Tracking a ghost’s lingering influence:
Ch ng Chisang (? -1135) and a forgotten style of Sino-Korean poetry

Gregory Evon
The University of New South Wales

1. Introduction

The idea that poetry (K. *si*; C. *shi*) possesses “a meaning beyond words” (K. *n -oe chi- i* ; C. *yan-wai zhi-i*) is a commonplace in the history of Chinese literary thought. This expression seems generally to have been used as a positive aesthetic judgement, but it would seem to do little violence to read it against the larger Confucian literary tradition. In that case, we can look to two canonical statements regarding the functions of poetry.

The earliest definition of poetry is found in the *Book of Documents*:

> The [p]oem articulates what is on the mind intently; song makes language last long (Owen 1992: 26).

Later, this was rearticulated in the “Great Preface” to the *Book of Songs*:

> The poem [the poetry of the *Book of Songs*] is that to which what is intently on the mind goes. In the mind it is being intent; coming out in language, it is a poem (Owen 1992: 40).

These two ideas formed the cornerstones of traditional Chinese views of what poetry *is* and *does*. Against this background, the idea that poetry possesses “a meaning beyond words” can be seen to have political and ethical implications insofar as that meaning might be hidden from view—not openly stated—and yet accessible through a variety of extra-textual information.

Moreover, the definition of poetry offered in the “Great Preface” leaves ample room for this possibility if we draw a distinction between the poem as a finished product expressed in words and its origin as intention in the mind: “what is intently on the mind” is itself “beyond words,” and this, in turn, necessitates ever more words (cf. ibid.: 128-129).

Although these judgements on the identity and function poetry arose in China, they became fundamental to the Korean literary tradition, where, to no small extent, they persist in various forms to this day.

In this specific context, it is necessary to highlight the idea of what poetry *is* and *does*. It is on this basis that we can approach a unique feature of Sino-Korean poetry and attempt to address one aspect of the history of this feature.

2. Sino-Korean or Chinese?

In 1960, Richard Rutt published a lengthy article which provided an overview of the history Chinese learning in Korea and more important, for my immediate purpose, the mechanics and terminology used by Koreans when composing Chinese poetry (Rutt 1960). The importance of this article cannot be overstated. It is, so far as I know, the single most detailed treatment of this subject with regard to the full range of issues involved in the composition of Sino-Korean poetry (hereafter, *Hansi*), and this, because Rutt assumed that his readers would have little or no prior knowledge of the subject.

Rutt’s motives and methods in writing the article also are interesting and important. He was keen to record of a style of education that it seemed “may disappear in the hurly-burly of the technical age” (ibid.: 60-61), and critically, the sources he drew on were not limited to books. Instead, his primary sources were people who were involved in such education. In short, he preserved what was a still living method of traditional education (ibid.: 1-2), and one of the critical elements of that education was the composition of *Hansi*.

With regard to *Hansi*, there are two major divisions: “ancient style verse” (K. *koch’e-si*; C. *guti-shi*) and “modern style verse” (K. *k nch’e -si*; C. *jinti-shi*), and both can be written with five or seven syllable lines, and with eight lines or four; the latter is known as a quatrain. The “modern style” is also known as “regulated verse” (K. *ryul/yul-si*; C. *lu-shi*), and it is the more demanding of the two in terms of its formal requirements (Liu 1962: 24-27). In addition to the required use of rhyme at the final syllables of even numbered lines, the “modern style” also requires that various positions in each line have characters belonging to one of the two tonal divisions, even or oblique.

Here I am solely concerned with the “modern style” or “regulated verse” with eight lines, for it is in Rutt’s description of this style that we are forced to recognize two equally important facts.

First, Koreans did compose Chinese poetry precisely on the same basis as did the Chinese, and at least in terms of the mechanics—the techniques employed—of composition, they demonstrated no shortcomings in their understanding of what was required. This is an aesthetic judgement of the most basic sort, and it is easily verifiable if one subjects Korean *Hansi* to an analysis of rhymes and tonal placement. Second, Koreans employed two variations of the “modern style” which were recorded by Rutt, and these two variations were codified as patterns that one could follow in writing “regulated verse.”

These two variations differ from what is regarded as the “modern style” proper in the Chinese context with respect to the placement of tones within any given line and in turn, the two lines which form a couplet. The normal pattern should have the tonal variation of the first couplet reversed in the second couplet, and the third couplet repeats the first and the fourth repeats the second (Liu 1962: 26-27).

The two Korean variations, however, provide an interesting twist: in the first variation, the pattern of the first couplet is reversed in each of the remaining couplets; in the second variation, the same pattern is repeated in the first three couplets, and then reversed in the fourth (Rutt 1960: 63).

These two variations are astonishing in light of the extensive work on the tonal prosody—the formal requirements—of regulated verse carried out by scholars working within the Chinese tradition and writing in English. In the authoritative works done by such scholars, there is no room for variation with regard to the “modern style” (Liu 1962; Bodman 1978; Bodman and Wong 1986), and as a consequence, these two Korean variations simply fall outside the limits of the “modern style.”

On the other hand, modern critical studies published in Chinese and traditional works themselves—especially those belonging to the traditional form of literary criticism known as *shihua* (poetry-talks)—are much more inclusive (e.g. Zhang and Zhang 1975, vol. 1: 126-132). It is not my intention here to provide an overview of the Chinese scholarship, but rather to look at the history of this issue in the Korean literary context.

3. The clash and the complement of traditions

The idea that these two Korean variations have somehow been forgotten is neither completely correct, nor is it wholly incorrect, and as with many topics which stand at the crossroad of the Korean and Chinese cultural traditions, it is the nebulousness of the point—indeed, the difficulty of offering a neat answer—that makes the question so frustrating and also, so interesting.

In effect, one is responsible for two traditions, much as Korean writers were themselves. This double responsibility is a central point of concern in the Korean poetry-talk (K. *sihwa*; C. *shihua*) tradition—the body of writings on which this paper is partly based—and this body of writings is fascinating because we are forced to recognize Korean writers' continual shifts of attention between the Korean and Chinese traditions. Such shifts are also disorienting, and here I would like to bring some order to this.

In the Chinese context, we can find examples of these two variations. These examples are included among various other examples (Wang 1958: 115), however, and there is no indication that these two variations provided models/patterns for emulation in China. Although there is a variety of specific terminology related to prosody—virtually the same in Korea as in China—these various examples are called, in sum, *yoch'eshi* (C. *ao-ti shi*), and various translations of this word are possible.

In my opinion, the best is "transgressive style," in which transgressive is to be understood in relation the normal arrangement of tones in the "regulated style." In short, the *ao*/*yo* style does not follow the normal rules: hence, it is "transgressive."

In the Korean context, this style is explicitly associated with Ch ng Chisang (?-1135), who was executed for his alleged involvement in an attempted coup d'état with the Buddhist priest Myoch' ng (? -1135). According to a story ascribed to Yi Kyubo (1168-1241), Ch ng later became a ghost and took revenge upon his executioner, Kim Pusik (1075-1151). Although the provenance of this story is questionable, there can be little doubt about the importance of Ch ng's name in relation to this style or his lingering presence in the Sino-Korean critical tradition.

Ch ng Chisan g and the "transgressive style" are virtually synonymous in the Korean sources—both traditional and modern—but in spite of this, it is not possible to say with any absolute certainty that he is the source for the two variant patterns in Korea. Even though these two variant patterns fall within the "transgressive style," there are other patterns which also would be described as "transgressive." In short, the two Korean variant patterns are *yoch'esi*, but not all *yoch'esi* are the same as the two Korean variant patterns.

Some of Ch ng's extant poems do show irregularities which clearly mark them as *yoch'esi*. None conform to the two Korean variant patterns, however, and herein lies the greatest obstacle: very few of Ch ng's poems have survived, and as a consequence, we cannot know whether he was, in fact, the source for these two variations in Korea, although it seems safe to assume that these two variant forms would have been associated with him in the Korean context.

This significance of this point will be addressed in more detail later, but now I would like to turn to the most of important of the traditional sources which treat him and the transgressive style.

4. A ghost in the Korean sources

The first mention of the word *yoch'esi* in Korea seems to have occurred in the late 15th century, in S K j ng's (1420 -1488) *Tongin sihwa* (*Poetry Talks by a Man* *from the East* [i.e. Korea]), completed between 1474 and 1477. S had also worked on the final draft of the *Kory -sa* (*History of the Kory Dynasty* [918-1392]), completed in 1451, and here too we find specific comments about Ch ng's poetry. Although the word *yoch'esi* is not found in the *Kory -sa*, it is not unreasonable to think that S 's interest in Ch ng derived from his work on the *History*, and that this interest was subsequently reflected in his *Tongin sihwa*. As will be seen later, this interest seems to have been reflected in another important text as well.

The likelihood of this is further strengthened inasmuch as the word does not seem to be mentioned in any of passages related to Ch ng in the most important and earliest *sihwa* collections in Korea: the *P'ahan-jip* (Collection to smash leisure; Yi Illo [1152-1220]); the problematic *Paegun sos l* (Stories by White Cloud [Yi Kyubo, 1168-1241) or the identical—or at least, similar—portions contained in the more authoritative *Tongguk Yi-Sangguk-chip* (The collected works of the Prime Minister Yi [Kyubo] of the Eastern Realm [Korea]; the *Pohan-jip* (Collection to mend leisure; Ch'oe Ch'a, 1188-1260); or the *Y gong p'aes l* (The stories of Y gong [Yi Chehy n, 1287-1367]).

The detailed reference to Ch ng in the *Kory -sa* is significant because the focus is on politics and his poetry, and this portion comprises the final lines of the section on Myoch' ng's failed rebellion. In full it reads:

> Chisang's original name was Chiw n, and from an early age, he was intelligent and renowned for his ability to write poetry. He was selected as the top candidate in the state examinations, and passing through the ranks, attained the position of chamberlain (*kig ju*) to the king. People say that [Kim] Pusik [1075-1151] at first kept his name on a par with Chisang in terms of literary composition, but that he stored up dissatisfaction and reaching that point [of dissatisfaction], he killed him, relying for support on [the charge of] secret compliance [i.e. the charge that Chisang had been in collusion with Myoch' ng's planned insurrection]. Chisang wrote poetry and had obtained the style of the Late Tang [836-905]. [With] Strange and skilful quatrains (K. *u-gong*; C. *you-gong*), his words (K. *sa-* ; C. *ci-yu*) were splendid (K. *ch' ng -hwa*; C. *qing-hua*), and his tonal patterns (K. *un-gy k* ; C. *yun-ge*) were heroic and unrestrained (K. *ho-il*; C. *hao-yi*). Of himself, he achieved a masterly method (*ilgab p*) (*KS*, vol 2: 773, a:18-b:5).

The first of S 's several entries on Ch ng in the *Tongin sihwa* reads, in places, very closely to the above passage from the *Kory -sa*:

> (Muny l [lit. Literary Vigour]) Kim Pusik and the Royal Remonstrator (Kan i) Ch ng Chisang kept thei r names on a par through poetry at one time…[In Kim's poems one finds that] his words and meanings are strict and orthodox, proper and elegant, and substantial, and these are the words of one who truly possesses virtue. The words and tones (K. *-un*; C. *yu-yun*) of Ch ng's poetry are fine and brilliant (K. *ch' ng -hwa*; C. *qing-hua*), and the structure of his lines (K. *ku-gy k* ; C. *ju-ge*) is heroic and unrestrained (K. *ho-il*; C. *hao-yi*). [He had] deeply obtained [i.e. mastered] the methods of the late Tang, and he especially excelled in the "transgressive style" (K. *yoch'e*; C. *ao-ti*) [as can be seen in some of his lines of poetry]. When these lines were recited [lit. came out of the mouth], people were astonished. Such lines were praised far and wide at that time, and at a stroke these lines were sufficient to sweep away the useless throng. The two masters' [Kim and Ch ng] temperaments did not conform each to the other (*TSH*, vol. 1, no. 4: 33-35).

In the section immediately following this introduction to Ch ng and his poetic style, S explains what is meant by *yoch'e*. This explanation appears to be the first of its kind in Korea. It closely resembles those given in Chinese sources (e.g. Dong 1974: esp., 432), and it seems to be the model for subsequent explanations in the Korean tradition.

> The "transgressive style" (*yoch'e*) was another change of Tang prosody (*Tang-ryul*), and in both the past and present, there are not many writers [who have used this style]. In this method [i.e. the "transgressive style"], one encounters a place at which the prosody (K. *yul/ryul;* C. *lu*) is to be changed [i.e. the tone should be altered]. Where one should write down a character belonging to the even tone category (K. *p'y ng -cha*; C. *ping-zi*), one instead writes [lit. switches and uses] a character belonging to the oblique tone category (K. *ch' k -cha*; C. *ze-zi*), [and one does this] in order to make the words' energy (K. *-ki;* C. *yu-qi*) unusual, haughty, and not in accordance [with what is proper or usual]. The people of the late Tang delighted in employing this style, and Ch ng's poetry deeply possessed that exquisiteness. Subsequently, there was no one able to continue [this style]. Only [Y ngh n] Kim Chidae (1190-1266) obtained this method…[and in his lines of poetry], there are many which extensively adopt [this method] (*TSH* [1: 5]: 35-36).

It is clear that S admires Ch ng and his use of the "transgressive style." Any doubts we might have on this point are dispelled in a subsequent section of the *Tongin sihwa* (*TSH* [1: 37]: 88-89), and in sum, these comments are important for a variety of reasons, in terms of both the history of Korean literary thought and S as a practicing literary critic.

First and foremost, it is evident that S is primarily concerned with Ch ng as a poet. There is no explicit mention of political issues, the most pertinent one being Ch ng's alleged role in Myoch' ng's failed rebellion. This is critical inasmuch as poetry itself is seen as linked to moral, ethical, and political concerns. In the Chinese and hence Korean classical literary traditions, this connection is of fundamental importance, as is made plain in the often quoted passage found in the *Analects of Confucius*: "Confucius said, 'As for the three hundred poems in the *Book of Odes*, one word [i.e. phrase] embraces them [all]: '[their] thoughts have no deviations'" (cf. Ames and Rosemont, Jr. 1998: 76, 232; Owen 1992: 48, 584).

As a consequence, it seems that S is distancing Ch ng from this sort of moral and political criticism by focusing on his poetry alone. At the same time, the basis for these criticisms is evident, for it is, in effect, the fundamental basis of all poetry criticism. It is thus significant that in the forward to the *Tongin sihwa*, written by Kang H imaeng (1424 -1483), Kang devoted considerable space to justifying the text on the basis of Confucius' statement, quoted above. Moreover, Kang cited the same passage as the first poetry-talk (*sihwa*) (*TSH*: K, 21; C, 22), thereby marshalling the support of the Confucian tradition for S 's book.

It seems possible that Kang was perhaps troubled by the lack of orthodox moral, ethical, and political values manifested in S 's text, since by the time the *Tongin sihwa* was written, the fiercely Neo-Confucian Chos n dynasty was over three-quarters of a century old, and distinctions between orthodoxy and heterodoxy were firmly drawn.

More to the point, Ch ng Chisang possessed no single attribute which might be used to present him as a good, orthodox (Neo-) Confucian. At best, he was an eccentric fellow who fell prey to the complexities of politics at the royal court; at worst, he was an eccentric who was also a dangerous plotter, complicit in an attempted coup d'état. In neither case does he fit the stereotype of a good (Neo-) Confucian, and here the question of *types* is critical, and this brings us to the question of poetry.

To the best of my knowledge, we can assume that those who would have read the *Tongin sihwa*—especially those at the end of the 15th century—would have known Kim Pusik and Chŏng Chisang, and their respective places in the history of the Koryŏ dynasty. In light of this, Sŏ's comments on their poetic styles seem to serve the purpose of defining these two different men's personalities through their poetic styles. It would seem that Sŏ assumes that his readers know these two men, and through his evaluation of their poetry, he demonstrates that the quality and character of the man is expressed in his poetic manner: for Kim, this style—like his character and reputation—is orthodox; for Chŏng, this style is transgressive, just as his character, too, is transgressive.

The central point in his evaluations of the two men is the distinction between what is orthodox and what is transgressive, and as mentioned above, this distinction does not place Chŏng at a disadvantage in the *Tongin sihwa*. This runs counter to our expectations insofar as the Chosŏn dynasty was thoroughly influenced by Neo-Confucianism to the extent that all else—that is, the Buddhist and Daoist thought associated with Myoch'ŏng and Chŏng—were to be suppressed. If nothing else, this is the stereotype by which modern scholars have come to view the Chosŏn dynasty, and although it is accurate enough as a general description of the overall intellectual tendencies of the dynasty, it often fails miserably when applied to specific instances.

Kim Manjung (1637-1692) is perhaps the most well-known, clear-cut example of what amounts to a remarkable deviation from the norms of Neo-Confucian orthodoxy (Bouchez 1985), but when we consider that Sŏ too was a Neo-Confucian, we begin to sense the complexities involved, and just as important, the shades of difference among various thinkers, writers, and statesmen (*kwallyo-munin*).

This conflict was not confined simply to politics *per se*, but was instead clearly articulated in ideas about literature and its application, uses, and meaning, and the general division becomes [Neo-] Confucianism to one side, and Daoism and Buddhism to the other. By the time the *Tongin sihwa* was written, this division seems to have been firmly established (cf. Chŏng Taerim 1991: 71-72), and as a result we sense something rather transgressive in Sŏ himself.

Yet this is precisely where the problem is to be found: Chŏng Taerim firmly places Sŏ in the established Neo-Confucian camp in the early part of the Chosŏn dynasty. And Chŏng's argument seems perfectly reasonable insofar as he focuses on utilitarianism (*hyoyong-non*) and its central importance in traditional Korean literary thought and criticism, especially in the early decades of the Chosŏn dynasty when Neo-Confucianism was becoming firmly entrenched to the exclusion of non-orthodox forms of thought: primarily, Daoism and Buddhism, two heterodox philosophical and religious systems whose positions were seen to be in direct conflict with the Neo-Confucians' fundamental aims of a centralized, hierarchical bureaucratic system.

One of the critical pieces of information used by Chŏng Taerim is Sŏ's preface to the *Tongmun-sŏn*. The larger context—political, intellectual, and even economic—in which the preface was written is interesting in and of itself, but these issues need not concern us here. What I would like to emphasise is the remarkable disparity between Sŏ's *Tongin sihwa* and the views he advances elsewhere, specifically in his *Tongmun-sŏn sŏ* (Preface to the Anthology of Writings from the East) and *Chin-Tongmun-sŏn chŏn* (Note on Advancing the *Tongmun-sŏn*).

In his “Note,” S suggests a difference between the Kory and the Chos n dynasties, and the question of the place of writing in the larger political, religious, and philosophical context is central to this difference: “Literary refinement came to great renown in the Kory , and guidance by virtue flourishes in our well -governed age [i.e. the Chos n dynasty]” (quoted in Ch ng Taerim 1991: 70).

In the “Preface” S ’s appeal to Neo -Confucian norms is most clearly stated, however, and this is evident in the final section in which he draws a broad distinction between the writings of the past—that is, the classical past of Confucianism—and those of the “subsequent ages” (K. *huse;* C. *hou-shi*)—that is, the generations subsequent to the classical past.

Here too he charts the development of writing/literature (K. *mun*; C. *wen*) in Korea, though in greater detail than in the “Note,” and as before he judges the newly established Chos n dynasty as sitting at the apex of Korea’s literary achievement:

> Writing in Korea began in the Three Kingdoms [3rd-7th centuries], flourished in the Kory , and has reached its apex in this vigorous Morning [Cho; i.e. the Chos n dynasty]. This is related to the vicissitudes of heaven and earth and of fortune, and the origins of this, nevertheless, can be scrutinized. Moreover, writing (*mun*) is a tool for piercing the Dao: the writing of the *Six Classics* [of Confucianism] “is not ‘having intention directed at writing’ ” [K. *pi yu i mun*; C. *fei you yi yu wen*], and of its own accord, it is wedded to the Dao. The writings of the subsequent ages (*huse*) first have the intention of writing, and some [writings] are not genuine with respect to the Dao. For those engaged in study at present, if one is able really [to put one’s] heart in the Dao and not write within writing [i.e. instead to write in accord with the (Neo-) Confucian Dao, rather than being intent on writing first and foremost: see above], if one takes root in the *Classics* [of Confucianism] (K. *ky ng* ; C. *jing*) and is not stupefied by the *cheja* (C. *zhuzi*; i.e. the various teachings other than Confucianism), if one reveres what is true and rejects the ephemeral, and if one is high of virtue and scholastic attainment and is just: then this is what is taken to serve as the wings [i.e. aids or assists] for the writings of the sages, and it will surely have the Dao. If one writes within writing and does not take root in the Dao, if one turns one’s back on the model and standard of the *Six Classics*, [and thus] falls into the hollow of the grain mortar [i.e. mistakes] of the curriculum of the *cheja*, then one’s writings are not writings piercing the Dao (*TMS*, vol. 1: 552).

The position set forth by S is marked by a variety of inconsistencies, most notably the conflict between the virtue of the newly established Chos n dynasty and his overall emphasis regarding the devolution of writing—and the moral/ethical component therein. S seems to be arguing out of both sides of his mouth, and in the historical context, this is understandable. The question of the ethical/political legitimacy of the new dynasty leads to an inevitable conflict between means and ends, and as made clear in the “Preface” itself, the *Tongmun-s n* is being presented to the king whose own virtue is explicitly seen as linked to it (*TMS*, vol. 1: 22 and 552).

Ch ng Taerim also points to the logical absurdity (*nolli-ch n’gae i mosun*) of this position insofar as it leads to a collapse between the “root and the branch” (*pon-mal*)—the Dao itself, on the one hand, and writing and its function, on the other—and he notes that this absurdity is to be found in Zhu Xi himself and did not pass without criticism (69). There is nonetheless another position from within the Korean tradition by which this absurdity can be elucidated, and this position is to be found in S K j ng as critic in his *Tongin sihwa.*

Based on Sŏ's comments regarding Chŏng Chisang, one can put forth the counter argument that the "Preface" and the "Note" were perhaps not so reflective of Sŏ's intellectual position as they might appear at first glance. In particular, one is struck by his singling out the *cheja*, and as reflected in the annotators' comments to the "Preface," the use of *cheja* in this context is most strongly suggestive of Daoism, specifically the *Lao-zi* and the *Zhuang-zi* (*TMS*, vol. 1: 22). This censure of Daoism—though Buddhism perhaps can also be included here—is further underscored by his exhortation to reject the "ephemeral" (K. *pu*; C. *fu*), itself a none too subtle denunciation of the idea of transience central to both Buddhism and Daoism. In short, the disparity between the "Preface" and "Note," on the one hand, and the *Tongin sihwa*, on the other, is remarkable, and it is difficult to know precisely how to interpret this disparity.

One thing is clear enough, however: the looseness and freedom in personality expressed through Daoism and Buddhism as found in Yi Kyubo's writings, for instance, turns to a greater self-consciousness—more intellectual, more restrained—as found in Kim Manjung who, though sympathetic to intellectual traditions other than Confucianism, nonetheless subjected these to a critical gaze.

By contrast, Sŏ merely presents to us two utterly dissimilar critical bases upon which he appraises literature. In a sense, it is as if two very different people worked on the *Tongmun-sŏn* and the *Tongin sihwa*, and it is thus significant that Chŏng Taerim makes a point of dispelling any doubts regarding the veracity of Sŏ's authorship of either the "Preface" or the "Note," though he does so for reasons unrelated to either Chŏng Chisang or the *Tongin sihwa* (66).

In spite of this apparent dissimilarity, there is at least one reason to see a remarkable degree of continuity between the *Tongmun-sŏn* and the *Tongin sihwa*, and this continuity is precisely Chŏng Chisang's poetry, or perhaps more accurately, the absence of it.

Sŏ is the figure whose name comes up in relation to three major texts which mention Chŏng Chisang and his poetry—the *Koryŏ-sa* (1448) (Pratt, Rutt, Hoare 1999: 430), the *Tongin sihwa* (1474-1477), and the *Tongmun-sŏn* (1478)—and the coincidence of the final two texts is interesting because it seems that all that remains of Chŏng's poetry is gathered therein: Min Pyŏngsu counts 13 pieces (1997: 99), whereas the index to the *Tongmun-sŏn* lists 14 individual titles (*TMS*, *saegin* [index]: 47). Whatever the case, but a few pieces have been transmitted, and it is reasonable to believe that Sŏ is largely responsible for the preservation of what little remains.

5. Conclusion

While Sŏ seems to have been the critic who took the deepest interest in Chŏng Chisang and preserved his scanty corpus of poems, many other critics—both before and after Sŏ—have been responsible for preserving memories of Chŏng in the tradition of Korean poetry criticism. In essence, Chŏng's poetic fame has persevered throughout this tradition in spite of the fact that there is little upon which to judge his fame. Chŏng Chisang the poet barely exists, and yet he is a continual and important presence in Korea's poetry-talk tradition.

Moreover, his name is virtually synonymous with the "transgressive style," and this raises an intriguing question related to the two variant forms of the "modern style" recorded by Rutt: how is it that these two variant forms came to be codified patterns in Korea, albeit little used? These are "transgressive style," but many other variations—"transgressive styles"—are possible: why these two in particular?

Answering such questions, if only tentatively, would require attention to issues and materials dealt with only briefly in the limitations of this paper: in particular, the fascinating resources found in the Chinese poetry-talk tradition, the equally fascinating resources found in the Korean tradition, the influences of the former upon the latter, the many shifts in critical attitudes both in China and Korea, and the emergence of different schools of literary thought.

Of these, the last is the most important, and it seems likely that the codification of these two variant forms in Korea was a result of the empiricist *Sirhak* (Practical Learning) movement in the late 18th or early 19th centuries. This thorny issue, however, must be set aside for another occasion.

Works Cited

Ames, Roger T. and Henry Rosemont, Jr. 1998. *The Analects of Confucius: A Philosophical Translation*. New York: Ballantine Books.

Bodman, Richard W. 1978. “Poetics and Prosody in Early Medieval China: A Study and Translation of Kukai’s *Bunkyô Hifuron*.” Ph.D. diss., Cornell University.

Bodman, Richard and Shirleen S. Wong. 1986. “Shih,” pp. 682-689 in William H. Nienhauser, Jr., editor and compiler, *The Indiana Companion to Traditional Chinese Literature*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Bouchez, Daniel. 1985. “Buddhism and Neo-Confucianism in Kim Manjung’s Random Essays (S p’o manp’il),” pp. 445 -472 in William Theodore de Bary and JaHyun Kim Haboush, eds., *The Rise of Neo-Confucianism in Korea*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Cho, Chong p. 1991. *Han’guk sihwa y n’gu* (Researches in Korean poetry-talks). Seoul: T’aehaksa.

Ch ng, Taerim. 1991. *Han’guk koj n -munhak pip’y ng - i ihae* (Understanding traditional Korean literary criticism). Seoul: T’aehaksa.

Dong, Wenhuan (1833-1877). 1974 [reprint of the 1864 edition]. *Sheng-diao si-pu* (Four charts of the [sounds and] tones). Taipei: Guangwen Shuju.

KS (*Kory -sa* [The history of the Kory dynasty], facsimile reproduction). 1955. Seoul: Y nse Taehakkyo Tongbanghak Y n’guso.

Liu, James J.Y. 1962. *The Art of Chinese Poetry*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Min, Py ngsu. 1997. *Han’guk Hansi-sa* (The history of Chinese poetry in Korea). Seoul: T’aehaksa.

Owen, Stephen. 1992. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. Cambridge, Massachusetts and London: Harvard University Press.

Pratt, Keith, Richard Rutt and James Hoare. 1999. *Korea: A Historical and Cultural Dictionary*. Surrey: Curzon.

Rutt, Father Richard. 1960. “The Chinese Learning and Pleasures of a Country Scholar: An Account of Traditional Chinese Studies in Rural Korea,” pp. 1-100 in *Transactions of the Korea Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society*, vol. XXXVI (April 1960).

TMS (S K j ng, compiled, *Tongmun-s n* [Anthology of Eastern (Korean) Writings]) No Sajin. 1968-1970. Seoul: Minjok Munhwa Ch’ujinhoe.

TSH (S K j ng, *Tongin sihwa* [Poetry-talks by a man from the east]) Pak S nggyu, annotated and translated (original Sino-Korean text included). 1998. Seoul: Chimmundang.

Wang, Li. 1958. *Hanyu shi-lu xue* (Studies in the rules of Chinese poetry). Shanghai: Xin Zhishi Chubanshe.

Zhang, Zhengti and Zhang Tingting. 1975. *Shi-xue* (Studies in poetry). Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu Yinshuguan.