

# Compilatory Development to History of Modern Chinese Literature

Liu Hanzhe

Chinese language and literature(teacher-training), Faculty of Humanities, Shenzhen University, Shenzhen, China

**Keywords:** history of modern Chinese literature, comparison, development, origin

**Abstract.** This article mainly explores the inheritance and innovation in the narration of modern Chinese literature history and the three different writing paradigms origins, including political-social, aesthetics-deconstruction and diversified-open writing paradigm by comparing the evaluation through authors of several major modern Chinese literature textbooks.

## 1. Introduction

When stating the compilation of literary history in Theory of Literature, Wellek and Warren said: “a period is a cross-section of time governed by a system of literary norms, standards, and practices. The adoption, dissemination, variation, integration, and disappearance of these norms, standards, and practices can be explored.”(317)As an important position to spread the knowledge of modern Chinese literature history, the determination of the guiding ideology of the textbooks for the professional courses of modern Chinese literature history in universities, as well as the choice of the author's works and the choice of concepts, which are directly affecting the teaching effect of professional courses in and universities. “History of Modern Chinese Literature” is a compulsory course for studies in Chinese language and literature majors in universities. Its history has mainly experienced three development periods from the 1950s to the 1980s, 1980s to 1990s, and after 1990s. Since the founding of People’s republic of China, Compilation of Chinese New Literature History written by Wang Yao has been the foundation stone of the writing of modern Chinese literary history, Chinese Modern Literature History written by Tang Tao in the early days of economic reform and opening up; and The History of Modern Chinese Novels that was written by western sinologist Xia Zhiqing is the literary criticism classic at mainland and abroad. In the early 1960s Outstanding achievements of “Rewriting the History of Literature” in the 1980s: Thirty Years of Modern Chinese Literature, which was written by Qian Liqun; in addition, The History of Modern Chinese Literature, which was written by Zhu Donglin and other scholars under the influence of diverse ethos after the 1990s. They have been playing their values in different historical periods and carry very different historical traces.

This article mainly explores the inheritance and innovation in the narration of modern Chinese literature history and the three different writing paradigms origins by comparing the evaluation through authors of several major modern Chinese literature textbooks.

## 2. Writers, Works, and Texts Listed in Various Versions of Literature History textbooks

Table 1 the first Table illustrates the time divisions of the five literature history works

Name	The History of Chinese New Literature	A History of Modern Chinese Fiction	“History of Modern Chinese Literature”	Thirty Years of Modern Chinese Literature	History of Modern Chinese Literature
			Tang Tao		
Time	1951	1961	1980	1987	2008
Author	Wang Yao	Xia Zhiqing	Tang Tao	Qian Liqun	Zhu Donglin, Ding Fan,

					Zhu Xiaojin
Time period staging	<p>Part I: Great beginning and development (1919 - 1927)</p> <p>Part II: Left-Wing Writers Alliance (1928-1937)</p> <p>Part III: Under the banner of national liberation (1937 - 1942)</p> <p>Part IV: Literary about workers, peasants and soldiers (1942-1949)</p>	<p>Part I: Initial term (1917-1927)</p> <p>Part II: Ten years of growth (1928-1937)</p> <p>Part III: During the Anti-Japanese War and after the victory (1937-1957)</p>	<p>The May 4th literary revolution and its development (1917-1919)</p> <p>The May 4th literary revolution -- the first period of the domestic revolutionary war (1919-1927),</p> <p>the second period of the domestic revolutionary war (1927-1937)</p> <p>The literary movement after the beginning of the Anti-Japanese War (1937-1942)</p> <p>Creation after the publication of Speech at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art (1942-1949)</p>	<p>Part I: First decade (1917-1927)</p> <p>Part II: Second decade (1928-1937.6)</p> <p>Part III: Third decade (1937.7-1949.9)</p>	<p>The May 4th literary revolution Literature creation in the 1920s</p> <p>Literature creation in the 1930s</p> <p>Literature creation in the 1940s</p> <p>Literature creation in the liberated areas</p>

Narrative method	Political-collective model	Appreciative-criticism mode	Writer-works mode	Aesthetic-self-discipline mode	Diversified-open mode
------------------	----------------------------	-----------------------------	-------------------	--------------------------------	-----------------------

From the time division of the five literary history works in the Table above, it can be seen that the main difference is the time division of the beginning of literary history. Wang Yao tends to define the May 4th Movement in 1919 as the starting point of modern literature and titles it “great start”. From Xia Zhiqing's version on, it is more inclined to set “1917” as the beginning year.

In terms of narrative style, the textbooks by Wang Yao and Tang Tao are mostly based on political activities and wars. The version of Xia Zhiqing is mainly based on the creation of novels as a clue, which is a combination of Chinese and Western narration. In addition to introducing the developmental contours of modern literature in the introduction and concluding remarks, Qian Liqun's modern literary history textbook is based on the author's creation, which greatly enhances the text, rather than external factors that change at any time and reflect the gradual separation of literary history from ideology and politics. The version of Zhu Donglin introduces the writer's literary creation in chronological order and literary genre.

Table 2 the second Table shows a contrast of five versions of literary history from the lengths of the monograph writers, important writers, and diverse writers with differences in narration

	The version of Wang Yao	The version of Xia Zhiqing	The version of Tang Tao	The version of Qian Liqun	The version of Zhu Donglin
writers with special chapter	0 member	10 members	6 members	9 members	6 members
Lu Xun	Part of a special chapter + two sections	A special chapter	A special chapter	Two special chapters	A special chapter + two sections
Guo Moruo	A section	None	A special chapter	A special chapter	A special chapter + one section
Lao She Ba Jin Mao Dun	A section for Mao Dun and Ba Jin respectively Half section for Lao She	A special chapter for each one	A special chapter for each one	A special chapter for each one	A special chapter for each one
Shen Congwen Qian Zhongshu	One paragraph for Shen Congwen Nothing for Qian Zhongshu.	A special chapter for each one	A section for Shen Congwen Two paragraphs in a section for Qian Zhongshu	A special chapter for Shen Congwen A paragraph in a section for Qian Zhongshu	A special chapter for Shen Congwen A paragraph for Qian Zhongshu
Eileen Chang	None	A special chapter	None	There are about 2000 words in a section	Most of a section
Taiwanese literature	None	/	None	A special chapter	A special chapter

In the list above, the lengths of the indispensable writers such as Lu Xun, Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Li Yaotang and Lau Shaw in the history of modern Chinese literature are listed in the textbooks. It

can be seen that these five writers all take up a certain length of narrative space, especially Lu Xun, whose literary length ranks first in the list of writers in all editions. The ranking of the “Lu Guo Mao Ba Lao Cao” in the Tang version corresponds to the proportion of other writers.

In addition, it lists the lengths of writers Shen Congwen, Qian Zhongshu and Eileen Chang, who have a great controversy in the history of modern Chinese literature. It can be seen from the above Table that the length proportion of Shen Congwen is increasing, and Qian Zhongshu's *Fortress Besieged* is not listed in the Wang and Tang editions. It is listed in the overall length and improved since then. Eileen Chang has a certain length in the Zhu version, especially in the Xia Zhiqing version, which was taken seriously in the history of literature.

Starting from the Qian version, it is no longer confined to mainland literature, and a special chapter is written to introduce “Taiwan literature”.

### **3. Key Writers, Work Inheritance and Innovation Course of Different Versions of Literary History narration**

#### **3.1 Lu Xun and His Works**

First of all, Wang Yao clearly pointed out that “the dawn of the October Revolution” was Lu Xu’s creation origins in the 1950s when literature served politics; “in the New Cultural Movement that gradually emerged”; “Lu Xun had been consciously serving politics and pursuing the clear goal for serving people’s revolution since he began to write.” (78) Wang only pointed out the important impact of the era background and political pattern on Lu Xun’s creation, as well as the revolutionary goal and fighting spirit of his creation. Amid the deepening of reform and opening up in the 1980s, Tang Tao mainly studied through the origins of Chinese and foreign cultures, as well as Lu Xun’s detailed life experience, thinking his creation was aimed at “healing the spirit of nationals”.(42) Meanwhile, Tang introduced the complexity of thoughts in Lu Xun’s literary creation. Significant changes later occurred under the impact of post-structuralism and modernist literary theories. Qian Liqun’s version of literary history, a masterpiece that “rewrite the history of literature”, did not mention Lu Xu’s living experience, but only put forward the opinion that Lu Xun’s literary concepts started from “reforming the didacticism of life”.(30) In the era of diversification and opening in the new century, Zhu’s version added more analyses of ideological origins, such as “Lu Xun’s thoughts were intrinsically uniform in the early and later stages.”(32)

Secondly, the evaluation of Lu Xun is a long course of inheritance and innovations. At first, Wang Yao portrayed Lu Xun as a national hero with the spirit of revolutionary fighting-“In politics, Lu Xun was battle-inspired, class-based, and national, with limitless fighting power and high enthusiasm for revolutions. Wang accentuated Lu Xun’s political significance. Wang Yao portrayed Lu Xun as a leading figure in the political background. Recently, Wang wrote an article titled *The Direction of Lu Xun’s Leadership*. The article gave a detailed description of Lu Xun’s flag-bearer image in the debate between left-wing and right-wing capital classes and his significant role in construction theories of a literary revolution. Tang Tao still keeps the habit of viewing Lu Xun from the perspective of politics, which is an inheritance of Wang Yao. For instance, Tang quoted Mao Zedong’s evaluation of Lu Xun in *The Theory of New Democracy*. It can be seen that he regarded Lu Xun as a “communist soldier” from the political perspective. The innovation lies in Tang Tao, who made a comprehensive evaluation combining Lu Xun’s life story, era background, and literary creation, such as adding the summary statement of changes in Lu Xun’s thoughts and status. Lu Xun’s status didn’t change until Qian Liqun presented his version of literary history-Qian repositioned Lu Xun as “the greatest thinker and litterateur of China in the 20<sup>th</sup> century”, “the well-deserved national soul of modern China”, “Nearly all Chinese writers have developed a distinctive literary genre on the foundation created by Lu Xun, which is a unique phenomenon of China’s modern literature”, and “Lu Xun is one of the cultural giants of the 20<sup>th</sup> century”(29). Thus Lu Xun walked down from the alter, becoming “Lu Xun of the human world” and “Lu Xun in literature”. Before Qian Liqun, Xia Zhiqing, a Western sinologist, held the view that “Lu Xun was the first to write Western-style novels in China and widely acknowledged as the greatest modern novelist.”(23) At the end of the 1990s, Zhu’s version also continued such an evaluation, “Lu Xun

was the founder of China's modern novels"(29) and "one of the founders of China's modern literature".(32)

Of course, all these versions portrayed Lu Xun's works in a common yet individualistic way. On the whole, they basically involved Lu Xun's novels, prose, and essays, as well as important collections of works. Meanwhile, even the design of chapters and sections is consistent. For instance, the chapter is roughly divided into such parts as "Life and Thinking" (The versions of Wang and Qian are simpler), "Call to Arms and Wandering, "A True Story of Ah Q) (Wang's version didn't set an independent section), prose, essays and Old Stories Retold (not included in Wang's version). From the perspective of local analysis, Tang Tao's evaluation was essentially a study in the theoretical framework of "society-history". Compared with Wang Yao's understanding of Lu Xun's novels, however, it was more objective and detailed. For instance, Wang Yao thought, "Medicine vividly revealed the reason that the Xinhai Revolution failed for being separated from the masses"(79). Tang Tao further put forward that "the structure of Lu Xun's novel has double tragedies"(49). Meanwhile, Tang Tao focused on introducing Ah Q's spiritual victory in The True Story of Ah Q. Also, he compared Ah Q to other works with farmer-related themes and displayed Ah Q's profound historical prospect. Qian Liqun even deconstructed the original evaluation mode more directly and creatively shifted the priority to analyzing the depth of expressions and the uniqueness of patterns. For instance, Lu Xun did not put forward his political criticism in Medicine, but implied the poor life of Hua Laoshuang through a "padded blanket" and portrayed the spiritual foolishness of the family of Hua.(30) Also, Qian introduced from the perspective of the writing structure. He not only analyzed Ah Q's basic thoughts or artistic characteristics, but placed him in Chinese history in the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Also, Qian summarized the history of Ah Q in different eras from a developmental perspective and mentioned his historical transcendence. It can be said that Qian Liqun paid a higher emphasis over human's literature and restored the original image of novels. Zhu's version combined the achievement of the previous authors and raised the proportion of Lu Xun and his works in the book. Therefore, Zhu mostly made comprehensive evaluations. Of course, Zhu also made unique insights-"Take the tragedy of love in Remorse, for example, Zhu not only inherited the objective reason for Chinese feudal forces of former versions, but also put forward subjective reasons to equal importance". "Chinese were limited to the fixed tranquility and happiness of small families, yet had no high social ideals to support their new life." He pointed out that "it is not because of having no love", but that "socio-economic pressure" was unable to support the love.(44)Zhu analyzed Lu Xun's thoughts through comparison and concluded that "Lu Xun never became the 'captive' of any thought.(31)

### **3.2 A Comparison of Writers Such as Shen Congwen, Qian Zhongshu and Eileen Chang**

Apart from extensively discussed Lu Xun, some writers with controversy and changes in literary history narration are also non-negligible. Although Wang Yao only introduced Shen Congwen with fewer words, he praised Shen's ability to apply words. Also, he only used scattered words, such as "Shen's writing approach is also fantastic", "all characters under Shen's pen only have one outline", "Shen is sometimes dilatory", "his words are sometimes void and tedious.(221-222) However, Qian Zhongshu and Aileen Chang were seldom mentioned. Xia Zhiqing brought about the transition of changing such a situation. Xia introduced Shen, Qian, and Zhang in a whole chapter respectively, and nearly all his words were full of praises. Whereas Qian Liqun evaluated the Besieged City as a novel with multiple levels of connotations(386), Xia Zhiqing assessed that "it is the most interesting, elaborately-created, and may even the greatest novel of China's contemporary literature."(282) Due to the influences of Xia, Tang Tiao also expanded the space for Shen Congwen and Qian Zhongshu. In particular, Tang's evaluation of Shen Congwen was objective, thinking his novels "were generally filled with imaginations from folk customs when portraying characters and events, which creates an aftertaste to reading. Eventually, Shen developed a distinctive and unique artistic style."(244-245) Qian Liqun also said, "Shen Congwen's works were repeatedly published and studied, which proved that the historically neglected literary phenomena might not be given permanent cold shoulders." (222)Zhu's version inherited the views that Shen Congwen developed

“the artistic character of pursuing innocence, kindness, and beauty in life”.(204) It said Shen’s words “were unsophisticated and simple” and “have poetry effects”.(210)This is also reflected in Qian Zhongshu and *The Besieged City*. The works of Wang Yao and following works shifted from being neglected to being worshiped. Tang’s version said Qian Zhongshu “lacked exquisite conception and summarized typical plots, and paid no attention to portraying characters’ personality, with inadequate artistic appeal”.(314) From Tang’s evaluation to Qian’s version, Qian Zhongshu was positioned as “another outstanding satirical novelist of modern literature” and his irony was praised as “combining ethics, folk customs, and human feelings”; (387)Zhu’s version profusely praised *The Besieged City* as “a satirical novel of modern China” and “a new *The Scholars*”. (267-268) Regarding Eileen Chang, nearly all versions, excluding Xia’s version, positioned her as a popular novelist at the edge of contemporary literature rather than a serious writer. Only Zhu’s version mentioned *The Rice-sprout Song*, an anti-communist work. However, it was hailed in Xia’s version as “already an immortal work in Chinese history of novels”. Xia Zhiqing even praised Eileen Chang as “the most outstanding and important writer of today’s China”.(254) It is indispensably related to Xia’s political positions and his living in a foreign environment. In addition, Zhu’s version also made a unique evaluation of Eileen Chang, such as “Eileen Chang’s female writing is an important achievement apart from mainstream literature”, her words “were private conversations”, and “*The Golden Cangue* can be the object of study on females’ lust and desires.”(276)

It can be found through deep comparisons above that modern literary writing is abandoning the simple stereotype of ideology, but adopts evaluation concepts that meet literary standards and an increasingly objective and rigorous tone. It indicates that the history of China’s modern literature becomes increasingly independent and diversified. These textbooks constitute the history of academic study on modern literature and record the historical footprints of this subject in the tortuous progress. The reason behind it is more worthy of discussions.

#### **4. Innovation Course of Writing Paradigm for the History of Modern Literature**

The above analysis indicates that these historical innovations are affected by political, era, social, and cultural factors. Generally speaking, the history of modern literature has basically shifted from “political-social” writing paradigm to “aesthetics-deconstruction” writing paradigm, and eventually to the “open-diversified” writing paradigm. The innovation course of these paradigms is discussed in more detail.

##### **4.1 Political-Social Writing Paradigm**

Wang Yao’s *History of China’s New Literature* was completed in the 1950s. It directly resulted from two regulations. Firstly, the Ministry of Education summoned the Meeting on Higher Education and approved the Draft of Curriculum for the Literary and Grammar Schools of Institutions of Higher Learning. The draft stipulated: “The History of China’s New Literature is one of the main courses for the Chinese language and literature department in universities”. Secondly, the curriculum (preliminary draft) of *The History of China’s New Literature* stipulates that “new literature is not ‘vernacular literature’, ‘Chinese literature’, ‘people’s literature’, and ‘civilian’s literature’. Instead, new literature is neo-democratic literature.” There are two goals of learning the history of new literature: “1. To know the relationship between the New Literary Movement and the New Democratic Revolution. 2. To conclude experience and lessons, and accept excellent heritages of new literature.” Meanwhile, the division of developmental stages for new literature in the curriculum is highly consistent with Wang’s version. It can be said that the curriculum enhances the relationship between literature and politics. It is not hard to know from Wang’s version that “the origin of ‘political-social’ narration mode-in the early period of founding New China, was the inevitable result of meeting the political and cultural appeals shortly after the founding of New China. In addition, it is partially related to the personal conditions of Wang Yao, who was devoted to studying the history of Chinese classical literature before studying new literature. Therefore,

Wang directly referred to the achievements and experience of compiling Chinese literary history in terms of the literary concepts and formulation cases in textbooks. Meanwhile, Wang Yao pointed out, “The literary history is not only a literary science, but also a historical science that examines the historical development of literature. Therefore, a literary history should not only reflect the literary characteristics of portraying people’s life, but also have the feature of examining the developmental process as a historical science.” (From Wang Yao) It is noteworthy that the History of China’s New Literature consists of Volume A and Volume B. Volume A was first published in September 1951, while Volume B was not published until August 1953. It originated from the Symposium on History of China’s New Literature (Volume A) held by the Newspaper of Literature and Art in September 1952. It criticized that the book was “gravely wrong” in “positions, opinions, and methods”, thinking Wang Yao divided academics, thinking and the class. Also, Wang’s book introduced Hu Shi, Zhou Zuoren, and Guo Moruo in the meantime, and portrayed “reactionary and decadent” writers, including Xu Zhimo and Shen Congwen. Therefore, the symposium thought the book was not rigorous about literature and neglected the leadership of the Communist Party of China in China’s New Literature Movement. This symposium was held to classify partial capitalist authors of the original branch into the reactionary branch. It was the reason why Chen Congwen was collected in Volume A, while Qian Zhongshu’s *The Besieged City* and other works were not recorded in Volume B.

It was not until the early 1980s did modern literature usher in a favorable turn under the influences of the theory of artistic and literary black lines in the 1930s during the Cultural Revolution. Shortly after the third plenary session of the 11th Central Committee, China started to “bring order out of chaos” and started the ideological liberation movement that liberated thinking and sought truth from facts. Also, such opinions as “literature is the study of humans” and “literature is a form of aesthetical ideology” were put forward. Meanwhile, the circle of literary theories started to reflect on the weaknesses of the political-social mode and debate about humans’ subjectivity. All of these lead to the replacement of political monism by the author-work mode. Tang’s version is one of the outstanding achievements-It advocates that literature is essentially aesthetical, while the literary study is the object of literature, literary phenomenon, and literary experience. In addition, Tang described Lu Xun in a more humane and detailed manner. It might be because he knew and got along with Lu Xun. However, his book was mainly completed between the late 1970s and 1980s, which failed to avoid historical limitations. Besides, Tang Tao was Wang Yao’s student, which meant his analytical thoughts were influenced by Wang Yao more or less. It might also be another reason why Tang failed to escape political ideology.

#### **4.2 The paradigm for Aesthetics-Deconstruction Writing**

As one of the achievements in “rewriting the literary history”, Qian Liqun’s *Thirty Years of China’s Modern Literature* may be the inevitable result of domestic and foreign factors. In the mid-1980s, the deepening of reform and opening up and the occurrence of communications media created favorable conditions for the large-scale entering of translated works on Western literary theories, including hermeneutics, aesthetics, and post-modernism centered on anti-rationalism-To criticize and deconstruct the thinking means of the integrity, centralism, and identity that derived of humans’ subjectivity and rich feelings in the modernization process.(Wang Huiyong The trend of thoughts profoundly affected Chinese traditional culture. For instance, American scholar Jameson lectured on relevant theories in China. Also, professional newspapers, including the Newspaper of Literature and Art, Newspaper of Literary Theory, and Newspaper of Literature, introduced such theories by varied means. Some periodicals even published foreign scholars’ papers on the trend of post-modernist thoughts. These Western literary theories expedited the course of “rewriting the literary history” in the mid-1980s. Before this, Xia Zhiqing highly evaluated Eileen Chang, Qian Zhongshu and Shen Congwen in *History of China’s Modern Novels*, a book completed in the early 1960s and spread in the early 1980s. It even became one of the impetuses facilitating “rewriting the literary history” since the 1980s and significantly normalizes it. The *History of China’s Modern Novels* was born in the foreign open and diversified environment. As a bystander, Xia Zhiqing can

directly observe what Wang Yao and Tang Tao failed to understand. Due to differences in political stances, they had a widely different understanding of the same writer.

In 1985, Qian Liqun, Chen Pingyuan, and Huang Ziping jointly put forward China's Literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. Also, Chen Sihe put forward the holistic opinion of new literature opened up the new theoretical paradigm of literary history for starting "rewriting the literary history". These scholars also received many responses from peers. Chen Si and Wang Xiaoming from Shanghai Literary Theories co-chaired the column of Rewriting the Literary History from July 1988. Within one and a half year, they solicit contributions from friends in different regions and published a batch of papers on strong advocacy for "rewriting the literary history". It is basically divided into two components. Firstly, a major issue of literary history was introduced through an author and his works, such as Lan Di's discussions about Mid-night. Secondly, the general literary history was analyzed vertically, such as the new descriptions of the New Feeling School and Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies School. Chen Si and Wang Xiaoming could receive warm responses from the literary circle and spread Western thoughts because of a series of incidents in the 1980s that made them doubt about society and literature. Taking the opportunity of returning to the May Fourth Movement Spirit, he started to deeply reflect over literature from the perspective of psychology, thought, and informatics.

The theoretical basis and standards for reconstructing the history of literature are-Walking towards world literature & literature modernization and returning to literature itself (two vital components of "rewriting the literary history"). The limitations of literary history in mainland China stimulate the prosperity of rewriting history. The coming tendency was mentioned in the previous chapter: The changes in the explanation and positions of mainstream and branch writers result from this incident. For instance, Yan Jiayan's Historical Status of Lu Xun's Novels (a book published in 1981), Qian Liqun's A Spiritual Quest, and Wang Furen's A Mirror of China's Anti-Feudalist Thinking Revolution clearly reflected the process where Lu Xun "shifted from didactical explanation paradigm to modernistic explanation paradigm." (Kuang Xinnian,9) Authors are increasingly returning to literature itself and narrating the literary history from the aesthetical perspective, attempting to reconstruct the original paradigm of political writing. Such is the most important reason why Qian Liqun's Thirty Years of China's Modern Literature extensively wrote about literary descriptions, including structure, writing techniques, and styles.

### **4.3 Diversified-open writing paradigm**

However, the modernists of the 1980s also had a tendency step to the other extreme in the later development. In the 1990s, writers and scholars in the mainland deliberately devalued the Left-wing literature, and raised some non-left-wing writers, so as the original subject advocate Liu Zaifu, he also pointed out that there was a critical review of literary criticism and literary history writing in the 1990s. At the same time, after the mid-1990s, in the atmosphere and pursuit of academic freedom and academic innovation, the threshold of literary research is further opened, and the scholars' exploration of literary history writing is becoming more and more open, and literature begins to return to literature itself. New literary history views such as modern literary history and research perspectives such as world and comparative perspectives, virgin land, such as martial arts writers are constantly being excavated and written. Scholars have clearly realized that the history of Chinese literature in the 20th century is not the exclusive development history of new literature, but should be an alternating history of new and old literature.(Chinese Modern Literature History Writing Seminar) Therefore, since the 1990s, History of Modern Chinese Literature wrote by Zhu Donglin et.al. is a comprehensive work, realized the unity of aesthetic return and analysis, combined Chinese modern and contemporary literature, and strengthened the personality comparative consciousness of Chinese and foreign writers, ancient and modern writers and modern writers, such as Bing Xin and Tagore, Xu Dishan and Tagore, and a more detailed description of popular novels. Yang Yi and other co-authored Chinese New Literature Illustration and other forms of illustrations and so on, make the writing paradigm of the entire literary history more open and pluralistic, set the length of each writer, do not deliberately flatter any writer and use a more

comprehensive perspective and objective language to describe.

## 5. Conclusion

The history of modern Chinese literature is not a matter of its own, but depends on the perspective of interpreters and their interpretations. From Wang version to Zhu version, after nearly 50 years, the general trend is that the development of modern Chinese literary history is basically open, pluralistic, objective and independent, and it is the inevitable result of the comprehensive effects of various factors in the history. Through the inspection of the five versions of modern Chinese literary history, this article summarizes the inheritance and innovation in this process, hoping to inspire the later writing and Oriental studies.

## References

- [1] Zhao Xueyong, Tian Wenbing Lu Xun's Shaping and Evolution in Literary History--Taking Tang Tao, Qian Liqun, and Yan Jiayan's Literature History as an example. Literary and artistic contention, 2015.
- [2] Wang Xiaowen, Teaching material type--Evolution of the Concept of Writing Modern Chinese Literature History. Journal of Huaibei Normal University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition), 2014.
- [3] Hong Liang, The History and Current Situation of the Compilation of Chinese Modern Literature History. Chinese Modern Literature Research Series, 2012.
- [4] Xu Wanping, On the Evolution of Lu Xun's Evaluation Concept in the History of Modern Chinese Literature. Journal of Neijiang Teachers College, 2011.
- [5] Chen Guoen, The Compilation of Chinese Modern Literature History Textbooks during the Period of Discipline Adjustment. Chinese University Teaching, 2010.
- [6] Bi Risheng, The Endless AQ--Taking Three Important Chinese Modern Literature History Textbooks as an Example. Journal of Shijiazhuang Vocational Technology Institute, 2010.
- [7] Zhu Xucheng, Wang Liguo, Analysis and Writing Suggestions on the use of textbooks in the History of Modern Chinese Literature. Chinese University Teaching, 2010.
- [8] Zhu Xucheng, Comparison of different versions of Modern Literature History Textbooks to Lu Xun and His Works. Journal of Yanshan University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition), 2009.
- [9] Zhu Xucheng, The different version of The History of Modern Chinese Literature has won in the new era - and the interaction between teaching and research. Journal of Shayang Normal Junior College, 2009.
- [10] Liu Fengjie, Returning to the original truth of History--A comment on the work of Zhu Donglin. The History of Modern Chinese Literature 1917-1997. Literary Comment, 2000.
- [11] Wang Yao, The History of Chinese New Literature. ShanXi:Beiyue Literature&Art Press,2015
- [12] Tang Hao&Yan Jiayan&Wan Pinjin, eds., "History of Modern Chinese Literature". Shanghai:Fudan University Press,2008
- [13] Qian Liqun&Wen Rumin&Wu Fuhui, Thirty Years of Modern Chinese Literature. Beijing:Peking University Press, 1998
- [14] Zhu Donglin&Ding Fan&Zhu Xiaojin,eds., History of Modern Chinese Literature,. Beijing:Higher Education Press,2000
- [15] Xia Zhiqing, A History of Modern Chinese Fiction. Shanghai:Fudan University Press, 2005
- [16] Zhu Liyuan, How post-modernist theory of literature entered China and exert its influences. Studies on literary and artistic theories, 2014.
- [17] Huang Ziping&Chen Pingyuan&Qian Liqun, China's Literature in the 20<sup>th</sup> Century. published on the Edition No.5 of Literary Evaluations, 1985.
- [18] Liu Zaifu--Comments on Eileen Chang's novels and Xia Zhiqing's Chinese Modern Literature Novels, Vision Vol. 7. Hebei Education Press, July 2002
- [19] "Chinese Modern Literature History Writing Seminar"ed.,Literary review, 2000.