

Modernity of Marxist literary Criticism: From the Perspective of Chinese Marxism

Jia Li^{1,*}

¹Faculty of Journalism Belarusian State University, 220030, Minsk, China

*Corresponding author: 328229287@qq.com

Abstract

The national standpoints, standards and concepts of Chinese marxist literary criticism constitute an important feature that distinguishes it from other forms of marxist literary criticism such as classical literature, Russian literary criticism and western literary criticism. This paper discusses the national view of classical Marxist literary criticism and Russian And Soviet Marxist literary criticism, and the formation of The National view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism under their influence. Marxist classical writers have discussed the nature, idiosyncrasies, history, standpoints and relations with internationalism of nation-states on different occasions. "Nation" is a modern historical phenomenon, common language, shared historical tradition and relatively clear activity territory are the characteristics of modern nation, the nation state and internationalism are dialectical unity, criticism from the class perspective is definitely the general position of classic Marxist literary criticism on nation. Russian and Soviet Marxist literary criticism developed the national thought of classical Marxist literary criticism, and further emphasized the historical nature of the nation and the isomorphism with capitalism. From the very beginning, the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism's acceptance of classics and Russian And Soviet Marxist literary criticism is "research, criticism and decision" with subjective consciousness. Nationalism and national salvation are the realistic circumstances and ideological motivation of the formation of the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism, and nationality is the positive value appeal of the latter.

Keywords

Globalization; Homogeneity; Individual; Traditional; Subjectivity.

1. INTRODUCTION

To promote the theoretical summary, reflection and construction of "The Chinese form of Marxist literary criticism" is the core starting point of this paper to study the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism. To sum up and reflect on the theoretical experience and limitations of Chinese Marxist literary criticism in the past on the question of nationality is a powerful demonstration and important support for the partially completed "Chinese form of Marxist literary criticism". "The Chinese form of Marxist literary criticism" is not a topic to be developed and constructed completely. In fact, since the introduction of Marxist literary criticism into China, Chinese Marxist literary criticism has started the construction process of its own national form. However, for a long period of time, it was more in the face of translating, disseminating, commenting on classics, Russian and Western Marxist literary criticism, and observing, elucidating and solving the problems of Chinese literature and culture. Cannot be the sinicization of marxist literary criticism and marxism literary criticism of China form before and after the construction by sequential two process, in fact they are intertwined with each other

the intertwining, the sinicization of marxist literary criticism and marxism literary form of China is, in fact, with the historical process, the sinicization of marxist literary criticism, Not fully transplanted from the outset, completely copy the classic, the Soviet and western marxist literary criticism, it from the start to their launched abound of subjectivity, conscious and consciously "research, criticism, and decided to" work, and the ethnic problems in the literature and art culture research is one of very important topic, at the beginning of the formation of marxist literary criticism from China, It soon got rid of the overall acceptance and mechanical implementation of classics and Russian - Soviet Marxist literary criticism.

2. RESEARCH ON CHINESE MARXIST LITERARY CRITICISM

As for the cultural stand of Chinese Marxist literary criticism, the academic circle is often divided among nationalism, internationalism and cosmopolitanism, and there are different people who support one of them. To a certain a critic, a period, a debate for the study of the Chinese marxist view of literature criticism, and from the overall view and propositions on grasp Chinese marxist literary criticism is relatively small, and points out that the view is different from other forms of Chinese marxist literary criticism important aspects and the connotation of marxist literary criticism, And the specific analysis of the research is close to none. In the following five aspects, including the whole, period, individual, argument and proposition, the author gives a stereoscopic review of the achievements of the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism:

From the perspective of overall research, the academic circles at home and abroad have carried out specialized and in-depth research on the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism in the last hundred years as a whole. Eagleton pointed out that Chinese Marxism had written "nationalism" into its party constitution, and the national appeal had deeply penetrated into the blood of its theoretical exploration and historical practice. Although Meisner focused on the national thoughts of li Dazhao, Chen Duxiu and other early Pioneers of Chinese Marxist literary criticism, But also prompt the nationalism through from the beginning and dominated China's marxist literary criticism in the spirit world, Chinese scholars such as wang hui and changyoucuan also think nationalism is understanding and criticism of Chinese literature in the 20th century the theory of the key, the latter from the beginning with the former happening or implicit or explicit, or directly or indirectly, deep and never decoupling. For Chinese marxist view of literature criticism, often cover in the one hundred years of Chinese nationalist general study, Jin Guantao "in one hundred to the evolution of Chinese nationalism structure" and ji-lin xu "liberal nationalism trend of modern China" in the form of concept of history, the origin of Chinese nationalism, development and evolution of the objective, the analysis and evaluation of the purpose, It contains roughly the historical evolution of the national view of Marxist literary criticism in China, but it does not specifically analyze its main connotation and characteristics. In general and specifically to clean up, analysis, summary and reflection and expand Chinese marxist view of literary criticism, to rise to as the Chinese form of marxist literary criticism the connotation of the important traits to support research, in the current study also pay the rights, which is one of the main and the core topic of this paper is dedicated to research.

From the point of view of stage research, researchers paid more attention to and studied the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism in the early and contemporary periods, while the research in the middle period was relatively weak. Meissner's "on the origin of li dazhao marxism with China" is the study of the representative work of early Chinese marxist view of literature criticism, it detailed analysis such as li dazhao, Chen duxiu's ideology of nationalism and internationalism and its difference, pointed out the Chinese marxist literary criticism from the start, the nationality of highly, it will together, socialism and nationalism Mutual support and fulfillment. Cao Fuxiong and Guo Shulan, in Contemporary Chinese Marxism's National

Consciousness and World Mind, also point out that contemporary Chinese Marxist literary criticism combines national conditions with world vision and creatively solves China's realistic problems under the background of the world. In the early and contemporary period, foreign scholars have paid great attention to Chinese Marxist historiography adopting the narrative mode of the nation state. There are many research achievements in this area, among which Derek and Du Zhanqi are the representatives. They affirmed the historical rationality of Chinese Marxist historiography establishing the mode of nationalism book history. But it also reflects on the obscuration and erasure of other identities and the history of private space. In addition, Liu Qingfeng studies the cultural stance of Chinese Marxist literary criticism during the Cultural Revolution, pointing out that it is a kind of neo-Huaxia centrism of social revolution, and expressing his concern about the revival of this mentality in contemporary times.

Nation - modern: on the relationship between the nation and the modern, carry out early in the modern history of literature research and more Wang Yao, Tang Tao, Changyue, Sihe Chen and others in the 1970s and early '80s ongoing discussion, established the concept of character of modernity of Chinese literature in the 20th century, but the problem in Chinese literary theory research, however, were not timely cleaning and reflection. So the decline of ancient literary theory and the influx of western modern literary theory, some scholars in Chinese literary theory in the 20th century literary theory achievements made low evaluation, aphasia sound, and called for the modern conversion of ancient literary theory, denied that a sense is the modern Chinese literary theory of the 20th century, the nature of the nation. It was only with the large-scale and in-depth discussion of modernity in Chinese literary theory that the literary theory circle began to think about the relationship between modernity and nation-state and realized that they are and should be unified in Chinese literary theory. In fact, Chinese literary theory in the 20th century on the basis of absorbing western literary theory, in the construction of their own is modern, this modern is not copied overall introduction on western modern literary theory, it is also the agglutination with China economist wisdom to solve the problem of their own literary culture, and hence national, Chinese literary theory in the 20th century is a modern and national unity. However, there are still some scholars who oppose modernity and nationality, either advocating anti-nationality (western) modernity or anti-modernity (ancient) nationality. At present, the research on the modernity of the national view of Chinese Marxist literary criticism has hardly been carried out, and the national characteristics of its modernity and the modern characteristics of the national nature remain to be discussed. The practice of Chinese socialist revolution and construction in the 20th century is not placed in the modern vision. The unity of nationality and modernity of Chinese Marxist literary criticism cannot be revealed.

3. RESEARCH ON INTERNATIONAL MARXIST LITERARY CRITICISM

In all kinds of knowledge discourses, from the origin of classical Marxist literary criticism, to the development of Marxist literary criticism in Russia and the Soviet Union, and then to the development of Marxist literary criticism in China and the west, Marxist critical theory has always been an important point to study the nationality of literature. Because of the internationalism of Marxism and the evil of Nazism (also known as "national socialism", nationalismSocialism), nationalism has been a topic to be avoided in western Marxist literary criticism. While Gramsci, Fromm, Williams in his theoretical writings roughly about national problem, but in each component in the theory, or despising position of nationalism, while for us to think about the nationality of literature today still have value, but for the ethnic problems and no system of opinion is true. However, with the end of the cold war, globalization open, people as a sharp and unavoidable problem again before the marxist literary criticism, including Anderson, Jameson, Eagleton, Abraham a batch of contemporary marxist critics abroad such as Muhammad published many constructive opinions, they have come to the attention of some

Chinese scholars and research, Now the research on the above four theorists' national views is briefly described as follows:

Except the view of Jameson's affirmation and expounded, and some scholars for its harsh criticism, of which India scholar, Abraham's "Jameson his rhetoric and" national fable ", "the most famous, Jameson will all third world literature as well as the" national fable ", ignoring the internal difference and diversity, is their misunderstanding and distortion, Moreover, it still exudes the smell of centralism that looks at the eastern others with the West as the subject. Moreover, Mohamed's main criticism of Jameson is that Jameson's abstract affirmation of "third World" nationalism is not the consistent position and practice of Marxism in dealing with nationalism. Nationalism is not an independent phenomenon, it is progressive or reactionary depends on it with the life and death struggle between capitalism and socialism, the relationship between Jameson abstractly third world nationalism, certainly is not within the framework of a specific relationship with the capitalist judge the nature of nationalism is a kind of unsupported eclecticism. In a word, the current research on Jameson's national theory is mainly to explore the national thought of his national allegory, and has reached a considerable depth. There are many people who explain, criticize and defend Jameson's national theory. However, the research horizon is still narrow. Few people pay attention to and study Jameson's post-modern theory and the incomplete national discourse in the study of globalization, and the in-depth discussion of Jameson's unique national concept under the transnational capitalism is forgotten.

Ajizi Mohamed, an Indian Marxist critic, is an important marxist cultural theorist in the third world. His national thoughts are mainly expressed in the book "In the Name of Theory: Class, Nation, Literature" and related academic interviews. Compared with Eagleton, Muhammad's national thoughts have not attracted the attention of Chinese scholars. At present, only Zhao Xifang, Chen Yangu and others have made critical studies on Muhammad's cultural thoughts. Zhao Xifang, in his book Postcolonial Theory, gives a brief description of Muhammad's marxist criticism of postcolonialism, introduces His all-round criticism of Said orientalism, and points out that Muhammad positioned the right wing nature of postcolonial theory from the framework of contemporary imperialist world pattern. Although postcolonialism criticizes capitalist globalization internally and culturally, it is a set of theories that fundamentally conspire with it, and Marxist criticism should be resolutely removed from it. Chen Yangu analyzed Muhammad's contradictory attitude toward both affirmation and criticism of nationalism, and elucidated His criticism of capitalist globalization. In Muhammad's opinion, "the critical energy of literary theory can no longer rely on third-world nationalism or post-colonialism. It depends on whether it can re-establish the combination of cultural criticism and political and economic criticism in a global perspective. As an intellectual in a third world country like China, His thinking on national issues is closer to our situation than that of western Marxist theorists, which deserves our sufficient and due attention. However, current research is still very weak, which needs to be made up in future research.

Although Chinese scholars insist that national subjectivity is the dominant opinion in the face of globalization, there are still many scholars who reflect on and question this, and even propose to replace subjectivity with intersubjectivity. He Lai believes that "subjectivity" is a concept that needs philosophical reflection. It is illusory, root-less and dogmatic. Behind the universal subject lies the desire for control and special interests. Nor can we completely deny the progressive significance of subjectivity in a certain limit. He thought that "subject" was the beginning and end of western modern philosophy, but it contained serious problems at the beginning of its emergence, which foretold its fate of predicament crisis and final death. Despite Ren Ligang reflects on China's marxist practical materialism and practical sublation subjectivity thought, but "have a variety of subjectivity is still the subject-object dual subjectivity of position domain, based on the communicative practice of intersubjectivity is at the expense of the

individual subject relationship" between the main body, we need to innovate the understanding of subjectivity, Sublate the metaphysical concept of subjectivity. Liu Yuedi believes that Chinese scholarship can only be "self-created" by changing from comparative culture and cross culture to intercultural from cultural standpoint. Due to dissatisfaction with subjectivity, Habermas, Homi Bhabha and others proposed to replace subjectivity with intersubjectivity as the cultural stand of national cultures under globalization, which was recognized by some Chinese scholars. Back to the

4. CLASSICS OF MARXIST LITERARY CRITICISM

From such a basic understanding, marxist literary criticism classics not only show the main characteristics of aesthetic modernity, but also inspire cultural modernity to a certain extent. Therefore, it can be said that Marxist literary criticism is synchronized with the development of western modernity and keeps pace with The Times. The Classics of Marxist literary criticism are the product of the middle and late 19th century. Of course, they are synchronized with the aesthetic modernity of western culture at first. However, as the classics of Marxist literary criticism reflect and criticize enlightenment modernity from the point of view, position and method of the proletariat, It is different from the aesthetic modernity that reflects and criticizes enlightenment modernity from the viewpoint, standpoint and method of bourgeois and capitalist society. This difference is mainly reflected in the treatment of "super-utility" and "non-utility" of aesthetics, the treatment of "self-discipline" of social reality and the treatment of "self-discipline" of aesthetics, and the treatment of "criticality" of revolution and the "reflection" of aesthetics. Marxism founder in the treatment of literature and art phenomenon is very clear, literature and art as the ideology, as a "built in accordance with the laws of beauty" the spirit of the production, as a master of the world "practice - spirit", is the biggest characteristic is transcendent, but this kind of "beyond" is not "abandoned", but "sublation". Therefore, as a social ideology, literature and art "surpasses" real life, not to "abandon" real life, but to "sublate" real life; As a "built in accordance with the laws of beauty" of the spirit production, literature and art "beyond" realistic utility directly, not completely "abandoned" directly to the realistic utilitarianism and achieve "utilitarianism", but "sublation" directly to the realistic utilitarianism and achieve "super utility", which are based on direct utilitarian and internalization, implied aesthetic indirect utility; As the way of "practice-spirit" to master the world, literature and art "surpass" material production and spiritual production, not unilaterally "abandon" material production and spiritual production, but "sublate" material production and spiritual production, material production and spiritual production in a new aesthetic level together. Thus, when Marx and Engels criticized Lasalle's tragedy *Von Zeckingen*, they, according to Engels, "measured Lasalle's work from an aesthetic and historical point of view with a very high, that is, the highest standard". From the point of view of Marxist aesthetic modernity, literature and art are by no means completely "non-utilitarian", but aesthetic "super-utilitarian". According to the aesthetic "super-utilitarianism", Marx was bound to criticize Lasalle, hoping that he would be "more Shakespearean, and I think that your greatest weakness is Schiller's way of turning the individual into a mere mouthpiece for the zeitgeist". Also criticized Lasalle Engels said: "I think that we should not forget to concept of realism, in order to Schiller and forget Shakespeare", and "German drama has greater depth and aware of the history of the content, with Shakespeare's plays, the vitality of the plots and the richness of the perfect fusion", "it is the future of the theatre". In other words, for literature and art, Marx and Engels did not require literature and art to act as a simple mouthpiece of the spirit of The Times and the author's intention as Lasalle did, nor did they regard literature and art as an "aesthetic non-utilitarian" form unrelated to ideological content and utilitarian purpose as Kant and Schiller did. This is why Engels said, "Your *jegingen* is completely on the right track. The main characters are representatives of certain classes and tendencies, and therefore of certain

thoughts of their time. Their motivation comes not from trivial personal desires, but from the historical trend in which they live. But also is that should be improved to make over the course of the plot itself more these motives vividly and actively, the so-called naturally, but on the contrary, to make the argument that sex debate (however, I am very glad to see you again in these debates in the former jury courts and people's speech in the conference to) become unnecessary things." In the same vein, Engels wrote to Min Kautsky: "I am in no way against the tendency of poetry itself. Aeschylus, the father of tragedy, and Aristophanes, the father of comedy, were poets of strong inclinations, and Dante and Cervantes are no less powerful; The main value of Schiller's Plot and Love is that it is the first German drama with a political orientation. The Russians and Norwegians who write good novels in modern times are all inclined writers. But I think inclination ought to flow naturally from the scene and the plot, without any particular indication of it; At the same time, I do not think that a writer should ram down upon his readers the future solutions to the history of social conflicts he describes." Moreover, Engels made the same point in his letter to Harkness. "By no means," he said, "do I blame you for not writing a straightforward socialist novel, a 'tendentious novel,' as we in Germany call it, that promotes the author's social and political views. That's not what I meant at all. The more hidden the author's insights, the better it is for the work of art. What I mean by realism can even be expressed regardless of the author's opinion." Thus it can be seen that the aesthetic modernity of marxist literary criticism classics is a proletarian aesthetic modernity synchronized with and different from that of the modernist era. This kind of aesthetic modernity not only reflects and criticizes the traditional concept of enlightenment modernity, but also reflects and criticizes the narrow aesthetic modernity of the modernism era, which reflects the open aesthetic modernity facing the future of Marxist literary criticism classics.

5. MODERNITY OF MARXIST LITERARY CRITICISM CLASSICS

The modernity of Marxist literary criticism classics not only has "aesthetic modernity", which reflects and criticizes enlightenment modernity, but also has "cultural modernity", which is consistent with the orientation of postmodernism, and reflects and criticizes aesthetic modernity. Of course, marxist literary criticism classics, after all, are concrete literary criticism texts produced in the middle and late 19th century. In terms of the basic characteristics of cultural modernity (uncertainty, difference and fuzziness), they mainly show an open tendency and do not have very specific manifestations. Not only such, marxist philosophy and aesthetics, after all, is a marxist world outlook and methodology, therefore, the marxist literary criticism also can not be absolutely like postmodern philosophy and aesthetics, and is still adhere to the dialectics of practice of literary criticism, so that the uncertainty and diversity of literature and art in the note, vagueness, While opposing the metaphysics of binary opposition, we should not neglect certainty, commonality and clarity, especially emphasizing the dialectical unity of the two aspects. As Engels said, "All differences are integrated in the intermediate stage, and all opposites are transferred to each other through the intermediate link. For such a stage of development of the view of nature, the old metaphysical thinking method is no longer sufficient. The dialectical method of thought also knows no strict boundaries, no universal and absolutely valid 'either/or!' it shifts fixed metaphysical differences to one another, except 'Either/or!', and at the right place recognized 'it also there!' and make opposites connected by mediations; Such a dialectical way of thinking is the only one which in the highest degree is suitable for this stage of development of the view of nature. Of course, the metaphysical categories are still valid for everyday applications, for petty scientific inquiries." This dialectic thinking method is also applicable to the humanities and social sciences such as literary criticism. The literary criticism of the founder of Marxism is the concrete application of this practical dialectics. This point, Engels to Lasalle in the letter is the most clear. For the tragic conflict, Engels has a definite stipulation, but in how to express the tragic conflict, he also

pointed out many different ways."By placing the peasant movement on the back burner," said Engels, "you have given an incorrect picture of the aristocratic national movement in one respect, and at the same time, I think, you have neglected the element of real tragedy in The fate of Keegingen.It seems to me that the great royal family had no intention of forming an alliance with the peasants: the fact that they were extracting their income from the peasants did not allow it to happen.Alliances with cities are more likely;But no such alliances have emerged, or only in small parts.

The national revolution of the aristocracy could be achieved only by an alliance with the cities and the peasants, and especially with the latter.The tragic factor, it seems to me, is precisely this: the basic condition of a union with the peasantry is impossible;So the policies of the aristocracy must be of little consequence;When the nobles tried to take over the leadership of the national movement, the masses of the people, the peasants, rebelled against their leadership, and their downfall was inevitable.I can't judge how much history you have on your assumption that There really is some connection between Zegingen and the peasants, and that's not the point at all.Moreover, as far as I can remember, in his appeals to the peasants Hudden touched only slightly on this troublesome problem with the aristocracy, and attempted to focus the peasants' anger in particular on the monks.But I do not for a moment deny your right to regard Zergingen and Hooden as intending to liberate the peasants.But in this way, the modernity of marxist literary criticism classics is not only "aesthetic modernity", reflecting and criticizing enlightenment modernity, but also "cultural modernity", which is consistent with the direction of postmodernism, reflecting and criticizing aesthetic modernity.Of course, marxist literary criticism classics, after all, are concrete literary criticism texts produced in the middle and late 19th century. In terms of the basic characteristics of cultural modernity (uncertainty, difference and fuzziness), they mainly show an open tendency and do not have very specific manifestations.Not only such, marxist philosophy and aesthetics, after all, is a marxist world outlook and methodology, therefore, the marxist literary criticism also can not be absolutely like postmodern philosophy and aesthetics, and is still adhere to the dialectics of practice of literary criticism, so that the uncertainty and diversity of literature and art in the note, vagueness, While opposing the metaphysics of binary opposition, we should not neglect certainty, commonality and clarity, especially emphasizing the dialectical unity of the two aspects.As Engels said, "All differences are integrated in the intermediate stage, and all opposites are transferred to each other through the intermediate link. For such a stage of development of the view of nature, the old metaphysical thinking method is no longer sufficient.The dialectical method of thought also knows no strict boundaries, no universal and absolutely valid 'either/or!'it shifts fixed metaphysical differences to one another, except' Either/or!', and at the right place recognized 'it also there!'and make opposites connected by mediations;Such a dialectical way of thinking is the only one which in the highest degree is suitable for this stage of development of the view of nature.Of course, the metaphysical categories are still valid for everyday applications, for petty scientific inquiries."This dialectic thinking method is also applicable to the humanities and social sciences such as literary criticism.The literary criticism of the founder of Marxism is the concrete application of this practical dialectics.This point, Engels to Lasalle in the letter is the most clear.For the tragic conflict, Engels has a definite stipulation, but in how to express the tragic conflict, he also pointed out many different ways."By placing the peasant movement on the back burner," said Engels, "you have given an incorrect picture of the aristocratic national movement in one respect, and at the same time, I think, you have neglected the element of real tragedy in The fate of Keegingen.It seems to me that the great royal family had no intention of forming an alliance with the peasants: the fact that they were extracting their income from the peasants did not allow it to happen.Alliances with cities are more likely;But no such alliances have emerged, or only in small parts.

The national revolution of the aristocracy could be achieved only by an alliance with the cities and the peasants, and especially with the latter. The tragic factor, it seems to me, is precisely this: the basic condition of a union with the peasantry is impossible; So the policies of the aristocracy must be of little consequence; When the nobles tried to take over the leadership of the national movement, the masses of the people, the peasants, rebelled against their leadership, and their downfall was inevitable. I can't judge how much history you have on your assumption that There really is some connection between Zegingen and the peasants, and that's not the point at all. Moreover, as far as I can remember, in his appeals to the peasants Hudden touched only slightly on this troublesome problem with the aristocracy, and attempted to focus the peasants' anger in particular on the monks. But I do not for a moment deny your right to regard Zegingen and Hooden as intending to liberate the peasants. But this immediately created a tragic tension between the two men, who were firmly opposed to the emancipation of the peasants on the one hand, and the peasants on the other. This, it seems to me, constitutes a tragic conflict between the inevitable demands of history and its practical impossibility. You have neglected this factor, and reduced the tragic conflict to a more limited scope, so that Zegingen did not immediately declare war on the emperor and the Empire, but on one vassal (though here you have very rightly brought in the peasants), and that he was destroyed by the indifference and cowardice of the nobility alone. But if you had previously focused on the fervour of the peasant movement, and on the aristocratic mood which must have become more conservative as a result of the previous Shoe-club and poor Conrad, the point would have been argued quite differently. But all this was only one way in which the peasant movement and the popular movement could be written into the drama; There are at least ten other methods that are as good or better. "This incisive discussion not only makes a penetrating analysis of the tragic conflict between The failure and the collapse of Zegingen, fully demonstrating the powerful power of the meta-method of historical materialism, but also criticizes the wrong representation of zegingen's tragedy in Lasalle's play, and clearly and firmly defines the tragic conflict: The tragic conflict between the inevitable demands of history and the practical impossibility of such demands, meanwhile, points out that the possibilities for representing this tragic conflict are numerous - - there are at least ten other ways as good or better. And Engels point for the performance of the tragic conflicts, it seems, is to determine, common, clear, that is to be the inevitable requirement of the nature of the tragic conflicts -- history and the conflict between the requirement in fact is not possible, should put the gold root in the peasant movement and the imperial power and the interests of the nobility of dying to show his failure and collapse, The certainty and clarity of this qualitative stipulation cannot be ambiguous, but the means of embodying this tragic conflict, namely, the plot, structure, language, characterization of characters and expression of individuality in tragic plays, can be uncertain, diverse, diverse and manifold. In this way, the certainty and uncertainty of marxist literary criticism, diversity and commonality, clarity and vagueness of dialectical unity of method and point of view, both against the traditional western aesthetics and literary criticism metaphysical dualism, and phase synchronization with postmodernism thoughts and methods, also avoid the postmodernism beauty and relativism and the nihilism of literary criticism, So that literary criticism can develop along the right direction.

We can also see this dialectic of Marxist literary criticism in Engels' letters to Min Kautsky and Harkness. For example, Engels respected Shakespeare and Balzac, advocated realistic creation methods and aesthetic principles, and required to write socialist literary and artistic works to serve the proletarian revolution. However, he did not provide min Kautsky and Harkness with a unique and intransferable expression method. He asked Min Kautsky: "Inclination should come naturally from the scene and the plot, without any particular indication of it; At the same time, I do not think that a writer needs to ram down upon his readers the future solutions to the history of social conflicts he describes." [1] 673 That is to say, literary

and artistic works should have tendentiousness, but the method of expression of tendentiousness is uncertain, different and vague. In his letter to Harkness, he used Balzac as an example to show that "realism can even be revealed regardless of the author's opinions." These thoughts should be very useful for us to reflect on the development of literature and art and literary criticism since the 1942 Yan 'an Forum on Literature and Art. Therefore, we believe that Marxist literary criticism is open and keeps pace with The Times, and is synchronized with and connected with some correct viewpoints and methods of western modernism and postmodernism. At the same time, The advanced thought and method of Marxist literary criticism makes marxist literary criticism more practical dialectic than western modernism and post-modernism literary criticism. This is the reason why we should adhere to and develop Marxist literary criticism.

REFERENCES

- [1] Qi X Y. "People" Discourse and Class-nation-state Imagination -- The Construction of "People" Discourse in Literature from 1940 to 1970s [J]. Jiangnan Forum, 2014(05):80-83.
- [2] Wu Xueli. Enlightenment Reconstruction and Cultural Reconstruction -- From "May 4th" to "New Enlightenment" Ideological Practice [J]. Journal of shanxi normal university (social science edition), 2013, 40 (4) : 123-127. The DOI: 10.16207 / j.carol carroll nki. 1001-5957.2013.04.013.
- [3] Marx, Engels. Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Vol.4 [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995.
- [4] Zhang Yuneng. Reflection on Aesthetic Modernity in Cultural Criticism [J]. Shanghai Culture, 2006, (4).
- [5] History of Philosophy Group, Department of Philosophy, Peking University. Marx, Engels, Lenins and Dahling on German Classical Philosophy [M]. Beijing: The Commercial Press, 1972.
- [6] Marx, Engels. Selected Works of Marx and Engels: Vol.1 [M]. Beijing: People's Publishing House, 1995
- [7] Ma Jianhui: Three Tendencies and Their Discrimination in the Study of popular character of Literature and art in the new Century, Theory and Criticism of Literature and Art, No.6, 2013.