

Interpretation of China's Experience from the Perspective of Western Literary Theory and Relevant Issues

ZENG Jun, Shanghai University

Translated by HE Shuangzi, Shanghai University

Abstract: The interpretation of “China’s experience” from the perspective of Western literary theory has exerted a profound influence over the construction of discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory, whose China’s experience includes “heterogeneous experience”, “common experience” based on the generality of human civilization and “unique experience” native to China. In terms of the subject of literary theory, the interpretation of China’s experience from the perspective of “western literary criticism consists of western scholars’ interpretation of Chinese experience”, which was inevitably biased, and “Chinese scholars’ understanding and interpretation of China’s experience by applying western literary theory”, which is generally conducted by “cross-cultural comparison”, “verifying western theory by China’s experience” and “amending western theory by Chinese experience”. The construction of discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory is a multidimensional process of theoretical construction which needs to overcome “source fallacy” and “subject fallacy” and improve discourse interpretation of Chinese literary theory with the goal of “effective interpretation” and an open and tolerant mindset.

Key Words: western literary theory; Chinese experience; theoretical interpretation

Western literary theory is a theory of “the other” which has exerted a far-reaching influence on the transition of discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory since the Chinese Reform and Opening up. On one hand, it has changed the discourse mode and even discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory from the perspective of problematic consciousness, research object,

About the Author: Zeng Jun is a professor of Chinese Department of Shanghai University, whose research field is Literature and Art, Cultural theory and criticism. His representative works include *A Polyphony of Reception-A History of Reception of Bakhtin in China in the Study of Reception Histories* and *Cultural Analysis of Viewing*, etc.

Foundation Item: This paper is the phased result of National Social Science Major Project “China’s Issues in the 20th Century Western Literary Theory” (Item number: 16ZDA194) and “American Left Wing Literary Theory”.

research method and conclusion, which focuses on the transplantation “from theory to theory” and the “heterogeneous clash” in theoretical discourse system. On the other hand, it has rebuilt Chinese issues and image by discovering, understanding and interpreting Chinese art, cultural phenomenon and problems, which concentrate on the shift “from experience to theory” and the diffusive erosion of the practice field of critical discourse. Therefore, it is necessary to face up to the interpretation of China's experience from the perspective of Western literary theory and relevant issues so as to construct discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory.

1. Internal Heterogeneity : Three Perspectives Defining “Chinese Experience”

“Chinese experience”, which has been widely used before it became an academic term, needs to be defined at the beginning, when it comes to the discussion of specific problems. For instance, Cheng Zhongying said that “The Book of Changes, the integrated system of language and thought of China, is the original form of Chinese experience”¹ in 1980s, when “China's experience” hadn't been clearly defined. The obscure term remained to be referred to as experience and phenomenon related to China with explicit sovereignty border and cultural attribute at the end of the 20th century. It was used to explain that “films made in the mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan are all rooted in the same cultural tradition (age-old Chinese cultural tradition) and film tradition (Shanghai film tradition before 1949), but they have drifted apart after 1949 due to social and political disruption.” by Chen Xihe in his “China's Experience” in *New Films Made in the mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan* published in *Art of Film Making* in 2001² when the situation began to change and the complexity of “Chinese experience” has emerged. The term has been widely used in the field of philosophy and social science without being clearly defined and indicated solely together with “China's mode”, “China's road” and “China's miracle”, ending up to be a response to “China's rise”. Actually, “Chinese experience” which originally appeared in a thesis published by Joshua Cooper Ramo in *Times* was used to describe the basic experience and features in the process of China's rise in terms of politics and international relations, including “China's new development strategy is promoted by the hope to gain equal, peaceful and high-quality growth. Technically speaking, it has overturned all traditional thought of private ownership and free trade. China's new development strategy is too flexible to become a theory. Believing that individual issue cannot be dealt with by uniform solution, it focuses on renovation and test, defending national border and in-

terest actively and accumulating ways of asymmetric power projection more and more deliberately... The best way to realize modernization is 'crossing the river by feeling the stones' instead of the Great Leap Forward forward by 'shock therapy'.³ Apparently, Ramo has proposed that "Beijing Consensus" should be defined as a brand new mode different from "Washington Consensus" with new liberalism tendency established on capital and market. Extensive discussion and dispute has been aroused due to its publication, and Chinese scholars tended to amend the expression of being compared to "Washington Consensus" by using the term "China's mode" "China's road" or "China's experience". It is during this period that "China's experience" has drawn wide attention again as a very important issue.

How can "China's experience" be defined in the discourse construction of contemporary Chinese literary theory? As far as I am concerned, firstly, "Chinese characteristic experience" and "experience in China" should be distinguished. The former refers to the connotation of China's experience in a narrow sense, while the latter the extension of China's experience in a broad sense. All definitions should be the balanced combination of connotation and extension. Secondly, "Chinese characteristic" is a fluid system constantly reinterpreted. For instance, Marxism, originally western theory which has been endowed with new literary thought after being sinicized for over a century in guiding China's revolution and socialist construction for Chinese Communist Party, has become "Chinese characteristic Marxism". British scholar Laing had a chapter in the Marxist Theory of Art dedicated to the Chinese characteristic Marxism, where he mainly discussed Lu Xun, Mao Zedong as well as Hu Feng, Hao Ran and Jiang Qing.⁴ Despite the different cognition of Marxism between western scholars and Chinese scholars, it reflects that "Chinese Marxism" has identifiable Chinese characteristics. At last, "China's experience" is both the result of natural growth rooted in local culture and the product of various theoretical construction as local knowledge. Thus, the issue of "China's experience" should be discussed in a multidimensional context of time, space, concepts and values, which needs to be rediscovered and reinterpreted all the time.

The definition of "pure Chinese characteristic" needs to be determined when defining "China's experience", which cannot be simply tackled from the perspective of binary division. The "pure Chinese characteristic" has been long emphasized on the basis of binary opposition between China and western countries as well as cultural comparison, which is exemplified "Difference of the basic thoughts of eastern nation and that of western nation" published by Chen Duxiu, as I quote "Western civilizations utilize war as fundamental resolution of conflict, while oriental civilizations utilize peace and cultivation to resolve differences." "Westerners keep individuals first while Chinese family first." "Westerners keep law and profit

first while Chinese love and etiquette first.”⁵ Similarly, Du Yaquan summarized in *Moving and Motionless Civilization* that “Western civilization is like strong liquor while Chinese civilization fresh water; western civilization is like tasty meat while Chinese civilization unprocessed vegetable. Those who get intoxicated by liquor and meat should be treated with water and vegetable.”⁶ Despite the fact that the binary division, starting with the segregation of Chinese and western civilization, can be used to describe the development of both civilization before 1840 to some degree, it is ill-founded to summarize unexpected turn of events during one thousand years since modern China when it comes to the analysis of China's cultural transition since the modern period of China, especially since the May 4th New Cultural Movement. It is the power from western countries, including developed capitalist countries as well as Russia and Japan “Departing from Asia for Europe” that contributes to the social and cultural transformation of China for the last 170 years. In brief, “modernization, a heterogeneous power, has been infused into the traditional Chinese society.

Therefore, three dimensions should be taken into consideration when it comes to the discussion of “China's experience” of the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory. First, “heterogeneous experience” can be easily recognized from the perspective of embryology. The complexity of “China's experience” is influenced by western heterogeneous factors. For example, the introduction of “modernization”, “globalization”, modernism and post-modernism have constituted the heterogeneity of the literary and art experience of modern China after being transformed into China's practice by Chinese writers and artists. As a result, it is easy to spot those elements from “China's experience” and match them with existent western propositions. We can even say that this part of China's experience cannot exist without the influence of western literary theory. For instance, the discussion of misty poetry of early 1980s triggered anxiety when scholars found it was impossible to interpret poetrt text by literary concepts of non-western modernism. Excitement caused by over-interpretation and anger aroused by refusal to interpretation of avant-garde literature faced by Chinese critics at the early 1990 also came from the lack of understanding of modernism and post-modernism. Second, not all foreign experience is heterogeneous as cultural similarity and theoreticle coherence commensurate of are the prerequisite of the communication of human civilization. As a consequence, more and more “common experience based on the commonality of human civilization” has come into being with the deepening of cultural communication of Chinese and western culture. Life experience, emotional experience and values shared by all humanity, such as birth, death, illness and vicissitudes of life, can be analyzed and explained by both Chinese literary theory and western literary

theory. Third, common experience cannot be identical. Therefore, “common but differentiated experience” has become an important part of discovering the unique value of China’s experience. We can establish “Chinese characteristic experience” on the basis of identification of heterogeneous difference, which means discovering the uniqueness of “China’s experience” in its comparison with western experience or world experience. They are both the issue of “modernization”. China is a typical “late developing” country, which cannot be understood and interpreted by “the logic of early developed modernization”. Urban and rural problem also remain a complicated issue: “rural China” versus the binary opposition of urban and rural areas; the expansion of “ultra-large metropolis” versus the hollowing out of rural areas. Chinese literature has been transformed into creation pattern based on modern Chinese language, especially mandarin, after the May 4th New Cultural Movement, which possesses Europeanized characteristics and is greatly different from ancient Chinese in terms of vocabulary, grammar and rhetoric. As a result, modern Chinese writing has become a literary issue with the most Chinese characteristics. Combined awareness of ancient and modern times, China and west countries should be established when dealing with the creation experience of Chinese literature. Issues that influence the development of Chinese literature in China during the process of being sinicized, whether being affected by heterogeneous factors or not, can be identified as “China’s experience” which requires our understanding, interpretation and explanation.

Technically speaking, as a discourse system and theoretical mode as well as an instrument, “western literary theory” cannot fulfill the interpretation of “China’s experience” on its own.

Thus, we need to clarify the question that “who” interprets “what” China’s experience in “what” way by “what” western literary theory. From the point of view of “who”, the subject of literary criticism, the interpretation of China’s experience on the part of western literary theory includes the following two aspects: namely western scholars’ understanding and interpretation of China’s experience, and Chinese scholars’ understanding and interpretation of China’s experience by using western literary discourse.

2. Interpretation of China’s Experience on the Part of Western Scholars

Western scholars’ understanding and interpretation of China’s experience have borne fruits in the field of comparative literature and comparative poetics, which often fall into the realm of imagology whose logical starting point is established on the exposure, understanding and imagination of “an exotic atmosphere” on the part of home culture.

Three situations can be summarized in accordance with to what extent western scholars go exposure to China:

(1) Those having no exposure to China at all, and understanding and interpreting China only by reading relevant information about China. For instance, Benjamin who never set his foot on China formed his concepts and judgment about China by reading documents and art exhibitions. He got acquaintance with Chinese literature, art, thought and culture through Nietzsche, Bertolt Brecht, Franz Rosenzweig, J.P. Dubosc and so forth. Benjamin came to understand ancient Chinese thought and traditional Chinese art, such as the charm and spirit of landscape painting and Chinese calligraphy, from the depiction of Chinese ancient ideology by Franz Rosenzweig in the *Star of Redemption* and Chinese art collection of J.P. Dubosc as well as *My Country and My People* written by Lin Yutang respectively. Besides, his judgment of Chinese operas was completely based upon the interpretation of “defamiliarization” of Mei Lanfang’s performance on the part of Bertolt Brecht when he constructed his epic theory. In brief, Benjamin wove his “China’s knowledge prospect” as he understood by abstracting highlights of Chinese culture covering tremendous information in all his power. Similar examples include Foucault, who never set foot on China, but managed to launch his philosophical thinking on Archaeology for Humanities through the conception of “some Chinese encyclopaedia (une certaine encyclopédie chinoise)” put forward by Jorge Luis Borges. Louis Althusser who failed to enter China but missed his chance somehow still paid close attention to what was going on in China.

(2) Those who partly went exposure to China by academic communication with Chinese scholars, visiting China or attending lectures in China. For example, Ivor Armstrong Richards and William Empson, representatives of Anglo-American New Criticism, who taught for a long time in China’s university, not only nurtured a great deal of Chinese scholars of New Criticism, but also grasped Chinese thought and culture, such as *Mencius on the Mind* which is one of Richards's important works. What’s more, Jacques Lacan who learnt Chinese and Buddhism from Paul Demié vill, French sinologist and scholar of Dunhuang Studies, and studied ancient Chinese classics, such as *Mencius*, *Lao-tzu* and *Doctrine of the Mean* with Francois Cheng, also paid great attention to Chinese culture. Fortunately, he gave up his opportunity of visiting China in 1974, when delegation of *Tel Quel* set off for China. Fredric Jameson lectured and received his disciples during his many visit to China after 1980s where he spread western literary theory and developed a post-colonial theory of “national allegory of the third world countries” by regarding China's experience as interpretative object which has a far-reaching influence over post-colonial literary criticism of China.

(3) Those who take China as research object. Strictly speaking, most of influential western literary theorists of 20th century only contacted and cared about Chi-

na in different extent instead of taking China as the primary research object, not to mention being willing to become “experts in China issues”, which justified the fact that Arif Dirlik and Ien Ang would take China, a third world country, as their research object after the emergence of “post-colonial literary theory”. There are vast difference between post-colonial theorists, which deserves our attention. Edward Said (Palestinian) and Homi K.Bhabha (Indian) gave their voice in the mainstream academic circle of the first world; despite the fact that Partha Chatterjee has studied in the US, he mainly conducted his academic activities in India. Post-colonial theorist Arif Dirlik who took China as his research object was born in Turkey and received American education, and his interest in Chinese revolution and history came from the changeable cultural tide of 1960s. Ien Ang, Chinese race born in Indonesia, couldn't speak Chinese. Her *On Not Speaking Chinese* is out of her marginal thought of racial cultural identification. Therefore, Arif Dirlik researched China from the point of view of a “foreigner”, while Ien Ang attempted to dispel “Chinese characteristics” as a hybrid (Cultural Hybridity).

Western scholars tend to interpret China's experience with their “western eyes” inevitably, namely their beforehand viewpoints, including literature and art cultivation, theoretical standpoint, presupposition of consciousness of problems and even their personal experiences and feelings. Here the concepts “western eyes” and “colored glasses” need to be clarified. The latter is often used when we criticize western scholars for their demonization of China, which is, however, not exactly correct. The term “colored glasses” originates from Liu Shaoqi's *Dialogue with North China Reports*, “You have to do honest reporting without exaggeration. You mustn't put on colored glasses.”⁷ In this case, colored glasses mean biased opinion, which refer to existent prejudice before one faces specific person or matter. Therefore, idea first and conclusion to confirm are the essential characteristics. However, beforehand viewpoints refer to the cognitive viewpoint of subjects which are objective to some extent, namely “western eyes”. Therefore, beforehand viewpoints constitute the organ of cognition, which are acceptable as they are shared by all interpretations. We can enrich and amend those beforehand viewpoints by cultural communication so as to realize the “Fusion of Horizons” between research subjects(western scholars) and research objects (China's experience). What should be avoided is the emergence of “prejudice” before interpretation. That is to say, some viewpoints and conclusions have come into being before scholars truly launch their research of China's experience and such being the case, they try to dismember and interpret China with the attitude of confirming their prejudice. For instance, when it comes to the interpretation of China's traditional ideology and culture, oriental absolutism would become a stereotype of some scholars; when it comes to the

discussion of contemporary China, some European and American left wing scholars would encounter double misunderstanding of the romantic imagination of the “first three decades” of new China and the pessimistic disappointment of the “later three decades”. Prejudice against China can be evidenced by the fact that some western Marxism literary theorists highly praised by Chinese scholars whose works are widely translated, introduced and researched in China even refuse to visit China for academic exchange.

3. Chinese Scholars' Interpretation of China's Experience by Using Western Literary Theory

Another one is Chinese scholars' interpretation and understanding of China's experience by using western literary theory. In terms of cross-cultural communication, heterogeneous cultural elements are bound to penetrate and influence local cultural elements as long as there are communication and dialogues between different cultures and civilizations. However, since the Opium War in 1840, the problem between China and western countries has dominantly become the ideological background of the reinterpretation of the ancient and modern problems under the western attack. The "West" here refers to the compulsory influence on China of the developed capitalist countries in Europe and the United States for more than 100 years. Therefore, there are always two emotional structures in academic research in the discussion of the transformation of discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory influenced by western literary theory. The first is an objective and neutral standpoint based on cross-cultural comparison and the other is a subjective standpoint based upon the mode of “stimulation-reaction”. The former regards variants in the process of exchanges between Chinese and western countries communication as “normal state” and launches research from an outsider perspective, while the latter pays close attention to the westernization of China in the process and then considers the problem from the perspective of China. The research of the influence exerted by western literary theory over the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory from the perspective of comparative literature and comparative poetry would definitely involve the relations between “sender-media-receiver” by using research methods of Doxologie, Crenologie and Crenologie, during which the transformation requires utmost attention. For instance, Bakhtin's theory has exerted huge influence over the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory. But interestingly, Bakhtin's polyphonic theory was acquired by Qian Zhongwen by reading his

Russian works, while the spread of his carnival theory in China was fulfilled by Chinese scholars influenced by European and American academic training, such as Liu Kang's "the clamour of dialogue: Bakhtin's theory of cultural transition". The diffusion of polyphonic theory in China managed to fulfill the rectification the name of Fyodor Dostoyevsky's novels and promote the conceptual transformation of China's realistic theory of the early 1980s, while the carnival theory has become an important theoretical resource of the turning of cultural research after 1990s as it has been used by post-modernization theory and mass cultural theory in Europe and America. Besides, the two theories have encountered different fate in China. The polyphonic theory has been faithfully translated, but met with constant doubt among Chinese scholars as to its possibility and vast confrontation with realistic literary ideals, while the carnival theory has been widely used by Chinese scholars even without consideration of contexts and limitations in spite of its being transformed to large extent when introduced to China. Such being the case, polyphonic theory is loyal to the intention of its "sender" and more orthodox in terms of cross-cultural comparison and mesologie respectively, while carnival theory is less orthodox as it has stepped on a detour. However, both theories have promoted the transformation of the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory in different historical periods from the perspective of the mode of "stimulation- reaction" in that the former comes from the impetus of Chinese scholars in recovering the literary spirit of realism while the latter the enormous influence of postism on Chinese literary theory. Cross-cultural comparison is the basic attitude and method of academic study while the intervention of the mode of "stimulation-reaction" constitutes the inner power and problematic awareness of Chinese scholars' academic thinking, both of which are correct.

It is a complicated situation that Chinese scholars interpret China's experience by using western literary theory. Western literary theory is an ideological field full of heterogeneous conflicts, so different theoretical perspectives can be obtained when different western literary theories are chosen. In the meanwhile, the complexity of China's experience makes it possible that its existence can be illuminated and discovered by various theoretical perspectives. As a result, totally different conclusions can be arrived at when one piece of China's experience is interpreted by western literary theory. Take the study on Lu Xun for example. Realistic literature concepts constitute the basic perspective of the interpretation of Lu Xun's works at the end of 1970s and the beginning of 1980s.⁸ Modernization theory has become a new perspective of the interpretation of Lu Xun's works since 1985.⁹ Later, post-modernization has been used in its interpretation since the 21st century.¹⁰ Lu Xun's image has changed from a realistic fighter who aimed at transforming

nationality into a modernist scholar filled with inner depression and anxiety, and then into a post-modernist maniac dedicated to ironically teasing deconstruction. Apparently, some elements of Lu Xun can be hidden with the activation of different theoretical perspectives, thus forming a completely different image. There is no simple correspondence between western literary theory and China's experience, and instead, it is a process filled with sophisticated exchange and collision. Some ingredients of China's experience have gained proper explanations in the interpretation of western literary theory, but at the same time, some have been exaggerated, or even twisted and deformed deliberately.

Specifically speaking, Chinese scholars' interpretation of China's experience by using western literary theory can be summarized as the following: first, similarities and differences between Chinese culture and western culture can be discovered by cross-cultural comparison. For example, the *Tao* and the *Logos* written by Zhang Longxi studied the nature of language and its complex connotation in literature creation and reading from the perspective of comparative poetry between the East and West. Zhang paid special attention to culturally heterogeneous and historically irrelevant works in his research and emphasized that he maintained that different cultural traditions should be placed in equal position and that comparative poetry should inspect and consider theoretical problems by blending eastern and western critical thoughts rather than being confined to applying western concepts and methods to non-western texts, thus finding out common points of some shared subjects (which appear in China and western countries during different phases). Second, verifying western theories by China's experience. It is a common phenomenon that Chinese scholars try to find similar or same examples to verify research methods and existent conclusions offered by western literary theory in Chinese literary and culture in their study and understanding of western literary theory. For instance, many terms, such as "seen from the perspective of Russian formalism" "psycho-analysis field" "structuralism analysis" and "interpreted from the perspective of post-colonialism", used in our papers indicate a typical attitude of learners, which means that learners would dissect literature works by imitating research methods offered by western literary theory after they choose local literature works and cultural phenomenon familiar to them in their study of western literary theory, thus constituting a demonstration of western literary criticism. The most typical example is that many learners apply Greimas semantic rectangle to the analysis and interpretation of Chinese literature and TV products. (Many of them apply the method which is used to analyse "The Story of a Myna of Strange Tales from a Lonely Studio" in Fredric Jameson's book "Postmodernism and Theories of Culture", which is some misreading and revising for Greimas semantic rectangle.) There are more

examples where China's experience is interpreted by existent western literary theory. For example, when it comes to the perspective of psychoanalysis, Oedipus complex, living instinct, death instinct, desire and sex have become key ideas in the illustration of literature works and writers' unconsciousness. When it comes to the criticism of cultural industry, Horkheimer and Adorno's deception, standardization and stylization have become the weapon against the development of contemporary Chinese culture. When it comes to the study on youth subculture, resistance/collection has become a basic form. Third, amending western theory by China's experience. China's experience would not be necessarily remolded to fit in the shape of western culture when western literary theory encounters China's experience. Chinese scholars would discover that research methods, viewpoints and conclusions of western literary theory cannot fully explain the confinement and shortage of China's experience as long as they are equipped with enough theoretical wisdom and matter-of-fact spirit, and then put forward their ideas and understanding focused on the limitation of those theories, which is, however, a great effort to promote theoretical innovation by means of China's experience in the vigorous dialogue between Chinese scholars and western literary theory. For example, Zhao Yiheng has been dedicated to his research on semiology during recent years and published series books named Chinese Semiology, among which A General Narratology has caught the greatest attention. Zhao creatively put forward ideas like text intentionality, demonstrative narration and personal padding by recompleting the explanation of narration from the perspective of semiology starting from the turning point, which was triggered by his sense of theoretical dissatisfaction after being immersed in western criticism theory for a long time. Zhao attempted to establish a world criticism theory and believed that the cultural legacy of an oriental nation has entered a general system of critical theory. What is needed is not the presupposition of the feasibility of any theory, but the test of the validity of certain theory in critical practice. We are required to develop theory because any theory is far from perfect in the globalized world. Development of theory does not prove the non-universality of theory, but the inadequacy of universality of theory.¹¹ Despite the fact that Zhao's general narratology has aroused some disputes in academic circle, an incomplete world critical theory is far more valuable than one full of correct nonsense.

4. Towards Effective Interpretation: Transcending the Difference of the Discourse of Literary Theory between China and Western Countries

There is a problem about "journey of theory" and "transformation of translation"

when western scholars' interpretation of China's experience and Chinese scholars' interpretation of China's experience by using western literary theory enter Chinese context, which leads to deformation and misunderstanding of relevant discourse of literary theory to some extent. As a result, western literary theory should be considered as one that has been understood and interpreted by Chinese scholars in Chinese context when reflecting on it. Specifically speaking, these western literary theories, no matter translated or not, remain western products instead of Chinese literary theories in terms of their nature. For instance, words like "instinct" "tension" "structure" "discourse power" and "colony" have their existence in Chinese language since ancient times, and instead, it has to be admitted that those theoretical connotations related to discourse of literary theory are created, defined and elucidated by western countries in the first place. Secondly, it has to be realized that those western literary theories have become sinicized when translated and reinterpreted, as is evidenced by signs that they have been translated into Chinese, that they have been bestowed with Chinese scholars' understanding and that the understanding of western discourse of literary theory has been influenced by Chinese thinking to some degree. For instance, carnivalesque theory was exacted by Bakhtin based upon the development history of European carnival culture and a series of frames of significance interpretation of "two life styles (daily life and carnival life) "dualism" (death and birth, reversal of up and down, disappearance of boundary) and "carnival mode" . Carnival theory has developed in two research fields after being introduced in China; one is the research of folklore where carnival is referred to as some carnival elements in folk festivals and endowed with significance and value; the other is the research of literature where many critics have discovered carnivalism in literary works at all times and in all over the world from the perspective of linguistic carnival, narrative carnival, visual carnival and desire carnival. The connotation and extension of carnival have been transferred in the application of carnival theory, namely a shift from the "overall carnival" of Bakhtin to "local carnival" (discovering elements similar to carnival), the confrontation between "two life styles" has dissolved (carnival life has become a supplement and deviation of daily life), and "duality" has been weakened (more focusing on negative and revolutionary dimensions such as "subversion" "digestion" "lower body" and "lower class"). What mainly contributes to the sinicized understanding and application is that the implication of having one's fling is added to the understanding of carnival theory in Chinese context when the word "carnivalesque" is translated into Chinese Kuanghuan (狂欢). Consequently, understanding of carnival theory has been unavoidably generalized. On the other hand, Bakhtin's understanding of carnival theory has been imprinted in the

discourse system of Chinese literary theory after it had been widely accepted and widely used by more and more Chinese scholars, who would definitely be affected by problematic consciousness, elucidation strategies and existing conclusions of western literary theory when they interpret China's experience by using this set of discourse. That is why we think of Bakhtin, Rabelais, Dionysia, "two life styles" and "dualism" when it comes to carnival, thus magnifying the significance and value of carnival elements in China's experience as we observe and research, which leads to the saying that discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory has been "colonized" by western literary theory.

Nevertheless, we would go to the other extreme if we reject western discourse and strengthen the purity of Chinese discourse out of unwillingness to being "colonized". On one hand, the simple and crude interpretation of China's experience by existing conclusions of western literary theory should be opposed firmly. On the other hand, Chinese scholars manage to give out their voice in the discussion of common problems when we get involved in the issue of the discourse of western literary theory by using China's experience. Reverse thinking should be adopted in the interpretation of China's experience by means of western literary theory: what peculiarities have been offered by China's experience? What problems cannot be covered by this theory and discourse? Such being the case, how can we amend this discourse and theory? This is one of the ways to "Borrow Water to Sail a Boat" and "join in production international academic discourse". More and more common experience of western and Chinese culture has contributed to the dialogue space for them. The following questions should be pondered over: How can we interpret this from the perspective of Chinese literary theory? How can we interpret this from the perspective of western literary theory? What gives rise to such differences? Can we put forward another new set of theory different from western literary theory?

The construction of discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory is a theoretical one of all times from all over the world in a multi-dimensional space, where we should avoid two misunderstandings. One is "source fallacy", namely the practice of defining the source of "China's experience" from "pure local China's experience", in which case scholars mean to seek experience and discourse with "Chinese characteristics" from Chinese traditions. That is why "seeking roots" of culture will be oriented into the direction of traditional culture of China's ancient times and considering globalization, modernization and urbanization as great disaster when we stress on Chinese characteristics, nationality and aboriginality. As mentioned before, considering the fact that the penetration and influence among various cultural elements have become a normal state in today's world, what should be attached importance to is facing the reality of "heterogeneous and diver-

sified" experience and discovering and extracting the particularity and universality of China's experience rather than extracting a Chinese characteristic of utmost purity. The other one is "subject fallacy", namely the practice that China's experience should be elucidated by Chinese discourse and Chinese scholars, thus rejecting or even partially denying the validity and rationality of foreigner scholars' interpretation of China's experience by using foreign discourse, Chinese discourse and Chinese scholars' interpretation of China's experience by using foreign discourse. Strictly speaking, a discourse system of literary theory cannot be a valuable one if it is only approved and used by its native scholars. As a matter of fact, true influence of discourse of literary theory is the product of interrelation of different subjects, which is evidenced by the fact that the discourse of literary theory should be initia-tively created by Chinese scholars and that the discourse of literary theory should be accepted and used by scholars from more countries, especially those from ad-vanced capitalist countries in Europe and America. Therefore, the priority of the construction of the discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory lies in the fact that more and more Chinese scholars manage to creatively offer discourse of liter-ary theory with interpretation validity of both China's experience and world's ex-perience. Contemporary Chinese literary theory should launch its understanding of China's experience and world experience, enhance the validity of the interpretation of discourse of contemporary Chinese literary theory with the goal of "valid inter-pretation" and an open mind, thus gaining the discourse power of Chinese literary theory by exerting influence over western mainstream discourse of literary theory. The ultimate goal of the construction of discourse system of contemporary Chinese literary theory aims at giving Chinese scholars western points of view as well as giving western scholars Chinese points of view by transcending the differences be-tween China and western countries.

Notes

- 1 Cheng Zhongying. "Chinese language and China's Traditional Philosophical Thinking Pattern." *Philosophical Trends*, no. 10, 1988.
- 2 Chen Xihe. "'China's Experience' in New Films Made in the mainland, Hong Kong and Taiwan." *Art of Film Making*, no. 1, 2001.
- 3 Huang Ping. *China and Globalization: Washington Census or Beijing Census*. China of Social Sciences Academic Press, 2005, p. 6.

- 4 Dave Laing. *The Marxist Theory of Art*. Translated by Ai Xiaoming, and Yin Hong, Hunan People's Publishing House, 1987.
- 5 Chen Duxiu. *Difference of the Basic Thoughts of Eastern Nation and That of Western Nation*. Art Publishing House, 2009, pp. 61-64.
- 6 Du Yaquan. "Moving and Motionless Civilization." *Collected Works of Du Yaquan*. Shanghai Century Publishing Group, 2003, p. 338.
- 7 Zeng Jun. "China in the 'Constellations' of Arcades." *China Book Review*, no. 5, 2015.
- 8 Liu Shaoqi. "Dialogue with North China Reports." *Collected Works of Chen Duxiu*. People's Publishing House, 1981, p. 402.
- 9 Zeng Jun. *A Polyphony of Reception---A History of Reception of Bakhtin in China*. Guangxi Normal University Press, 2004.
- 10 For example, some important works include:
Chen Yong. "Lu Xun and Realistic Problems of the May 4th Literary Movement." *Literary Review*, no. 3, 1979.
Zhao Yuan, "Lu Xun and Russian Realistic Literature." *Series of Books of Chinese Contemporary Literature Research*, no. 2, 1981.
Tang Tao, "On Realism of Lu Xun's Novels." *Literary Review*, no. 1, 1982.
- 11 Lin Fei. "Modernism Creation Methods of Lu Xun's Novels." *Research Trends of Lu Xun*. no. 7, 1985.
Wu Zhongjie. "Imitation Learning of Modernist School: Modernism in Lu Xun and May Fourth literature." *Luxun Research Monthly*, no. 6, 1994.
Lin Zhihao, "Lu Xun and Modernism" and "Symbolism". *Social Science*, no. 2, 1988.
- 12 Liao Jiuming. "Postmodernism Features of Old Tales Retold." *Chengdu University Journal*, no. 3, 2002.
Li Yajun. "Postmodernism Value Dimension and Textual Normal Form of Old Tales Retold." *Yinshan Academic Journal*, no. 4, 2003.
Zhao Xiaoqi, "Explicit Postmodernism in Weeds." *Tian jin Social Science*, no. 1, 2004.
Ruan Bo. "On Postmodernism Style of Lu Xun's Essay." *Research of Chinese literature*, no.1, 2016.
- 13 For example, some important works include:
Liu Haibo. "Xianglinsao: Struggling in the pattern of Greimas: Another explanation to 'Blessing'." *Journal of Jinan University*, no. 5, 2001.
Wang Zhaoli. "Interprete 'In Chancery' by applying Greimas's narrative grammar." *Journal of Hotan Teachers College*, no. 3, 2007.
Yang Chun. "The Deep Structure of Zhang Ailing's Novels: A Study of Flower

Withers from the Perspective of Greimas's Action Element and Semantic Matrix." *Journal of University of Science and Technology Beijing*, no. 1, 2016. Through the search of HowNet, more than 50 articles like these have been published, involving the analysis and interpretation of Chinese and foreign literature and television works by Chinese scholars.

- 14 Zhao Yiheng. "The Possibility of World Critical Theory: an Example of Time Discussion in Broad Sense Narratology." *Contemporary Foreign Language Study*, no. 7, 2010.