

An Overview of Foreign Literature Studies in China from 1949 to 2019¹

◎ CHEN Zhongyi

Hunan Normal University

Abstract: In retrospect of foreign literature studies in China from 1949 to 2019, we have to acknowledge two fundamental facts. Firstly, although in the initial 30 years of this period foreign literature studies in China largely followed the Soviet model, neglecting Western literary and cultural traditions to some extent—with over a decade under the influence of extreme “leftist” trends—it was during this time that the groundwork for the academic framework of foreign literature studies was painstakingly laid. Secondly, with the influx of Western ideas, foreign literature studies during the subsequent 40 years underwent a complete paradigm shift, providing the spiritual nourishment for and playing a pioneering role in liberating thought and rectifying disorders. However, this period saw a conspicuous adoption of Western paradigms in foreign literature studies, thereby somewhat abandoning certain valuable traditions and academic stances that ought to have been upheld. Meanwhile, foreign literature studies in this period also experienced an indiscriminating acceptance and hasty integration of ideas, leading to a mixture of the good and the bad. This essay provides an important overview of 70 years of foreign literature studies in China, though the specific situations are much more complex. In recent years, as the ideas of cultural confidence and a community of shared future for mankind deeply resonate with the public, the principles of serving the Chinese people and Chinese socialist cause are increasingly becoming significant recognitions within China’s foreign literature scholarly community.

Keywords: foreign literature studies, China, 70 years, summary, reflection

CLC: I106 **Document Code:** A **Article ID:** 2096-4374(2024)01-0092-19

DOI: 10.53397/hunnu.jflc.202401008

We achieve knowledge by inquiring into the principles of things, and our statements should be supported by evidence. The exploration of the history of academic disciplines is a foundational task for the development of those disciplines and thus serves as an effective project for cultural accumulation. A comprehensive summary and evaluation of academic development does not

necessarily enable us to see what others have not seen or to say what others have not said, but does at least help us to distinguish academic discussions and examine the sources and courses of ideas.

From the perspective of their history as disciplines, foreign literature and modern Chinese literature are inherently intertwined, representing two sides of the same coin which cannot be distinctly separated. Firstly, during the “Hundred Days’ Reform,” leading reformers like Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao, with their ideas of adopting Western political systems while retaining a Chinese essence, manifested the reformist’s inclination towards emulating the Western Renaissance movement as a model of “reforming through learning from antiquity” (Kang 267).² In 1898, Lin Shu’s translation of *La Dame aux Camélias* marked China’s first independent introduction to foreign literature, aligning with the paths of Yan Fu, Liang Qichao, and Wang Guowei. During the “Hundred Days’ Reform,” Yan Fu and Liang Qichao advocated for reforming Chinese literature by taking Japanese and Western literature as models. Yan Fu introduced the principles of “faithfulness, expressiveness, and elegance” (信, 达, 雅; *xin, da, ya*) in translation, and he applied this principle into his own translation practice. “Faithfulness” and “expressiveness” in translation need no further elaboration, but “elegance” refers not only to language but also to the selection criteria, encompassing value judgment and aesthetic orientation. Wang Guowei employed Schopenhauer’s theory of tragedy in his essay “A Critique of *The Dream of the Red Chamber*.”

The May Fourth Movement in 1919 serves as another milestone. Regarded by the history of the Communist Party of China as a watershed between the Old and New Democratic Revolutions, which influenced the birth and development of the Communist Party of China, it also marks a watershed in the history of Chinese thought,³ hence known as the New Culture Movement. If the “Hundred Days’ Reform” adopted “Chinese learning for essence, Western learning for application,” the May Fourth Movement unequivocally sought “to find a new voice from abroad,” namely to seek new thoughts from foreign countries (Lu, “On” 68). Moreover, it undertook the responsibility of “engaging in national and social affairs” and “anti-imperialism and anti-feudalism,” thus enhancing the ideological nature of literature. Hu Shi, also a leading figure in the New Culture Movement, noted three major contributions of Chen Duxiu to the “literary revolution” of the May Fourth era: firstly, he transformed personal literary endeavors into a literary revolution embodying three major principles; secondly, he integrated the revolution of ethics, morality, and politics with literature into a grand movement; thirdly, his revolutionary momentum greatly advanced the literary revolution (192). Since the May Fourth Movement, a large influx of foreign literature into China has drastically changed the country’s literary ecology and the perception of literature among Chinese intellectuals, serving to discard the old and usher in the new, leading literary and cultural trends. For example, Lu Xun wrote in “How I Came to Write Stories” that his preference for works that advocate outcry and rebellion against oppression inevitably led to a focus on the literature of Eastern Europe, resulting in a particular interest in the literature of Russia, Poland, and some Balkan countries (525).

Publications such as *New Youth* and *Fiction Monthly* utilized foreign literature to promote

ideas of science, democracy, and national independence. Thus, English, French, German, Italian, Spanish, Soviet Union, and Eastern European literature of oppressed nations were introduced and critiqued in special issues. By the 1930s, Lu Xun, in collaboration with Mao Dun, established the magazine *Translations*.⁴ In addition to foreign realist literature, burgeoning modernist literature also entered China en masse, sparking a modernist poetry movement in cities like Shanghai. From eminent writers like Lu Xun, Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Ba Jin, Lao She, and Cao Yu to lyric poets represented by Feng Zhi and the new poetry movement spearheaded by Bian Zhilin, new Chinese literature was essentially nurtured in the rich soils of foreign literature and domestic realities. Moreover, many representative modern Chinese writers were also “dual-wielding,” engaging in both translation and writing. Therefore, around the translation of foreign literature, debates occurred between writers such as Lu Xun, Qu Qiubai, and others like Liang Shiqiu and Chen Yuan. In a letter to Qu Qiubai in 1931 and in “Essays Untitled II,” Lu Xun systematically articulated his views on translation. He advocated that “all translations must consider two aspects: one is naturally to strive for clarity, and the other is to preserve the flavor of the original work” (364–365); in response to those who preferred “smoothness over accuracy,” he argued for “accuracy over smoothness” (the so-called “straightforward and clumsy translation” was Liang Shiqiu’s rebuttal against Lu Xun, whereas “literal translation” was what Lu Xun championed). Qu Qiubai further proposed a “unity of fidelity and fluency” theory. These were fundamental judgments derived from their translation practices, touching upon the “domestication” and “foreignization” issues in literary translation. The translation and study of foreign literature, alongside its publication and critique, significantly propelled China’s new literature, as well as the spread of vernacular Chinese and Marxism.

Due to the needs of revolutionary struggle and intellectual enlightenment, ideological value was consistently emphasized in the translation and introduction of foreign literature. Ever since the publication of his essay “On the Power of Mara Poetry,” Lu Xun, with his unique insight and combative spirit, had inspired workers in foreign literature. Many of Mao Dun’s views on foreign literature also focused primarily on its social function and ideological value. Important works of the time include Mao Dun’s *Western Literature*, Qu Qiubai and Jiang Guangci’s *Russian Literature*, Zheng Zhenduo’s *Characteristics and Concise History of Russian Literature*, Zhou Zuoren’s *History of European Literature*, and Wu Mi’s *History of Greek Literature*. Though they would become influential, their emergence was not smooth sailing. The introduction of Soviet Union and Eastern European literature of oppressed nations first faced attacks from the “Xueheng School” and later ridicule from individuals like Lin Yutang. Soviet literature and Marxist literary theories were even banned and persecuted by the Nationalist government. Even left-wing intellectuals from the “Creation Society” and “Sun Society” once mocked Lu Xun as “China’s Don Quixote.” Consequently, Lu Xun praised translators of Soviet literature as Promethean fire-stealers. Zheng Zhenduo believed that “introducing foreign literature into the country, enriching the content and refining the form of domestic literature, was indeed an indispensable achievement.”⁵ Foreign literary works, from Ibsen’s *A Doll’s House* to Как закалялась сталь (*How*

the Steel Was Tempered), inspired a large number of passionate youths to join the revolution or the movement to resist Japanese aggression and save the nation.

Despite the participation of a large number of writers in the translation and introduction of foreign literature (including Hu Shi, Lu Xun, Mao Dun, Zhou Zuoren, Liu Bannong, Zheng Zhenduo, Zhao Yuanren, Li Qingya, Xie Liuyi, Shen Zemin, Zhang Wentian, Xia Mianzun, Chen Dabei, Ouyang Yuqian, Chen Wangdao, Li Jieren, Wang Luyan, Li Jiye, Song Chunfang, Guo Moruo, Cheng Fangwu, Yu Dafu, Tian Han, Ba Jin, Zhou Libo, Mu Dan, and others such as Shen Congwen, Ding Ling, Bing Xin, Ai Wu, Xiao Jun, Xiao Hong, Duanmu Hongliang, Lu Ling, Feng Zhi, Zhou Yang, Bian Zhilin, Li Jianwu, He Jingzhi, etc., with the list far too vast to be listed in full here), issues such as insufficient funding, publishing chaos, the mixture of good and bad quality, and the lack of research were always present.⁶ These problems continued until after 1949 when fundamental improvements began to be seen.

1. The First Decade: Learning from the Soviet Union

At the dawn of New China, namely the founding of the People's Republic of China in 1949, amidst the urgency of revitalizing numerous sectors, the translation and study of foreign literature were promptly placed on the agenda. Especially within the research sphere, the initial decade can generally be divided into three phases. The first four to five years served as a preparatory period. During this time, scholars familiar with foreign literature were not necessarily versed in Marxist-Leninist theory and Mao Zedong Thought. Hence, while participating in the initial thought reform for intellectuals, they were required to start with Chairman Mao's "Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art" for a supplemental education in Marxist literary theory. In connection with the practical work of foreign literature, they also needed to draw on the experience of their Soviet counterparts. For this reason, many undertook self-study of Russian to directly read the original works and even translate Soviet scholars' works on the history of foreign literature. After this period of preparation, between 1955 and 1956, the CPC Central Committee issued a call to "advance towards science." The policies of "letting a hundred flowers bloom and a hundred schools of thought contend" were subsequently introduced, marking the true beginning of the developmental phase for foreign literature research, with a plethora of research findings being published. However, just as some experience was being gained, and before the results could be reviewed, the nationwide rectification campaign began in 1957. The following year saw a rapid leftward shift in academic criticism, and "certain residual bourgeois academic thoughts" in the field of foreign literature research were criticized. Nevertheless, at the same time, Lu Dingyi, then minister of the Publicity Department of the CPC Central Committee, proposed the introduction of a set of foreign literary classics. Subsequently, the "Three Sets of Books" plan was initiated. These were the "Collection of Foreign Literary Classics," "Collection of Marxist Literary Theory," and "Collection of Classical Western Literary Theory." Over time, the names of these collections

slightly changed, but research into foreign literature revolving around the “Three Sets of Books” was comprehensively expanded. In 1964, following Chairman Mao’s instructions, the Institute of Foreign Literature at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences was established and took over the “Three Sets of Books” project. This laid the foundation stone for the discipline of foreign literature in China and also laid the groundwork for the development and prosperity of Chinese literature.

Overall, the New Literature Movement, spearheaded by Lu Xun, paid significant attention to foreign literature. However, from a research perspective, foreign literature study during the period from the 1920s to the 1940s, despite having its highlights, was not systematic. The research of foreign literature in the early years of New China can be seen as a fresh start. The Socialist Soviet Union naturally became Chinese scholars’ model. “Learning from the Soviet Union, the elder brother, and advancing along the path of socialist realism” was undeniably the best approach for the study of foreign literature in China during the 1950s. Besides swiftly importing Marxist-Leninist literary thought from Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, Chinese scholars timely translated and introduced works by Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, and a series of literary theory works authored or translated by Soviet scholars, while also initiating introductions and research on Soviet Union and a modest amount of Western literature. Endorsement for mainstream Soviet literature was a given, with critical focus also directed toward the West. In summary then, the first decade’s foreign literature studies—apart from affirming and learning from Soviet and Eastern European literature, as well as from some revolutionary literature from Asia, Africa, and Latin America regarding their spirit of struggle—criticized other literatures and research methodologies to various extents. This included criticism of Western humanism and humanitarian ideas, as well as of an excessive emphasis on the political attributes of literature. Nevertheless, it is commendable that foreign literature research at the time, despite its struggles, amassed significant experience for China’s literary and cultural endeavors, introducing a wealth of referential viewpoints and methods. More notably, the research into foreign literature was not entirely overwhelmed by the “ultra-left” trend. One clear piece of evidence was the critique against Yao Wenyuan. Yao, in his “On the Love Portrayal in Western Classical Literature through *The Red and the Black*,” entirely dismissed Western classical literature in a very overgeneralized way, which was met with explicit counter-criticism from peers within the foreign literature community. Similarly, on the methodological level, scholars contested Yang Jiang’s article on Henry Fielding, which began with a broad affirmation that “the 18th century in Europe was an era that valued rationality,” suggesting that the mainstream thought of 18th-century England was “conservative in its enlightenment trend.” Therefore, Fielding’s novels, seen as “fully reflecting the spirit of the age,” were naturally considered purely objective reflections of social reality, always “inevitably distorting the truth of life.” Critics argued that without class analysis and without consideration for social context, one could only see some superficial phenomena reflected in the works of this realist novelist, missing the essence reflected there, thus somewhat diminishing the significance of Fielding’s novels and misinterpreting the concept of realism. Likewise, scholars criticized Li Jianwu’s article commemorating the centenary of the publication of *Madame Bovary* for starting with the assertion

that the 19th century was characterized by the spirit of science, thus overlooking more important aspects of the spirit of the age. Based on this assertion, Li's article discussed the development of the realist novel in France at that time, naturally placing the influence of natural sciences in a decisive position, failing to see that the development of critical realism in French novel writing was mainly determined by the historical conditions and class struggles of the time, and conflating realism with naturalism, which was deeply influenced by natural sciences and was often confused with realism by past writers.⁷ However, the emergence of naturalism also had its class roots and social significance. Without taking class into serious consideration, abstract discussions on the spirit of the age or characteristics of the era are irrelevant to the age, and when applied to the analysis of literary works or literary trends blur the era's sentiment and visage. Such instances are numerous and varied.

2. The 1960s: A Historical Watershed

Although divergences had long existed, it was from 1960 that the contradictions between China and the Soviet Union split began to surface publicly. Subsequently, Soviet literature was labeled as revisionist. The "ultra-left" trend began to spread in the field of foreign literature research in China, with its core idea being "to take class struggle as the cardinal principle." It was also in 1960 that the Chinese foreign literature community, while critiquing revisionism, broadly branded Western literature with labels of imperialism or bourgeois ideology. The "Three Sets of Books" project, directly overseen by the Publicity Department of the Central Committee in the 1950s, entered a state of stagnation. From then until 1977, research into foreign literature entered a period of dormancy. However, foreign literature did not completely disappear; it remained a warm undercurrent in various covert or semi-covert forms, such as handwritten copies, oral transmissions, and "yellow cover books."

In other words, due to the well-known historical reasons, foreign literature studies fell into a slump with the deterioration of Sino-Soviet relations and the interference of the "ultra-left" trend, continuing until the end of the Cultural Revolution. Over this span of more than a decade, foreign literature was swept into the "revisionist" and "capitalist" trash heap, with the very few works that escaped this fate being reduced to simple political tools. Normal research was completely paralyzed and halted.

3. The Last Four Decades: Light and Shadows Drift Together

In 1978, the Third Plenary Session of the 11th CPC Central Committee brought revitalizing changes, infusing the land of China with vibrant life. The study of foreign literature was once again comprehensively rebooted. The "Three Sets of Books" project was relaunched, and the

journal *Foreign Literature Studies* was founded, marking the beginning of an unprecedented boom in the study of literature from all times and countries. The achievements in the study of foreign literature history, national literatures, and classic authors' works are too numerous to list. From traditional realism to avant-garde, from modernism to postmodernism, the trends in foreign literature studies surged, with a multitude of schools of thought emerging. Without the explosive emergence of foreign literature and its studies, Chinese literature could not have swiftly moved beyond "scar literature" to rapidly develop "root-seeking literature" and "avant-garde literature." In fact, the reforms of the 1980s in China were gradual, hardly sufficient to give rise to such literary movements. Yet, the pace of translation, study, and assimilation of foreign literature in China far exceeded the pace of "reform and opening up" in other areas. This largely facilitated the remarkable achievements of Chinese literature in the late 1980s and quickly integrated it into world literature. Cinema played a significant intermediary role in this process. The definitions provided by Chinese scholars regarding Western modernism, such as Yuan Kejia's notions of "profound one-sidedness" and "one-sided profundity," cannot be said to be anything but profound (qtd. in Pei 53). Similarly, without the whirlwind influx of foreign literary theory, Chinese literature could not have swiftly undergone the multiple transformations of politics and aesthetics to evolve into the current state of diverse and inclusive trends. It should be noted that since the 1990s, China's reforms have remained slow, and it took a long time before its socialist market economy system was well established. However, Chinese literature and literary theory took the lead in entering the "globalization" and postmodern "carnival." This pace was far greater than in other areas. The critiques by Chinese scholars on postmodern literature and cultural thought, such as the concept of "the absolute relativity replacing the relative absoluteness," cannot be described as anything but classic.

Over the past forty years of reform and opening-up, the substantial influx of foreign literature not only unprecedentedly impacted the Chinese literary scene but also played a pioneering role in correcting chaos and breaking constraints, thereby providing reference and support for China's intellectual liberation movement. It has had a significant catalytic effect on China's literary creation, cultural endeavors, and even the reform and opening-up process itself. Furthermore, debates around humanism have laid some groundwork for the "people-oriented" philosophy. At the beginning of 1978, Zhu Guangqian, starting from foreign literature and arts, published "An Overview of Discussions on Humanism and the Theory of Human Nature by Western Bourgeois Writers and Artists from the Renaissance to the Nineteenth Century" in *Social Science Front*, sparking the initial debate. Although the initial discussions were limited to human nature and class, they quickly developed into a broader debate on humanism and alienation. In 1983, a speech on humanism by Zhou Yang, then deputy minister of the Publicity Department of the CPC Central Committee, at the Party School of the CPC Central Committee, elicited a strong response. That year, the articles discussing human nature, humanism, and alienation issues amounted to over seven hundred. Two years later, the discussion heated up again, incorporating existentialism, modernism, and other factors. While using humanism to deny class struggle has its one-sidedness,

such discussions have brought China closer to the international community on issues of humanism, human rights, etc., and have played a significant role in enriching these values and understandings, contributing Chinese wisdom. They have also provided indispensable resources for building the system of core socialist values. In particular, 40 years of translating and researching foreign literature have greatly enriched the spiritual and cultural life of the Chinese people, propelled the development and prosperity of Chinese literature, and created favorable conditions for Chinese literature to reach new heights.

However, looking back over 70 years' foreign literature research, we must acknowledge two main facts. Firstly, in the initial 30 years, foreign literature studies in China largely followed the Soviet model, thereby neglecting Western literary and cultural traditions, with over a decade influenced by the "ultra-left" trend; during the following 40 years, Chinese scholars turned to the Western paradigm, thus somewhat abandoning some excellent traditions and academic stances that should have been upheld, and the situation of indiscriminate acceptance, hasty integration, and blind emulation led to a mix of good and bad. Of course, this is a very general evaluation, and the specific situation is much more complex. In the words of Feng Zhi, we seem to always live in negation, although there is affirmation within negation. Secondly, establishing a foreign literature discipline system with international influence remains an arduous task. It can be said without exaggeration that summarizing and reflecting on 70 years' foreign literature studies not only helps to clarify the discipline's own experience and lessons, but also helps to build a school of foreign literature studies that is centered on the Chinese perspective and serves Chinese purposes; it also greatly benefits the joint advancement and global influence of Chinese humanities and social sciences, the construction of culture and ethic under socialism with Chinese characteristics, and a community with a shared future for humanity.

4. Building on the Past, the Journey Ahead is Long

Since 1978, the translation and study of foreign literature have fully revived. Literature from Eastern countries has also received considerable attention and evaluation, with an unprecedented scope of countries and languages involved. Academic research efforts were comprehensively initiated, though, for various reasons, studies of Eastern literature were slightly less developed than those of Western literature during the same period.

However, the translation of Eastern literature during this period included works of representative writers from ancient to modern times, covering almost all genres, trends, and languages. Comprehensive research achievements include the *Special Collection on Eastern Literature* (2 volumes, 1979) edited by the Institute of Foreign Literature at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, which was China's first pioneering work in translating and studying Eastern literature, holding significant importance. Additionally, there were works like *A Brief Compilation of Foreign Literature (Asia and Africa)* (1983) edited by Zhu Weizhi, and *A Brief History of*

Eastern Literature (1985) and *Collection of Comparative Literature Essays on the East* (1987) edited by Tao Dezhen.

From 1990 to 2009, the study of Eastern literature gradually improved. Since the 1990s, the translation and study of Eastern literature in China have flourished, with many universities offering courses on Eastern literature. Instructors are engaged in Eastern literature research and master's and doctoral students in Eastern literature are recruited, forming a large academic community focused on this field. The Eastern Literature Research Department of the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, with its profundity and specialization of research, has enjoyed a high reputation domestically and holds an important position in the burgeoning field of Eastern literature research.

This period saw substantial achievements in Eastern literature studies. Apart from various foreign literature textbooks and sections on Eastern literature in histories of foreign literature, significant works include *A History of Modern Eastern Literature* (1994) edited by Gao Huiqin and Luan Wenhua, *A History of Eastern Literature* (1995) edited by Ji Xianlin, *Eastern Myths and Legends* (1999) edited by Xue Keqiao, *An Introduction to Eastern Literature* (1999) edited by He Naiying, *Eastern Literature in China* (2001) by Wang Xiangyuan, *Comparative Study of Eastern Folk Literature* (2003) edited by Zhang Yüan and Chen Ganglong, *Eastern Literature Research Collection* (4 volumes) edited by Wang Bangwei, and *Impressions: Narratives of Eastern Drama* (2006) by Meng Zhaoyi, among others. Compared with the past, this era's comprehensive achievements, primarily focused on research, demonstrate rapid development in China's academic field regarding the study of Eastern literature.

It should be noted that from the perspective of academic discipline the abundant epics and folk literature of the Mongolian ethnic group are part of ethnic literature studies in China. Institutions and scholars in China dedicated to the study of ethnic literatures have made significant efforts in this area of research. The literatures of Central Asia and the Caucasus countries which had gained independence from the Soviet Union were long classified under Soviet literature and did not attract sufficient attention from researchers of Eastern literature before the new century.

Western literature studies, including the emerging field of Latin American literature studies, have made considerable progress. English and American literature studies, due to historical and contemporary reasons, continue to maintain a strong momentum with numerous significant achievements. Soviet literature holds a unique position in China, and although it no longer stands alone in prominence as it did in the mid-20th century, its influence cannot be underestimated, with a highly competent research community. Literature from other Western countries, regions, or languages, both ancient and modern, has received attention and even preference from China's literary and reading communities at different times due to various authors, works, or literary trends, leading to a surge in related research achievements. Although Latin American literature was valued as early as the 1950s, substantial research did not begin until after 1978.

During this period, not only did comprehensive studies of Western literature proliferate, but numerous works on the history of foreign literature also emerged. These works represented the literary historical research achievements of several generations of Chinese scholars. Among these

works, the most influential are: *History of European Literature* (1999) edited by Li Funing and Liu Yiqing, *Series on the National Histories of 20th Century Foreign Literature* (1998) and *History of 20th Century Foreign Literature* (2004) edited by Wu Yuanmai, the latter of which won the first Government Award for Publishing. In the past decade or so, a large number of general foreign literature textbooks and comprehensive works have appeared. Notably, those focusing on the 60 years of New China, such as *Contemporary Chinese Research on Foreign Literature* and studies oriented around the academic history of authorial works like *Research on the Academic History of Foreign Literature* (edited by Chen Zhongyi, 2011), *60 Years of Foreign Literature Research in New China* (edited by Dan Shen and Wang Bangwei, 2015), and *The Academic Journey of Chinese Foreign Literature Research* (edited by Chen Jianhua, 2016), have garnered significant attention.

The 20th century, often hailed as the century of criticism, saw a dazzling array of movements and schools of thought, ranging from modernism to postmodernism. These theories and methodologies, including symbolism, impressionism, stream of consciousness, expressionism, existentialism, the Theatre of the Absurd, black humor, as well as structuralism, formalism, New Criticism, semiotics, narratology, psychoanalytic criticism, New Historicism, reception aesthetics, post-structuralism, post-feminism, post-colonialism, eco-criticism, and literary ethics, intermingled and competed for prominence, each leading the sphere in its own right. They have, to varying extents, impacted the study of literature and culture in China. However, it is important to note that not all these influences have been positive or constructive; the adverse effects caused by certain “post-” movements must be acknowledged.

A key characteristic of “post-” ideologies is their “neutralization” (or proclaimed “end”) of ideology, which essentially reflects the phasing out (or conclusion) of one side of the Cold War, objectively aligning with the development of transnational capitalism. The emergence of “post” concepts can be traced back to the 1960s and 1970s. In 1973, American scholar Daniel Bell, in his book *The Coming of Post-Industrial Society*, explicitly stated that the United States and other Western countries had entered the post-industrial era. He identified the main features of the post-industrial society as firstly, a service-oriented, capital-driven economy replacing the production-based economy, and secondly, the rapid development of control and information technology. Additionally, Bell posited that human societal development primarily consisted of three stages: pre-industrial, industrial, and post-industrial societies. These views soon evolved into the sensational *Megatrends* (1982) and *The Third Wave* (1984). Furthermore, as early as 1960, Bell advocated for the dilution of ideology, arguing that ideological confrontations were akin to traditional colonial methods, clearly hindering the development of productive forces. Although the White House did not immediately embrace Bell’s views, by the 1980s, the US government began to adopt a dual approach, maintaining military and economic dominance while relaxing ideological control. This approach masked the internal contradictions of the 1960s (such as opposition over the Vietnam War, generational gaps, and student movements) and the anti-communist policies of the 1970s.

It is curious that theories with a “futurist” tint, though having reached China as early as the 1980s and enjoyed by some, have not led to the establishment of China’s own “futurology.” Such a discipline would ideally be guided by Marxist positions, viewpoints, and orientations, grounded in reality, backed by history, and, based on micro-studies and scientific predictions in related disciplines, engage in more macroscopic strategic research on the future. Furthermore, although the aforementioned American scholars do not explicitly advocate Marxism, their fundamental approach is materialistic, and their main ideas are largely based on the demands of economic foundations and the development of productive forces. Isn’t this worth our profound contemplation?

In summary, the development of Western society and theories like Bell’s have, to some extent, laid the groundwork for the popularity of postmodernism. With the end of the Cold War in the early 1990s, the US government fully embraced Bell’s ideas, adopting a strategy of “information superhighways” while “neutralizing” ideology and strengthening transnational capital operations. At that time, Japan was proudly advancing its fax machine technology. However, internet-based information technology, advancing rapidly, not only quickly rendered fax machines obsolete but also created numerous profit miracles, turning the world into a veritable “global village” (or minefield).

Simultaneously, in 1979, French scholar Jean-François Lyotard published *The Postmodern Condition*. Starting from the plurality of cognition, he exaggerated the relativity of knowledge, hence articulating the decentralized, trendless characteristics of post-industrial era culture, thereby igniting postmodernist fervor. In terms of Western culture, from ancient myths, ballads, and epics to modern humanism, romanticism, realism, naturalism, and modernism, each era had its specific literary or cultural mainstream (or “main melody,” in Chinese terms). Postmodern culture’s feature, as seen by Lyotard, is its plural coexistence, negating any distinctions between primary and secondary, center and periphery. Thus, by the 1980s, French scholars like Jacques Derrida, Jacques Lacan, Michel Foucault, and the American Yale School scholars such as Paul de Man, J. Hillis Miller, Harold Bloom, and Geoffrey Hartman almost simultaneously launched a deconstructive assault on the traditional epistemology centered on phonocentrism and rationalism. Hence, deconstructionism, also known as post-structuralism, a critique and surpassing of structuralism, gained prominence.

Consequently, concepts such as deconstruction, dissolution, ambiguity, and uncertainty became widespread, denying the objectivity of knowledge and truth, leading to the replacement of relative absoluteness by the absolute relativity.

Compared with modernism, postmodernism has a potent effect of dissolving ideology. If the main features of modernism are: the belief that (1) that truth is knowable, and (2) that reality can be represented and a commitment to exploring various forms, then the main features of postmodernism manifest as: (1) truth is nonexistent or uncertain, and (2) cognition is fragmented, i.e., fragmented, ever-changing, and elusive. Due to the lack of a unified definition and a complete theoretical system for postmodernism, general understanding can only be based on its main

tendencies, such as its often being nihilistic, extreme, and negativistic, with a widespread emphasis on decentralization, anti-orthodoxy, and highlighting uncertainty, discontinuity, and plurality.

However, literature, as a special form of ideology, is not entirely subject to the forces of production and the level of societal development. Moreover, literature mostly arises from the individual labor of authors and is directed towards individual readers, making it a personalized aesthetic and cognitive activity that depends on the specific circumstances of authors and readers, including their individual intellect, emotions, education, and preferences. On the other hand, no matter how unique, literature is still a form of ideology, ultimately reflecting the era, society, and individual existence. From a historical perspective, the rise and fall or growth and decline of literary genres in world literature (from the earliest myths and ballads or poetry to tragedy, comedy, tragicomedy, and novels) corroborate this; case by case, neither any author nor reader can exist in isolation from their context. Yet, the manifestation of individuality in literature is progressively realized (transitioning from collective experience or collective unconsciousness to individuality or individualism). In the West, in ancient Greek literature, individuality is implicit or even completely submerged in collectivity. From Greek myths to Homeric epics and even Greek tragedies, what literature highlights is a collective consciousness. Individual judgments of good and evil, right and wrong, are essentially invisible. In Homeric epics, for instance, there is no question of right or wrong between the Athenians and the Trojans. Paris takes Helen, Agamemnon wages war, but both Paris and Agamemnon are great heroes in their own right, with no questions of right or wrong, good or bad, justice or injustice. In ancient Greek tragedies, like those of the three great tragedians, individuality and values are also concealed or even diluted and indistinct. If there is any fault, it is deemed to be due to fate. Oedipus is not at fault, nor are his father and mother; their destinies were such, and all attempts to escape fate ultimately become conditions for its fulfillment. Therefore, the focus was on plot. Aristotle's *Poetics* devotes nearly a third of its length to discussing plot, considering it crucial, the foremost among the six essential elements of tragedy, followed by character, diction, thought, spectacle, and melody.

During the Roman period, especially after the establishment of a Christian-centric view of good and evil, the West achieved a relatively unified worldview, which nearly spanned the entire Middle Ages. The individuality and value orientations of authors began to emerge with the rise of Humanism, termed "Humanistic Realism." By the Romantic period, the individuality of authors was unprecedentedly emphasized, even leading to a tendency where themes precede and ideas outweigh plots. It is for this reason that Marx and Engels highly esteemed the "Shakespearization" where plot and content are perfectly integrated, rather than Friedrich Schiller's ideational tendency. However, as the tendency of theme preceding plot intensified, many modernist literary works almost became demonstrations of concepts, relegating plots to mere afterthoughts. Consequently, literature became a true mouthpiece and a stage for the display of an author's individuality, thereby promoting idealism, formalism, and individualism.

Simultaneously, the subjective space of literature paradoxically presents a perplexing development. On the one hand, the objective space of literature (including authors) has been

expanding (from a narrow scope of performance to encompassing the entire world), yet its subjective space has been shrinking. For instance, the literary vision (especially in terms of fictional characters) has gradually narrowed from the vast external world to the inner depths of the self. That is, the Homeric expanse of sea and land has gradually been transformed into Kafkaesque psychological fortresses. Today, the virtual space of the internet has rapidly replaced these psychological fortresses, making communication even more challenging. Everyone is speaking to themselves, creating a cacophony of voices. On the surface, there's a buzz of conversation, but in reality no one hears anyone else's true voice. It is as if one is in a high-decibel noise environment, where no matter how loudly you shout, you cannot make others hear you. This means, on the one hand, the world has become a global village, but on the other hand, human relationships have grown colder. People's life increasingly relies on material wealth rather than interpersonal relationships. Competition has replaced cooperation. This would have been unimaginable in the previous agrarian societies, or the pre-industrial era. Human relationships have undergone a fundamental change. In literature, the "small self" has replaced the "greater self."

Certainly, literature, in its essence, is intricate, serving as the finest embodiment of the complex nature of humanity. Taking the seemingly straightforward notion that "writers are engineers of human souls" for instance, we encounter a complex paradox similar to that found in science. Literature can transform the soul, and science can transform nature. However, in literature the premise and outcome of transforming the soul always revolve around human flaws and weaknesses of human nature. Similarly, the cause and effect of transforming nature through science inevitably involve the oppression and revenge of nature. Thus, both literature and science often contradict themselves, vividly reflecting the contradictory nature of humanity. The endeavor of engineering souls through literature is like building castles in the air, constructing reality and the future on an imagined past. The question is: Now that we live in the present, why should we dwell on the past? The answer is, as Lu Xun put it, "Human nature hardly changes throughout history." The progress in science is akin to the myth of Sisyphus, where victory implies defeat, and the end signifies the beginning, in an endless cycle. The question is: If now we regret what we have done, why did we do it in the first place? As Engels stated, our victories over nature always result in nature's revenge; the greater the victory, the fiercer the revenge.

Let us consider eco-criticism to illustrate the complexity of the issue. Eco-criticism has indeed played a positive role in ecological protection, which is undeniable. However, extreme environmentalism may not have universal efficacy. Gabriel García Márquez once said in his Nobel Prize speech in 1982: while Europeans grieve over the fate of a bird or a tree,

[...] twenty million Latin American children died before the age of one—more than have been born in Europe since 1970. Those missing because of repression number nearly one hundred and twenty thousand, which is as if no one could account for all the inhabitants of Uppsala. Numerous women arrested while pregnant have given birth in Argentine prisons, yet nobody knows the whereabouts and identity of their children who were furtively adopted or sent to an

orphanage [...]. (134)

Márquez's remarks remain relevant today, illustrating that for developing countries, ensuring human survival—a civilized dignified life, or the right to development—is paramount. London used to be known as “The Big Smoke” due to the Industrial Revolution, but today, due to industrial restructuring in developed countries, their greenhouse gas emissions are being effectively controlled. Meanwhile, high-energy-consuming, high-resource-using, and labor-intensive industries have been (and are being) relocated to developing countries, which are then criticized for excessive energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions. Recently, some Western scholars in the humanities have even questioned and denied the concept of development, showing an extreme stance that overlooks the rights of those who have not enjoyed the benefits of development. Conversely, unrestrained exploitation is undoubtedly an act of knowing wrongdoing: a crime against others, oneself, and the future.

The world is indeed fraught with contradictions and lack of consensus. Similarly, the closure of the Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies at the University of Birmingham on June 27, 2002, was declared by some as the “end of multiculturalism.” But in reality, the world was entering an unprecedented era of transnational revelry; that is to say, diverse voices and colors blend together and fuse into each other, without any sense of hierarchy and distinction. Isn't this also true of China's recent literary creations and criticism? Whether they are old or new, local or foreign, all are presented in a colorful array.

Moreover, Third World writers, representing local interests, have not truly joined in this era of multinational corporate revelry. As for those so-called post-colonial writers, though they grew up in former colonies, their cultural upbringing and value judgments are not necessarily contrary to the ideologies of their former Western colonizers. Recent Nobel laureates such as the Caribbean writers Derek Walcott and V. S. Naipaul, and South African writer J. M. Coetzee, are better described as rebels against regional cultures rather than as critics of colonialism. Walcott even expressed enthusiasm for discussing multiculturalism, criticizing writers with a strong sense of local identity as cynics and narrow-minded nationalists (37).

This brings to mind Goethe's concept of world literature. Goethe envisioned world literature as a harmonious landscape where each nation's literature coexists and interacts, embodying the idea of interdependence and fusion. This vision was inspired by his exposure to Qing Dynasty novels like *Hao Qiu Zhuan* (*The Fortunate Union*), *Hua Jian Ji* (*The Flowery Paper*), and *Yu Jiao Li* (*Iu-Kiao-Li*), and even Indian texts like *Shakuntala*. He perceived in these works that the universality of human emotions outweighs the differences in thinking patterns. However, Marx did not share this blindly optimistic attitude. In *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*, he foresaw and described the monopolistic capitalism, which brings about “the entanglement of all peoples in the net of the world market, and with this, the international character of the capitalistic regime.” The realities of today have proven Marx's foresight, and the flow of benefits within this global market web is uneven. The so-called “globalization” in its essence is “Americanization”

or “Westernization,” which is in the form of “transnational corporations or transnational capitalization.” Statistics show that since the 1960s, the capital market has gradually risen to be the world’s leading market. By the late 1990s, the annual turnover of the world money market had reached 600 trillion USD, 100 times the total international trade volume; the total turnover of global financial products trading reached 20 quadrillion USD, 70 times the global annual GDP (Wang 19). The bubbles and uneven benefit distribution are evident. Moreover, capital brings not only profit but also ideas, ideologies, and values. All these factors can easily place Third World countries in a dilemma. To resist this transnational capitalism means potentially losing development opportunities; to comply with it might lead to assimilation by it.

Globalization and multiculturalism do not necessarily guarantee equality. They merely present a scene of cultural and ideological revelry (many postmodernists even began with the intention of opposing Western institutions or cultural traditions), which can easily lull people into thinking the world has truly become free or even harmonious. But who benefits most from this possible complacency? Naturally, it is transnational capital. The state of nihilism left by postmodernism extends beyond metaphysical categories, and its skepticism and deconstruction, bearing a pessimistic and even nihilistic tendency, have profoundly influenced the world, objectively facilitating the diversity and divergence of culture and literature under the globalization of the transnational capitalist era. The entire postmodernist movement’s deconstruction of traditional binaries (such as male vs. female, good vs. evil, true vs. false, beautiful vs. ugly, West vs. East, etc.) precisely aligns with the global expansion of transnational capital: distinction among different things is dissolved, and the center no longer exists. Thus, internet culture exacerbates this, making the world increasingly uncertain in the face of extreme cultural relativism and individualistic revelry. Consequently, it becomes difficult to define literature or answer the ancient yet ever-new question of what literature is in traditional ways. As Milan Kundera’s notion about the novel tells us, the current literary perspective could be described as an inquiry and response concerning the self. This returns us to the age-old philosophical question: Who am I? Where do I come from? Where am I going? However, this fundamental philosophical query, originally directed towards collective experience, is now increasingly confined to pure individualism or individualized performance.

Meanwhile, as a beneficiary (albeit at a significant cost) of globalization, China must firmly defend globalization and multilateralism, lest the hard-won opportunities of development be squandered. Hence, the concepts of a community with a shared future for humanity and the vision of building such a community were timely proposed by President Xi Jinping.

The above is merely a broad overview of the contemporary literary and cultural landscape, which is in reality far more complex. Simultaneously, whether in the theoretical or creative realms, there are still many who uphold the main melody of the time and zealously embrace the tradition of realism. After enduring deconstruction, the academic community increasingly anticipates the reconstruction of cognition and methods. Moreover, life is the most realistic aspect; the achievements and profits made by multinational corporations worldwide are very much tangible,

far from illusory. Figures like Bill Gates pay little attention to esoteric theories, even though these theories, however much they deviate from their original intentions, have objectively assisted them to some extent by dissolving traditional cognition (including classics) and its inherent national and regional or ethnic values and aesthetic identities.

In summary, after World War II, as the national liberation movement surged, traditional colonial methods became unsustainable. Imperialism, having completed regional and national monopolies of capital, began to infiltrate and plunder the Third World in the form of multinational corporations, or so-called “globalization.” Thus, most of the aforementioned theories have developed in directions favorable to transnational capitalism: blurring ideologies and dissolving national identities. These trends first impacted the Soviet Union and Eastern Europe in the 1980s, leading to cultural and ideological pluralism, the dilution of ideology, and the emergence of new ways of thinking, among others. Since the 1990s, the rapid development of internet technology and the ensuing virtual culture have further fueled the “post-” movements, or, in a sense, the information superhighway strategy implemented by the United States in the 1990s somewhat reflects Bell and others’ assessments of global development trends. Concepts like “human rights above sovereignty” and Samuel Huntington’s “Clash of Civilizations” theory could only be proposed after capital achieved regional, national, and then international monopolization.

In the era of globalization, in an age of “de-elite” mass consumption, where humanity shifts from natural reproduction to genetic engineering and AI experiments, from natural needs to manufactured demands, the responsibilities of literary and all humanities scholars are immense: should they comply and go with the flow, or choose to resist the tide of history by valuing the past over the present? Marx had already provided an answer to this. Marx, who understood capitalism as an inevitable phase in the development of human society, did not forgo critiquing the irrationalities of capitalism from a standpoint representing the demands of future societal development and the majority. That is to say, not everything that exists is rational. This should be a basic consensus among humanities scholars, as well as the foundational premise for the reconstruction of classics, academic fields, and values.

However, the noise of postmodernism and the rapid development of information technology, symbolized by the internet, have turned the world into a cacophony of self-indulgent revelry. The extreme individualism, extreme nihilism, and extreme relativism prevalent in these discourses have obscured the vision of many. From this perspective, it is undoubtedly necessary for Chinese scholars to re-examine and sort through these schools of thought and methodologies. As a result, the 1980s onwards saw a surge of comprehensive works. Notable among these are Yuan Kejia’s *An Introduction to Modernist Literature in Europe and America* (2003), Zhang Longxi’s *A Critical Review of 20th Century Western Literary Theory* (1986), Sheng Ning’s *Humanistic Dilemmas and Reflections: A Critique of Western Postmodern Thought* (1997), Wang Ning’s *Beyond Postmodernism* (2002), Nie Zhenzhao’s *Introduction to Literary Ethics Criticism* (2014), the collection *20th Century Marxist Literary Theory Studies by Country* edited by Cheng Zhengmin and Tong Qingbing (2012), and Fu Qilin’s *The Core Issues of New Marxist Literary Theory in*

Eastern Europe (2017), among others.

The outcome of postmodernist deconstruction is the replacement of the relative absoluteness with absolute relativity. Consequently, in the eyes of many, the relatively objective truth has dissipated, and even the most basic notions of good and evil have vanished. Thus, the past diversity of customs and languages within small regions has given way to a present where everyone speaks differently. Voices clamor, and conversations invariably turn to revelry, multiplicity, and virtuality. Who benefits the most from this? Perhaps capital. Regardless of the deconstructionists' original intentions, the actual effect of the deconstruction trend has blurred the distinctions between truth, goodness, beauty, and their opposites, and even posed a threat to the ideology and national cohesion of certain countries. However, the so-called "clash of civilizations" is ultimately a clash of interests, and fallacies like "human rights above sovereignty" could only emerge in the era of multinational corporations.

In the postmodern context, classics bear the brunt, becoming prime targets for deconstruction. Thus, they are either forced into obscurity or dissected and dismantled. The notion of the "end of literature" is proposed against this backdrop, aiming not so much at actual creative practice but rather at a comprehensive subversion of traditional cognition, values, and aesthetic orientations. Hence, the reconstruction of classics carries a sense of rectifying the disordered.

Based on these reasons, the Institute of Foreign Literature at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences initiated the "Foreign Literary History Research Project" in 2004, incorporating it into the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences's "Eleventh Five-Year Plan" the following year, and subsequently listed it as a key publishing project in both the "Twelfth Five-Year" and "Thirteenth Five-Year" plans. This research project, aimed at academic reconstruction, marked a new step beyond the existing "Three Sets of Books" project of the institute, indicating the beginning of a more systematic settlement of the academic relativism, fragmentation, and nihilism following the deconstruction trend in China's study of foreign literature.

Thus, the "Foreign Literary History Research Project" is grounded in China's national conditions and contemporary era, starting from the Chinese perspective and focusing on the Chinese, targeting classic foreign literary works and movements for both diachronic and synchronic scrutiny. The first and second series comprise sixteen academic historical monographs and sixteen corresponding translations: the first series covers authors such as Cervantes, Goethe, Hugo, Conrad, Pound, Gorky, Sholokhov, and Hemingway, while the second includes Pushkin, Tsvetaeva, Dickens, Hardy, Fitzgerald, Sartre, Zola, and Akutagawa Ryunosuke. The third series consists of academic histories and collections of research on Shakespeare, Balzac, Tolstoy, Dostoevsky, Tagore, Chaucer, Biblical literature, and *One Thousand and One Nights*, among others.

The sorting and study of academic or disciplinary history are not only necessary for revisiting old knowledge to attain new understanding, but also serve to correct fundamental academic thought, ultimately aiming towards the future. In other words, by summarizing experience and drawing lessons from the past, we are paving the way for academic development in the future.

In this sense, the academic project initiated by the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences is both necessary and timely, and it is bound to have a significant impact on the development of Chinese academia.

As President Xi Jinping has emphasized, Chinese people should reject both the old and rigid close-door policy and any attempt to abandon socialism for an erroneous path. Furthermore, he underscored the importance of remembering our origins, absorbing foreign achievements, and looking towards the future. This defines the direction of cultural development in the new era of socialism with Chinese characteristics and, naturally, also delineates the trajectory for the development of foreign literature research in China.

In summary, over the past 70 years, Chinese scholars have made remarkable achievements in translating and studying foreign literature, particularly since the 18th CPC National Congress in 2012. Foreign literature research in China has endeavored to strengthen Chinese cultural confidence and has continuously made progress in accordance with the aim of benefiting Chinese people and serving China's overall development. However, despite the achievements, there are still many arduous tasks to be done. Firstly, the discipline of foreign literature, involving multiple languages and nations, presents significant challenges in both achieving sufficient progress and sorting out problems clearly. Secondly, for a certain period, there has been a noticeable neglect within the foreign literature community towards the foundational body of Chinese literature and culture. Research methods that advocate "focusing solely on the text" have led the study of foreign literature towards fragmentation and minutiae.

Translated by Wenxin Zou

Notes

1. This paper was originally published in Chinese in *Soochow Academic*, no. 5, 2019, pp. 5–12, 2, 161.
2. Marx's "The Eighteenth Brumaire of Louis Bonaparte" similarly articulates comparable statements.
3. See 中国共产党党史(上册) [*The History of the Communist Party of China, Vol. 1*], Central Party History Publishing House, 2011.
4. In the early summer of 1934, Mao Dun visited Lu Xun's residence and discussed the publication of two special issues on foreign literature by the *Literature* magazine, which sparked a fervent enthusiasm for translation among their circle. Hearing this, Lu Xun suggested the establishment of a publication dedicated to translations. Mao Dun shared this sentiment; subsequently, during discussions about the publication of *Translations*, Lu Xun proposed, "Let's print Huang Yuan's name as the editor. We'll use his name externally, but I'll act as the actual editor-in-chief." On September 16, *Translations* was launched in Shanghai, primarily featuring translations of foreign realist literature, emphasizing both creative writing and critical commentary. In September 1935, *Translations* ceased publication after its second volume (6th issue), due to social and political tumult. It resumed publication in March of the following year (starting anew with the issue numbering), with Lu Xun writing the "Preface to the New Edition." By June 1937, due to turbulent times, *Translations* concluded with its new third volume (4th issue), after a total of 29 issues. During the publication of *Translations*, Lu Xun devoted much effort; Xu Guangping mentioned in "The Last Day" that the day before his demise, Lu Xun still insisted on carefully reading the advertisement of *Translations* published in

the newspaper. In 1953, under the strong support of central leadership, *Translations* was republished, with Mao Dun serving as the chief editor. In 1959, *Translations* was renamed *World Literature*.

5. 民铎杂志 [*Min Duo Magazine*], 1922, vol. 3, no. 2.
6. Perhaps the only exception is the study of Soviet literature. In the 1930s and 1940s, Chinese scholars had already reached a high standard in their research on Soviet authors such as Belinsky, Chernyshevsky, Dobrolyubov, Tolstoy, and Gorky.
7. See Yang Jiang, 菲尔丁在小说方面的理论和实践 [“Fielding’s Theory and Practice in Novels”]. 文学研究 [*Literary Studies*], no. 2, 1957, and Li Jianwu, 科学对于十九世纪现实主义小说艺术的影响 [“The Influence of Science on the Art of Nineteenth-Century Realist Novels”]. 文学研究 [*Literary Studies*], no. 41, 1957.

Works Cited

- Hu, Shi. 胡适学术文集:新文学运动 [*Hu Shi’s Academic Anthology: The New Literature Movement*]. Zhonghua Book Company, 1993.
- Kang, Youwei. 孔子改制考 [*A Study on Confucius’s Reforms*]. Zhonghua Book Company, 1958.
- Lu, Xun. 摩罗诗力说 [“On the Power of Mara Poetry”]. 鲁迅全集 [*The Complete Works of Lu Xun*], vol. 1, People’s Literature Publishing House, 2005, pp. 65–120.
- . 我怎么做起小说来 [“How I Came to Write Stories”]. 鲁迅全集 [*The Complete Works of Lu Xun*], vol. 4, People’s Literature Publishing House, 2005, pp. 525–530.
- . “题未定”草之二 [“Essays Untitled II”]. 鲁迅全集 [*The Complete Works of Lu Xun*], vol. 6, People’s Literature Publishing House, 2005, pp. 364–365.
- Márquez, Gabriel García. “The Solitude of Latin America Nobel Lecture, 8 December 1982.” *The Georgia Review*, vol. 49, no. 1, 1995, pp. 133–136. *JSTOR*, www.jstor.org/stable/41401618.
- Marx, Karl. *Capital: A Critique of Political Economy*. Vol. 1. E-book ed., Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1887, *Marx/Engels Internet Archive*, 1995, 1999, www.marxists.org/archive/marx/works/1867-c1/ch32.htm.
- Pei, Gao. 论九叶诗派——兼纪念袁可嘉先生 [“On the Nine Leaves School of Poetry: In Memory of Mr. Yuan Kejia”]. 上海大学学报(社会科学版) [*Journal of Shanghai University (Social Sciences)*], no. 2, 2009, pp. 43–54.
- Walcott, Derek. *What the Twilight Says*. Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 1998.
- Wang, Jian. 对当代资本主义全新形态的初步探索 [“A Preliminary Exploration of the New Form of Contemporary Capitalism”]. 文化纵横 [*Culture in Perspective*], no. 12, 2008, pp. 15–20.