuable cultural and literary legacies of mankind."<sup>44</sup>

<sup>41</sup> See *LPMG*, 2.89, 2.107, 2.116, 2.117, 2.128, 2.129, 2.130, 1.131, 2.132 and 2.152. Some are still waiting for publication. Irene Eber published her seminal study "Translating the Ancestors: S. I. J. Schereschewsky's 1875 Chinese Version of Genesis", 56, 1993, pp. 219-233 and Gálík was the "godfather" and Eber the chief organizer of the workshop entitled *The Bible in Modern China* "The Literary and Intellectual Impact", Hebrew University of Jerusalem, June 23-28, 1996, just at the time of the last days of celebrations at the occasion of three millenia of Jerusalem as the capital of Israel and Judah by King David. This was the first scholarly meeting of this kind in history where the connection of *The Bible* with Chinese literature and intellectual history was discussed. The proceedings of Jerusalem workshop in Monumenta Serica Monograph Series, Sankt Augustin, 1999, edit. by I. Eber, Sze-kar Wan, K. Walf in collaboration with R. Malek under the same title as above.

<sup>42</sup> *LPMG*, 7.2 and 7.3.

<sup>43</sup> *Journal of the Oriental Society of Australia*, Vols. 25 and 26, 1993-1994, p. 204.

<sup>44</sup> *Literary Research/Recherche Littéraire* (Toronto), 26, Fall-Winter 1996, p. 10.

### III

One of the Gálik's most extensive recent projects is his book studying the connection between the Bible and Chinese literature.<sup>45</sup> The most important in the series of about 20 essays on this topic is a study entitled *The Song of Song (Šir hašširim) and The Book of Songs (Shijing): An Attempt in Comparative Analysis*.<sup>46</sup> The aim of this long study is to analyse the lyric/al/ness of the two great specimens of Near Eastern and Far Eastern poetry and to try to point out its specificity: more metaphoric language of the first and more synecdochic of the second, more attention paid to aesthetic values in the first and more ethical values in the second. M. Gálik finished this study with the financial help of (just like some others, too) the German Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. With the advent of the *Bible* into Chinese literary and intellectual life, a new field for Sinologists and comparatists was opened. Maybe not a very broad field, but definitely one of high importance. The most influential book in world literature and culture found its way into the part of the universe completely unknown, not even foreseen by the biblical authors.

*The Bible*, especially the *Old Testament*, its historical and literary parts, has been Gálik's affection since childhood. In his opening speech at the Jerusalem workshop he confessed in front of the audience that in the families of his parents and grandparents "there was really only one precious book, the *Bible*, or, better to say, its Catholic digest, but with famous illustrations by a well-known German wood-cut printer, artist Julius Schnorr von Carolsfeld (1794-1872)."<sup>47</sup> It was Gálik's ABC for he read biblical stories instead of fairy tales. He was enthralled by the heroic deeds of Samson, by the story of David and Goliath, even by David's crazy dance in front of the Arc of the Covenant. There was something similar between this touching story and the history of his village. Igram, his native village, used to be in the Middle Ages, at least since time of Genghis and Khubilai Khans, *villa ioculatorum castri Poson* (village of jesters of Bratislava castle).<sup>48</sup> Its inhabitants and the fields, upon which also young Gálik used to work, were the property of the Hungarian royal family. The serfs of Igram had to dance and sing in front of their feudal lords, just as David danced and sang before the Lord.

In the speech just mentioned, Gálik manifested his belief that "all human beings, inhabitants of this blue planet, are sons and daughters of the same God and there could not be a difference between the Jews, Christians, Moslems and all other believers or non-believers" and he expressed an idea of the necessity of "the third covenant", after the Old (Hebrew), New (Christian) ones, in order that the mankind, the nations of different religions, beliefs and customs, could dance in front of this new Arc in the spirit of universal communication and mutual understanding. Obviously, there is as yet not the time for a renewal of David's or the serfs' of Igram dance. Gálik's confessions are certainly idealistic – but

---

<sup>45</sup> *Influence, Translation and Parallels: Selected Studies on the Bible in China*. Sankt Augustin: Monumenta Serica Institute 2004, 351 pp.

<sup>46</sup> *Asian and African Studies* (Bratislava), n.s., 6, 1997, 1, pp. 45-75.

<sup>47</sup> *Human Affairs* (Bratislava), 7, 1997, 1, p. 88.

<sup>48</sup> *Súpis pamiatok na Slovensku* (A Catalogue of Slovak Monuments). Vol. 1, Bratislava, Obzor 1967, p. 487.

"it seems to be the only hope for the future of mankind. There is no better option in this age of globalism, multiculturalism and the threat of nationalist, religious fundamentalism and international terrorism. Otherwise the blue planet might once change her colour for red, dark and for ever dead."<sup>49</sup>

In 1998 at the occasion of Gálík's 65th birthday, his friends from Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft (Swiss Asia Society) dedicated to him the *Festschrift* entitled *Autumn Floods (Qiu shui). Essays in Honour of Marián Gálík*, ed. by Raoul D. Findeisen and Robert G. Gassmann (see note 2), with more than fifty contributions from his friends and pupils from four continents. At the occasion of his 70th birthday, the German Monumenta Serica Institute organized the above-mentioned international conference "Fascination and Understanding. The Spirit of the Occident and the Spirit of China in Reciprocity" at Smolenice Castle (Slovakia), February 21-25, 2003. Nearly forty papers were presented discussing the historical, philosophical, literary and religious aspects of the Sino-Western relations with the aim to promote the intercultural and interreligious communication and understanding. The proceedings of this conference will be at least partly published by the organizers in the prestigious sinological journal *Monumenta Serica*, Vols. LIII (2005) and LIV (2006).

Immediately after his 70th birthday M. Gálík finished editing of the proceedings of the Vienna Decadence symposium 1999 with the title *Fin de Siècle (Decadence) in Sino-Western Literary Confrontation* and to the organization of the Humboldt-Kolleg to be held in Korompa Castle (Slovakia) with the title: "Trade, Journeys, Inter- and Intercultural Communication in East and West (up to 1950 A.D.)." The last one will be financially supported by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation.

On March 24, 2006 Professor Wolfgang Frühwald, President of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation, in the presence of Professor Štefan Luby, President of the Slovak Academy of Sciences, conferred the Alexander von Humboldt Award on Marián Gálík. In the laudatio read at the festive act during the 34th Symposium for Research Awardees in Bamberg, was claimed that Gálík is "one of the founders of the field of modern Chinese literature studies. One of his important 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."

Highlighting of the importance of the Bible in Gálík's scholarly endeavour has its good *raison d'être*. The book was well received by the reviewers and the Tsinghua University Press with the help of the Department of Chinese Language and Literature is preparing its Chinese version. Dr. Christian Cochini, Macau Ricci Institute, is of the opinion that Gálík's collection of essays is "a goldmine in terms of its richness of information, inspiring comments and stimulating ideas regard-

---

<sup>49</sup> Private communication with Dr. Gálík, October 2003.

ing the influence of the Bible on Chinese literature.”(Chinese Crosscurrents (Macau), 2, January-March 2005, 1, p. 161). Professor Chen-chen Tseng, Department of English, National Dong Hwa University, Taiwan, underlined Gálik’s vision of the so-called Third Covenant, following the First between God and Israel (Exodus, 19-24), the Second between God and Christians, as described in the Gospels and Epistles, where all the people of *bonae voluntatis*, whether they believe in the God of the three Abrahamic religions or not, should unite in order to “live together” in peace and in intercultural and interreligious understanding. (Hanxue yanjiu/Chinese Studies (Taipei). 23, June 2005, pp. 518-519). Anna Bujatti (Rome), who knows Gálik well since 1972, met him often and read all his accessible works, wrote in her review that he is “un prodigioso tessitore” (a prodigious weaver) (L’Osservatore Romano, Sept. 21, 2005, p. 3), weaving together different literary or religious tissues in the intercultural and interreligious dialogue between Europe and China. In the last review of this book Beatrice Leung characterized Gálik’s volume, maybe, in an exaggerated manner, as “le monumental ouvrage”. She mentions that she read it “with interest and admiration” (Perspectives chinoises, 92, November-December 2005, p. 57) and appreciated the literary analyses of the works under review. She points to the cultural environment, his linguistic abilities and the knowledge of the culture of the Holy Land since his childhood, and the Sinological studies in his later years. This made him well prepared for the research of the divine words, better than his colleague in the Anglo-Saxon milieu where she lives. (ibid.)

\*\*\*

Gálik as a student, or as Yue Daiyun wrote about him, “an eminent assistant” (delide zhushou)<sup>50</sup> of Professor Průšek, was a member of the Prague School of Sinology. He was certainly most prolific among Průšek’s followers in literature and cultural history. Whereas Průšek was a sinologist par excellence devoting himself to different Sinological subjects from Chinese antiquity up to his time, Gálik studied mostly (though not only) modern problems against the background of Chinese and very wide foreign relations and affinities. Gálik was arguably one of the world’s most industrious English language literary comparatists of the 20th century.<sup>51</sup>

However, just as the saying goes, a prophet has very little honour in his own country. Until very recently, except for a narrow circle of his colleagues at the Institute of Oriental Studies and two dozen students at the university, Gálik’s name was almost unknown in the Slovak academic sphere. In this light one must appreciate highly the fact that on June 19, 2003 Gálik was decorated with the prestigious Prize of the Slovak Academy of Sciences for the year 2003, as the only

<sup>50</sup> Yue Daiyun, “Preface”, p. 3.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Deeney, John J. – Liu, Jiemin (eds.): *Twentieth-Century Comparative Literature Bibliography From Chinese Perspectives. English Sources*. Hong Kong, Comparative Research Unit of the Chinese University of Hong Kong 1991.

scholar from the institutes of Social Sciences of the Academy. The ceremonial act was arranged in commemoration of 50th anniversary of the Slovak Academy of Sciences.

Gálik's Sino-biblical studies as well as the studies in Sino-Western literary decadence (*fin de siècle*), extend the scope of his earlier endeavours in Sino-Western Comparative Literature. In the last years, except for the book on the Bible just mentioned, especially his essays on the theoretical problems of interliterariness, were well accepted by the publishers and probably also by the readers. Some of them were published in English and translated into Chinese not only once.<sup>52</sup>

As a part of the commitment he is supposed to realize in the years to come as the Alexander of Humboldt Award Winner, he plans to organize an international conference entitled "Eastern Christianity between the Death of Muhammad (632 AD) and Tamerlane (1405 AD)".

Two other projects concerned with the Sino-Czechoslovak intercultural process and with the Sino-German intercultural process, already well-developed, should be finished in the following years, unless the third Moirae, Lachesis, cuts the thread of his life prematurely.

---

<sup>52</sup> "Comparative Literature as a Concept of Interliterariness and Interliterary Process." In: Tötösy de Zepetnek, S., Dimić, M. V. with Sywenky, I. (eds.): *Comparative Literature Now. Theories and Practice. La Littérature Comparée à l'Heure Actuelle. Théories et Réalisations*. Paris, Honoré Champion 1999, pp. 95-104. Later published in a slightly revised version: "Interliterariness as a Concept in Comparative Literature." CLCWeb: *Comparative Literature and Culture: A WWW Journal*, 2, 2000, 4, 7 pp. Published for the third time under the same title as the last one, in: Tötösy de Zepetnek, S. (ed.): *Comparative Literature and Comparative Cultural Studies*. West Lafayette, Indiana, Purdue University Press 2003, pp. 34-44. Its Chinese version appeared under the title 跨文学交流中的跨学性 [Kuawenxue jiaoliu zhong de kuawenxuexing] (Interliterariness in Interliterary Process). *Zhongguo bijiao wenxue* 中國比較文学 (Comparative Literature in China), 3, 1996, pp. 91-97.

Another study: "Concepts of World Literature, Comparative literature, and a Proposal." CLCWeb: *Comparative Literature and Culture: AWWW Journal*, 2, 2000, 4, 8 p. Its first Chinese version appeared under the title 世界文学概念, 比较文学以及建议 [Shijie wenxue gainian, bijiao wenxue yi ji jianyi] (Concepts of World Literature, Comparative Literature, and a Proposal), *Zhongguo bijiao wenxue* 中國比較文学 *Comparative Literature in China*, 1, 2003, pp. 121-135. Its second Chinese version appeared as 2000 年 '世界文学观念' 述品 [2000 nian 'shijie wenxue guannian' shupin] (Concepts of World Literature in 2000). In: Yang Naichao 楊乃乔 and Wu Xiaoming 伍晓明 (eds.): *Bijiao wenxue yu shijie wenxue* 比较文学与世界文学 *Comparative Literature and World Literature. Yue Daiyun jiaoshou qishiwu huadan teji* 乐黛云教授七十五华诞特辑 *Festschrift for Professor Yue Daiyun at the 75th Birthday*). Peking. Peking University Press 2005, pp. 113-122.