

The Adaptive Comparative

SOWON S. PARK

I

European literary histories are steeped in botanical metaphors. So, for example, the plant figure is found in the elaborations of Friedrich Schlegel, arguably the founder of modern literary history, as when he writes in *Epochs of Poetry*, ‘in the Homeric plant we see, as it were, the origin of all poetry; the roots are lost to our sight but the blossoms and branches of the plant emerge from the darkness of Antiquity in their incomparable splendour’.¹ In this developmental narrative of literary history, the ‘seed’ of a nation is planted by the earliest national poet, then grows, maturing in the soil of tradition, and finally blooms to express the ‘essence’ of a people. This metaphorical frame has served critics well for organizing literary histories along national lines. As John Neubauer noted, ‘Organicism infused literary histories as the study of literature became slowly institutionalized in the course of the nineteenth century’.²

When accounts of national literatures are given the conceptual structure of roots, branches and blossoms, like so many groves of trees in an arboretum, it naturally follows that they are seen to develop autonomously, their essential qualities flourishing as they stand free of alien influences. But when literatures are compared, the botanical metaphor primes comparisons for a specific kind of practice, one that notes parallels between autonomous organisms that grow independently side by side. This is the canonical sense of the comparative with which we are familiar: it refers to something like the bringing together (from Latin ‘*com*’: with) of parallels (from ‘*par*’: equal) while reading across cultures beyond one’s own classical heritage.

This model of the comparative upholds ideals like diversity, plurality and heterogeneity. It is often seen to be broadening horizons, pulling

down barriers and crossing frontiers. Most importantly, it seeks to validate our common humanity in search of a universal cultural legacy that lays the foundation for a cosmopolitan future, undivided by regional and national parochialism, or to return to Schlegel, to trace back to one's common roots. Implicit in such comparative endeavours is the assumption that literatures are inherently autonomous and rooted in their own soil. The drawing of parallels between them can therefore be unproblematically regarded as an objective and neutral act, unaffected by the power dynamics of history. This is a model widely accepted, even possibly widely practised. It is this model of comparison I shall refer to as the 'humanist' comparative.

The humanist comparative based on the plant metaphor of literary development proved a powerful way of organizing literary history, especially for engaging with the rise of nationalism in nineteenth-century Europe. It also permeates the way we think about world literature today. But in the wider global context of the twenty-first century, it lacks a certain explanatory force. For the autonomous 'groves of trees' model is unable to give a satisfactory account of the continuing predominance of Western literary norms throughout the world. World literature may be tacitly accepted as that which is universal but, in fact, it mostly refers to the literature of the West – Britain, France, Germany, Italy, Spain, the US and Russia. The disparity of relations between what we call the centre and what we call the periphery in the global literary field contradicts the idea that comparison brings together the objects in a relation of parity.

This issue has simmered throughout comparative literary studies for the last twenty years and a sizeable number of critics have challenged the assumptions upon which some of the humanist comparative methods are based. For '[t]he reasons not to compare are legion', as Susan Stanford Friedman has maintained in 'Why Not Compare?'.³ A discussion of the valuable and intricate points made by Friedman and others on the problems of comparison (Radhakrishnan, Cheah, Saussy et al.) are beyond the scope of this paper, but if there is a core strand of scepticism in their contestations, it is that comparisons which uphold equality and universality have too often been unequal in method and incomplete in scope. As Friedman points out:

[C]omparison presumes a normative standard of measure by which the other is known and often judged. In describing one thing in terms of the other, comparison

assumes knowledge of the one to which the other is compared. The known then operates as the measure of the unknown, standing in an unequal relation to it.⁴

Friedman raises the issue of authority in comparisons, and the basic problem with methods that presume the neutrality of their own measures. Several critics point out that the method can result in a circular argument that confirms their norms as universal and timeless and that such lack of attentiveness towards one's assumptions has resulted in the universal privileging of Western literary norms in the world cultural heritage. The harshest voice was Spivak's, which rallied in *Death of a Discipline* against the 'Hegemonic Comparative Literature' that 'remains part of the Euro-U.S. cultural dominant.'⁵ On a more sober note are the reflections on the state of the discipline collected in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Globalization* (2006), edited by Haun Saussy. Structured as a response to the 1993 ACLA (American Comparative Literature Association) report by Charles Bernheimer, *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, the diverse diagnoses and thoughtful proposals point to the various ways in which humanist comparative criticism assumes self-certifying beliefs that contradict its lofty credo.⁶ It is pointed out that the widening of the scope of canonical comparative literary studies to non-Western traditions has not resulted in an adjustment of previous conceptions and methods. For widening the canon often meant looking for a common humanity whose normativity has been unquestioningly accepted, the result of which is a reproduction of the same norms in a new context. One of the challenges that the humanist comparative faces this century is how to constructively address this issue.

II

Beside the model of the humanist comparative I have outlined, I would like to add another. And that is comparison, not as a voluntary act driven by universalist and cosmopolitan principles, but as an involuntary act enforced by historical necessity, where boundaries are not crossed but violated; barriers are not overcome but disrespected; horizons not broadened but enforced. What I am referring to is the comparative of the postcolonial. For the postcolonial, comparison is never a matter of choice with a view to bringing out parallels across cultures: it is a burden thrust upon the people by the ascendant authority, which has rendered traditional readings invalid. A succinct way of expressing this kind of

comparison is Robert Young's concept of the 'postcolonial comparative' (from which my own title derives). He writes:

[p]ostcolonial authors have always written comparative literature—a literature that did not have to wait for the frame of comparative literature to be in dialogue with other literatures. For postcolonial writers had no choice: that work was done by the violent, historical imposition of colonialism, which forced postcolonial society and its literature into comparison in the first place. Postcolonial literature therefore cannot be anything but comparative, since it is written from the position of always already having been put in comparison with other literatures.⁷

Young's elaboration of the 'postcolonial comparative' highlights that not all comparisons are driven by humanist aims, as well as pointing to historical cases where humanist aims operated within narrow and exclusive bounds. As postcolonial critiques have revealed, comparison, for the postcolonial, is often a narrowing of one's perspective to keep faith with a tradition negated by higher powers, a re-focussing on one's heritage that has been unexamined and denied, a validation, even a valorization of specific historical events replete with concrete suffering and an affirmation of one's own distinct political and social identity in the face of values that render it invisible. It attempts to retrace lost values like linearity, homogeneity, singularity as opposed to the customary comparative standards like heterogeneity and multiplicity. Evoking a particular social and political reality as opposed to the universal is a primary concern. As Young argues:

[p]ostcolonial literature, tormented by other literatures to which it does not belong, seeks to uncompare the comparative situation to which it has been assigned and simultaneously to recompare the terms and position of the invidious, hierarchical comparison according to which the postcolonial is always translated into the universal terms of the West. European literature no longer succeeds in imposing itself as the universal through which postcolonial literature must be translated; the translation works the other way around, transforming the European text into its own idiom.⁸

Young, like critics of the humanist comparative, debunks the humanist assumption that comparison is a peaceable, neutral and equal exchange. In the global literary field, where states are locked in a competitive structure, each wary of protecting its autonomy and heritage, and some struggling to do so, the postcolonial comparative asserts that literature is not where we are least political, but where we are most so.

III

This idea of an inherently ‘perspectivized’ literature as comparative literature has many implications, one of which this discussion would like to develop. The modern literature of East Asia was born from a comparison with European literature in precisely the way that Young outlines. Launched by the spectacular Meiji Restoration of 1868 in Japan, the ‘Civilization and Enlightenment’ movement swept across East Asia, a notable part of which was the spread of European literature. The comparison galvanized the literary fields of Meiji Japan, the Yi dynasty of Korea and the Great Qing Empire of China into a mass reform of historic proportions. To put it simply, European literature was widely accepted as the standard to which East Asian literature must aspire.⁹

But if comparison with European literature was the condition of modern East Asian literature, it was not the result of a direct imposition of history in the model of the postcolonial comparative, for East Asia was never fully colonized by the West. This rudimentary fact complicates the global literary map that has emerged from the ‘West and the rest’ binary. Though East Asia lived through similar processes of Westernization and modernization as elsewhere, it comprised an empire of its own (the Pan-Asian Empire or the Japanese Empire, 1894–1945) in competition with the West. The distinctive dynamic of this region offers the opportunity for us to observe the less recognized ways in which comparisons with European literature were made and the effects that were brought to bear upon the indigenous literatures.

The most striking feature of comparisons in this region is that they were voluntary, systematic and acquisitory. ‘Knowledge shall be sought throughout the world so as to strengthen the foundations of our country’, announced the Meiji Charter Oath of 1868.¹⁰ In this spirit of learning and borrowing, East Asian states drew on the advanced knowledge of the industrial capitalist nations. It is worth pointing out that cultural borrowing was already a long-established pattern in East Asia, as notably seen in the historical form of tributary missions sent to imperial China. Indeed, acquisitory learning and borrowing is a cultural practice which remains strong in the region to this day. What was new was the source: with the advent of modernity, the West displaced China as the centre in the previously Sinocentric world and the ‘opening’ of East Asia was a period of unprecedented cultural adaptation to European civilisation. During East Asian enlightenment, China, Korea and Japan

methodically adopted the structure of Western civilization, not only in politics, economics, science, technology and law but also in art, music and literature. Literature was seen as yet another field of knowledge to be studied and assimilated. Like other disciplines, European literature provided a powerful framework for understanding the shifts modernity brought along and was embraced as a necessary field of knowledge to deal with this period of mammoth transition.

All the 'founding fathers' of modern Japanese, Korean and Chinese literatures were great scholars of Western literature and were vociferous about the necessity of adopting Western ideas from what literature is to what it might be and to what it should do, radically transforming and restructuring literature according to Western standards. For example, Tsubouchi Shoyo (1859–1935) in Japan, Yi Kwangsu in Korea and Lu Xun (1881–1936) in China all began as comparatists of European literature, of a sort, but paved the way for a new kind of literature—New Literature—which flourished among the revolutionary changes.¹¹

New Literature redefined East Asian literature on European terms: the concept of literature (文) changed its focus from the Confucian classics, which were diverse and largely non-fiction, to a more narrowly conceived form of imaginative, individual and expressive writing, typified by the novel. Changing with it also was the conception of a person. Taking the place of the Confucian subject sustained by one's moral obligations to the authority of society was the modern subject whose essence was individual autonomy, freedom and self-realization. Consequently, new forms and themes, like, for example, the *Bildungsroman*, 'I-novels' and a concern with the ordinary texture of the individual life became of supreme importance.¹²

The literary theory of Yi Kwangsu (1892–1950), widely regarded as the 'founding father' of modern Korean literature, is hard to summarize since his beliefs took many turns throughout his long and prolific career, but his trajectory can be taken as representative of East Asian writers who adapted to European literature in the spirit of cultural acquisition. In what has become the Korean modernist manifesto 'What is Literature?', Yi gives an account of what literature should be in modern times. The following is a section entitled 'The Definition of Literature' where he gives his prescription:

Literature is the expression of man's thoughts and feelings in specific form. There are two points to be made about form. First, it has to be written. Orally transmitted myth and tales cannot be regarded as literature. Second, literature refers to genres such as poetry, fiction, drama and criticism and those works that do not observe

these generic traits cannot be regarded as literature. As for thoughts and feelings, even if written in fine prose, physics, natural history, geography, history, law, ethics and the sciences cannot be regarded as literature: only the writing which has been recorded through the experience of thoughts and feelings can be so.¹³

It is a standard definition of literature by Western standards at that time. From the East Asian viewpoint, however, it is a radical reconstruction of literature (文), excluding traditional forms such as analects, 'records', myth, romance, supernatural tales, letters, philosophical speeches, historical narrative, satire and political annals. To those uninitiated in the literary discourse of this time, such eager abandonment of tradition in favour of European literary forms in a region that possesses one of the longest literary cultures in the world may seem perplexing or objectionable. In contrast, there will be others to whom it would be entirely natural that European literature was acknowledged and accepted as superior across pre-modern Japan, Korea and China. In any case, speaking of a 'superior' form of culture at all grates against our multiculturalist ethos.

Indeed, there were substantial reactions against Westernization at the time and these remain across the East Asian countries to this day. The thread of contention and self-recrimination is captured, for example, in Yukio Mishima's comment on the Westernization of Meiji Japan:

[i]n the era of 'Civilization and Enlightenment', that followed the Restoration, Japan tried to deny her past completely, or at least hide from Western eyes any of the old ways that might persist despite all efforts to eradicate them. The Japanese were like an anxious housewife preparing to receive guests, hiding away in closets common articles of daily use and laying aside comfortable everyday clothes, hoping to impress the guests with the immaculate, idealized life of her household, without so much as a speck of dust in view.¹⁴

Such self-criticism was as plentiful then as now, plumbing depths made darker by the illumination of Western enlightenment.

So it is worth reflecting on why European literature was held up as the standard to which East Asian literature must aspire. If we examine Tsubouchi Shoyo's 1885 study *The Essence of the Novel* (小説神髓), unquestionably the most authoritative pro-modernization text, we see listed a long line of European authors, from Homer to George Eliot, as those from whom Japanese writers must learn. He prefaces his pro-European theory of literature with the following statement of intention:

It is because I also believe I have come to understand something of the true purpose of the novel that I now presume to offer my theories, such as they are, to the world. I hope that they will bring the readers to their senses and at the same time

enlighten authors, so that by henceforth planning the steady improvement of the Japanese novel we may finally bring it to the point where it outstrips its European counterparts.¹⁵

Tsubouchi Shoyo's argument indicates something of why European literature had such a major influence at this time. As the lines suggest, the comparative perspective was not so much produced by a forced irruption from the outside but driven by a sense of the need for self-preservation against a superior power and, furthermore, by a wish to tower over that force.

This is one way of pointing out that European literature prevailed as the new standard not only on the grounds of its literary values. What increased its purchase was that belief that literature offered up for scrutiny a repository of consciousness from which Western imperialism emerged. By extracting the essence from the example and assimilating to Western standards, it was widely believed that the imperial powers might ultimately be overcome. Underpinning all of this was the wonder evoked by superior Western technology and military mastery, the enthrallment with trains and battleships, electricity and dynamite, the telegraph and the photograph, producing a set of attitudes that made Westernization imperative. A new literature that corresponds to Western forms might forge an East Asian identity capable of surviving Western hegemony.

At the extreme end of this kind of thinking is Yi Kwangsu's controversial thesis *Treatise on the Reconstruction of Our Nation* (*Minjok Kaejoron*, 민족 개조론, 1922), published in colonial Korea. This now infamous text urged a total submission to the lure of the new and a comprehensive demolition of the traditional. In literary terms, reconstruction meant Europeanization. In political terms, however, it signalled the justification of Japanese annexation of the East Asian States. Proposing a resolution of the clash between tradition and modernity, Yi argued that the creation of a new unified superior East Asia was necessary in order for this region to survive the rapacious European world order. What began as a call for a radical severance with the bondage of the feudal Confucian past and the building of a new identity from the total reconstruction of the old ended with an argument for the dissolution of separate East Asian nations.

This summary of East Asian literary reform is cursory but one might nevertheless propose a theory that adaptation is a more fitting concept for this region than either the humanist or the postcolonial comparative

(which is not to say that they are not both relevant to some degree). Here I use the term 'adaptive' in a broad sense and not at the precise level of genetics. However a radical modification of organisms' behaviour under the influence of a threatening environment which demands simultaneous and extreme alterations in order to survive would be a just description of East Asian literary reform. Recasting the comparison with the adaptive frame is useful as it pulls together the multitudinous aims of the literary reformation with a single historical imperative: one must adapt in order to survive.

The popular contemporary refrain 'The weak are eaten, the strong eat' (弱肉强食) was used to explain aspects of life on every level from the personal to the imperial. That is not to imply that there is a direct link between Spencer's 'survival of the fittest' thesis and East Asian literary reform. But Spencer was a huge influence on Far Eastern thinking around this time and the reforms can be seen in the light of social Darwinist thinking. As the Meiji novelist Natsume Soseki (1867–1916) succinctly put it: '[i]f we were the stronger, it would be a simple matter for us to take the lead and make them (Europeans) imitate us. Instead, we must imitate them.'¹⁶

This kind of systematic imitation was born out of comparison but is not sufficiently accounted for by the model of neutral exchange or by the automatically hegemonic model. Seeing comparative literature as a series of adaptive acts can be productive to the extent that it affirms and validates the agency of the so-called 'peripheries'. The adaptive comparative draws attention to the self-motivated alterations made by the recipient culture even while acknowledging that the reception was broadly compulsory. It sees imitation as being marked by a spirit that is competitive as well as acquiescent, self-interested as well as self-renouncing, derivative as well as innovative. It is evident in, though not exclusive to, modern East Asian literatures, and offers an additional perspective on ongoing definitional debates about comparative literature and world literature.

So to return to Friedman's argument, the main objection was towards comparisons that 'replicate[s] a system of dominance on a global scale' by virtue of the 'known' operating as the measure of the 'unknown'.¹⁷ This worry rested on the assumption that comparisons between literatures of unequal relations can result in the dominant culture's norm prevailing at the expense of the weaker. It is a legitimate concern and an awareness of and vigilance against biases would have to be continually reasserted as a condition of comparison. At the same time, one might note that

hegemonic value judgments that reinstate, serve and perpetuate existing hierarchies are found in all criticisms, regardless of culture or history. While striving for equivalence is an ideal to which we should certainly aspire, it remains the case that literature circulates in a marketplace of unequal competing processes and will almost certainly continue to do so. As Pascale Casanova has argued, the acknowledgment of literary inequality is a precondition for crediting the concealed creative freedom in the 'peripheries', in the 'long and merciless war of literature'.¹⁸ The challenge is to find a way to think about a fluid literary world where centres and peripheries are less fixed, by 'crediting the concealed creative freedom'.

Thus it seems productive to open up the debate about what factors prevent comparison from turning into acts of appropriation. In the case of East Asian reform, key postcolonial terms like double consciousness, mimicry and ambivalence have less relevance, though their explanatory powers are manifest elsewhere. Instead, adaptation, modification, imitation, transculturation, and the invention of racial purity are notions far more effective as analytical units. The key factor to which this can be attributed is language and script.

In this region over the course of the reform, no European language was officially adopted by a nation state and European literatures were read mainly in translation or in adapted form. So even while exposure to the West generated a massive overhaul of culture, there was no direct European power dictating everyday events and no 'master' European language through which one's immediate experiences were filtered. Translators and adaptors took on a creative role in the formation of New Literature, not only in the sense that they often became prominent authors and critics themselves, but also in the way they mediated between traditional and Western literatures, replicating, modifying, reinventing, adapting, combining and transculturating.¹⁹ Running through them is a note of self-determination that emerges from exercising linguistic control over the reception of the texts. One can deduce from this difference the extent to which language and translation played a crucial role in producing a more self-centred reform. This is pertinent to discussions about world literature today where the study of literature written in minor languages is relegated in favour of those translated into English or into a European language.

Another notable feature of the literatures of this region that is relevant to current world literature debates is the diversity of political positions. The motive to compare during the East Asian enlightenment was, as

I have discussed, not only based on affirming a humanist universal. Comparisons of equivalence had a relatively modest role. But the politics upon which the reception of European texts was based encompassed a wide spectrum from Japanese imperialism and fascism, Chinese communism, and Korean pro-Japanese collaborationist ideology through to its polar opposite, anti-Japanese resistance. European literature often fuelled hyper-nationalist, competitive and even combative rhetoric and it led as convincingly to the revolutionary as to the reactionary, to the left as to the right, each literary faction getting further entrenched in their political positions. This wide political spectrum sets a precedent for the debates surrounding 'clash of civilizations' in global literary discussions today and reminds us that literary texts lend themselves to a vast range of political positions and that there is nothing inevitable about humanist aims.

Still there is an unexpected consequence of the Europeanization of East Asian literature that has potentially larger and encouraging relevance in the comparative context: the vernacular language movement. This is a typical example of Westernization being not merely an imposition of knowledge but also a means of resolving the contradictions of the inherited past. In all three East Asian states, Westernization, modernization and a return to the vernacular were indistinguishable. In Japan and Korea, pro-Western authors excoriated the Sinocentric worldview and urged a clean severance with the outdated literary modes of feudalism by writing in the language of their nation. In China modern authors rejected classical literary Chinese (*wen yan*) in favour of the vernacular Chinese (*bai hua*).²⁰ So while it is indisputable that Eurocentric norms were perpetuated, the transformation is more complex than a straightforward enforcement of European interests. As with the example of the vernacular movement, Westernization provided the means of rearticulating indigenous shifts that were already taking place. On this note, C. T. Hsia writes of China, the architects of 'the Literary revolution', like Hu Shi (1891–1962), were those who ably 'applied Western ideas to a fresh study of Chinese problems'.²¹

IV

This essay has situated modern East Asian literary reform in the frame of adaptation. In doing so, it has attempted to identify a type of comparative practice that is mostly obscure. The dynamic, behavioural and migratory view of literary development is less plant-like than mammalian. But it

is less at odds with the humanist and postcolonial perspectives than complementary. It is also useful for two reasons.

One is that it gives an account of why Western literary forms have functioned as universal norms since the advent of modernity while giving a more self-driven picture than what the phrase 'cultural imperialism' might suggest. By opening up the comparative field to the wide range of creative and voluntary adaptive variations that have emerged from the matrix of Western norms, one can acknowledge the abiding presence of European literature in the world literary landscape without reprising old hierarchies. This is connected to my second point. As globalization and digitization impact ever more on literary study, the predominance of the Western framework will become increasingly subject to re-evaluation. But it is highly probable that the predominance of European texts will continue. How we might address this issue is an ongoing concern. By being attentive to the levels of redress and adaptive recreation in the peripheries, Western classics can be acknowledged in their function as connecting centres between diverse literary spheres, rather than being seen as founts of literary worth releasing universal values. Tracing the global influence of a major author like Virginia Woolf, for example, can produce a literary network connecting diverse regions and languages, mediating a large proportion of literary interchange. A pattern of global connections, in which Woolf serves as a centre of communication pathways between peripheries, can reveal not only the structural predominance of the Western canon but also the highly adaptive regional functionalism to emerge from it. If the global literary field can be analysed as a configuration of connective networks, it may prove to be a step towards cultural equivalence.

Forty years after Mishima famously likened the Meiji attitude to that of an anxious housewife, Haruki Murakami, himself no stranger to European fiction, re-assessed the Meiji legacy. In his introduction to *Sanshiro* by Natsume Soseki, the representative Meiji novelist, Murakami writes that Soseki

willingly adopted [...] Western novel forms as his models and modified them in his own way. [...] As a result, in *Sanshiro*, despite the Western framework, cause and effect become confused here and there, the metaphysical and the physical are jumbled together, and the affirmation and the negation are nearly indistinguishable.²²

This re-evaluation is a welcome development that characterizes the turn that global literary studies have taken. The formative interactions

between East Asian literature and European literature provide a good example of the adaptive as a comparative practice. Of course, there are many more than the three models of the comparative I have discussed. What I hope to have achieved in highlighting the adaptive, however, is to place the comparative in a broader context where a variety of impulses co-exist in varying levels of compatibility with each other and to invite examinations of the adaptive alongside the humanist and the postcolonial in other literary traditions.

NOTES

- 1 Friedrich Schlegel, quoted in John Neubauer, 'Introduction', in *History of the Literary Cultures of East-Central Europe: Junctures and Disjunctures in the 19th and 20th Centuries. Volume III: The Making and Remaking of Literary Institutions*, edited by Marcel Cornis-Pope and John Neubauer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007), pp. 345–54 (pp. 346–347). [Vol. XXII in the series *A Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages*.]
- 2 John Neubauer, 'Organicist Poetics as Romantic Heritage?', in *Romanticism. Volume III: Romantic Poetry*, edited by Angela Estherhammer (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2002), pp. 491–507 (p. 500). [Vol. XVI in the series *A Comparative History of Literatures in European Languages*.]
- 3 Susan Stanford Friedman, 'Why Not Compare?', *PMLA*, 126.3 (2011), 753–762 (p. 753).
- 4 *Ibid.*
- 5 Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, *Death of a Discipline* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003), pp. 38, 25. Spivak proposes in the introduction that the 'book be read as the last gasp of a dying discipline' (p. xii). She has publicly recanted her verdict on comparative literature since.
- 6 Haun Saussy, ed., *Comparative Literature in an Age of Globalization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), p. viii.
- 7 Robert Young, 'The Postcolonial Comparative', *PMLA*, 128.3 (2013), 683–689 (p. 688).
- 8 *Ibid.*
- 9 By 'East Asian' literatures I refer to those written in languages that have been written in the Chinese script, that is to say in China, Korea, Japan and pre-modern Vietnam. 'East Asia' is not culturally homogenous, nor did the diverse cultures respond to Western imperialism in a uniform manner. However, East Asia is categorized as a cultural unit on the grounds that it had in common the Chinese script and the literary heritage of classical Chinese.
- 10 Donald Keene, *Emperor of Japan: Meiji and His World* (London: George Allen and Unwin, 1951), p. 137.
- 11 Eileen J. Chang, *Literary Remains: Death, Trauma, and Lu Xun's Refusal to Mourn* (2013); Sowon S. Park, 'The Pan-Asian Empire and World

- Literatures', *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture*, 15.5 (2013) < <http://dx.doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.2348> > [accessed 30 April 2015].
- 12 See Joshua Mostow, ed., *The Columbian Companion to Modern East Asian Literature* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2003); Michel Hockx, ed., *The Literary Field of Twentieth-Century China* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1999); Bruce Fulton, ed., *Modern Korean Fiction: An Anthology* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005).
 - 13 Yi Kwangsu, 이광수 전집 (*Yi Kwangsu Chonjip; The Complete Works of Yi Kwangsu*), vol. I (Seoul: Sam Jung Dang Co., 1966), p. 507. The critical essays of Yi are not available in English, although select translations are in progress. The original text of 'What is Literature?' is in mixed style (Gukhanmun) of Chinese characters and Korean. Both the English translation and the Korean transcription given here are mine. '문학이란 특정 형식하에 인간의 사상과 감정을 발표한 자를 위함이니라. 차에 특정한 형식이라 함은 두가지이니, 하나는 문자로 정의함을 말하니, 구비 전설은 문학이라 말하기 불가능하고, 문자로 기록된 후에야 비로소 문학이라 할 수 있다 함이 제 일이요, 제 이는 시 소설 희곡 비평등이 문학상 제 형식이니, 기록하되 체제가 무히 만록한 것은 문학이라 칭키 불가능하며 사상감정이라 함은 그 내용을 말함이니 비록 문자로 기록한 것이라도 물리, 박물, 지리, 역사, 법률, 윤리등 과학적 지식을 기록한 자는 문학이라 말하기 부득하며, 오직 인간으로 사상과 감정을 기록한 것이라야 문학이라 함을 위함이다.'
 - 14 Yukio Mishima, 'Introduction', in Tamotsu Yato, *Naked Festival*, translated by Meredith Wetherby and Sachiko Teshima (New York: Walker, 1968), pp. 7-15 (p. 7).
 - 15 Shoyo Tsubouchi, *The Essence of the Novel*, translated by Nanette Twine (Brisbane: University of Queensland Press, 1981), Department of Japanese Occasional Papers 11, p. 3.
 - 16 Natsume Soseki, 'The Civilization of Modern-Day Japan' (*Gendai Nihon No Kaika*), translated by Jay Rubin, in *The Columbia Anthology of Modern Japanese Literature: From Restoration to Occupation 1868-1945*, edited by J. Thomas Rimer and Van C. Gessel (New York: Columbia University Press, 2005), pp. 315-321 (p. 320).
 - 17 Friedman, 'Why Not Compare?', p. 753.
 - 18 Pascale Casanova, 'Literature as a World', *New Left Review*, 31 (2005), 71-90 (p. 90).
 - 19 Karen Laura Thornber, *Empire of Texts in Motion: Chinese, Korean, and Taiwanese Transculturations of Japanese Literature* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2009).
 - 20 Gang Zhou, *Placing the Modern Chinese Vernacular in Transnational Literature* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2011); Donald H. Shively, ed., *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1971).
 - 21 Hu Shi wrote his landmark essay 'Suggestions for a Reform of Literature' (1917), published in a leading Chinese journal *New Youth*, while studying at Columbia.
 - 22 Haruki Murakami, 'Introduction', in Natsume Soseki, *Sanshiro* (London: Penguin, 2009), pp. xxiii-xxxvi (p. xxxv).

Your short guide to the EUP Journals
Blog <http://eupublishingblog.com/>

*A forum for discussions relating to
[Edinburgh University Press Journals](#)*



EDINBURGH
University Press

1. The primary goal of the EUP Journals Blog

To aid discovery of authors, articles, research, multimedia and reviews published in Journals, and as a consequence contribute to increasing traffic, usage and citations of journal content.

2. Audience

Blog posts are written for an educated, popular and academic audience within EUP Journals' publishing fields.

3. Content criteria - your ideas for posts

We prioritize posts that will feature highly in search rankings, that are shareable and that will drive readers to your article on the EUP site.

4. Word count, style, and formatting

- Flexible length, however typical posts range 70-600 words.
- Related images and media files are encouraged.
- No heavy restrictions to the style or format of the post, but it should best reflect the content and topic discussed.

5. Linking policy

- Links to external blogs and websites that are related to the author, subject matter and to EUP publishing fields are encouraged, e.g. to related blog posts

6. Submit your post

Submit to ruth.allison@eup.ed.ac.uk

If you'd like to be a regular contributor, then we can set you up as an author so you can create, edit, publish, and delete your *own* posts, as well as upload files and images.

7. Republishing/repurposing

Posts may be re-used and re-purposed on other websites and blogs, but a minimum 2 week waiting period is suggested, and an acknowledgement and link to the original post on the EUP blog is requested.

8. Items to accompany post

- A short biography (ideally 25 words or less, but up to 40 words)
- A photo/headshot image of the author(s) if possible.
- Any relevant, thematic images or accompanying media (podcasts, video, graphics and photographs), provided copyright and permission to republish has been obtained.
- Files should be high resolution and a maximum of 1GB
- Permitted file types: *jpg, jpeg, png, gif, pdf, doc, ppt, odt, pptx, docx, pps, ppsx, xls, xlsx, key, mp3, m4a, wav, ogg, zip, ogv, mp4, m4v, mov, wmv, avi, mpg, 3gp, 3g2.*