

A Study of Mao Dun's Proletarian Literature

Shim, Tae-shik*

<Contents>

1. Introduction
2. "On Proletarian Art"
3. Comparison of Mao Dun and Bogdanov
4. Concluding Remarks

1. Introduction

In 1925 Mao Dun published his long article entitled "On Proletarian Art", which, most critics take for granted, represents a new phase in Mao Dun's literary theory. However, as it is alleged that the greater part of this article can be regarded as a translation, it is necessary to reassess this article as a whole.

Therefore, I will argue whether "On Proletarian Art", regarded as Mao Dun's influential essay on the relationship between politics and literature, is a translation from Bogdanov's essay "The Criticism of Proletarian Art" or not. At the same time, it will be argued that the original character of Bogdanov has been misunderstood in mainland China and I will examine the extent to which Mao Dun's idea in "On

* Research Fellow, Inha University

Proletarian Art” was based on Bogdanov’s thought.

2. “On Proletarian Art”

Between April and October of 1925 Mao Dun wrote the article “On Proletarian Art” [Lun wuchan jieji yishu 論無產階級藝術].¹⁾ It was written during a period of troubles, at a time of the rise of the revolutionary wave during the May 30th Movement 1925, in which he personally participated, at a time of sweeping anti-imperialist strikes, when the National Government and the National Revolutionary Army were being formed in the South.

This article consists of four parts. The first of them surveys the rise of proletarian art and literature in Russia and the Soviet Russia, Mao Dun distinguishes proletarian literature from the “people’s art and literature” of Romain Rolland on the basis of its ‘class’ concept. The second part is concerned with the conditions necessary for proletarian art, showing that it is a new kind of art and stating its characteristic traits. The third part speaks about the domain of proletarian art and literature. The fourth part discusses the content of proletarian art and the last part is about the artistic form of proletarian art.

Many critics have treated this article as one of Mao Dun’s most

1) Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰, “Lun wuchan jieji yishu 論無產階級藝術” [On Proletarian Art], *Wenxue Zhoubao* 文學周報 [Literature Weekly], vol.172 (10 May, 1925), pp.204-206; vol.173 (17 May, 1925), pp.9-12; vol.175, (31 May, 1925), pp.27-29; vol.196 (4 October, 1925), pp.200-202. Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.499-519.

significant writings up to the present because it not only reveals a landmark of his transformation from a bourgeois humanist to a Marxist in his literary thought and theory of the 1920s, but it is also the most important of Mao Dun's contributions to the theory of proletarian art and literature. Marian Galik, for example, asserts that Mao Dun's literary thought underwent "the most expressive change" in 1924 and 1925, and from that point on "the literary platform ceases for him to be a universal and national one. but turns into a class platform."²⁾ In the first comprehensive account of the history of twentieth-century Chinese literature presented by Bonnie S. McDougall and Kam Louie, it is also regarded as the influential essay in which "Mao Dun's views on the relationship between politics and literature in the 1920s are summed up."³⁾ Mao Dun himself basically agrees with such an appraisal. In his memoirs *The Road I have taken*, Mao Dun writes:

In the article "On Proletarian Art" I criticised Romain Rolland's view of 'art of the human race,' pointing out that this was "ultimately a Utopian fantasy of bourgeois intellectuals. In our world, how absurd does a term like 'the entire human race' sound? All we see are different classes: where is this human race without class distinction?" Here, in fact, I refuted some of my previous literary views. Although my literary thought was to undergo more changes and development in the years to come, this essay marked the beginning of my class-oriented literary views.⁴⁾

2) Marian Galik, *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism* (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1969), p.90.

3) Bonnie S. McDougall and Kam Louie, *The Literature of China in the Twentieth Century* (London: Hurst and Company, 1997), p.110.

4) Mao Dun, *Wo zouguo de daolu* 我走過的道路 [The Road I Have Taken], vol.1 (Hong Kong: Sanlian shudian, 1984.), pp.286-287.

From the beginning of the 1920s, there had been theoretical writings concerned with proletarian literature and art by writers joining the CCP. Critical essays on proletarian literature, such as Jiang Guangci 蔣光慈's "Modern Chinese Society and Revolutionary Literature", Yun Daiying 恽代英's "Literature and Revolution" and Deng Zhongxia 鄧中夏's "To the Young Studying Literature", were published before Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art."⁵⁾ Although they try to link literature to proletarian revolution, yet their major point is the urgent one that literature should be a tool of agitation and propaganda, without the discussion how literature can be as such a tool. Compared with these essays, it is obvious that Mao Dun's article discusses the consistent theory of proletarian literature and art, dealing in detail with the prehistory of proletarian art, the conditions of the birth of proletarian art, and the content of proletarian art and its forms.

Ye Ziming 葉子銘, one of the pioneers in the study of Mao Dun, argues that in "On Proletarian Art" Mao Dun revealed a new theory of proletarian literature and art. Ye Ziming writes:

Between May and October 1925 he published an article entitled "On Proletarian Art" in the *Literature Weekly* using the pseudonym Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰. This article represents a new phase in which Mao Dun's literary thought had already evolved and he began to apply the viewpoint of Marxist class theory and discussed, comprehensively, the origin of literature and art, content, form and realms of proletarian art of that time, and the succession of literary inheritance.⁶⁾

5) Jiang Guangci 蔣光慈, "Xiandai zhongguo shehui yu geming wenxue" 現代中國社會與革命文學 [Modern Chinese society and revolutionary literature], *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue shi cankao ziliao* 中國現代文學史參考資料, vol.1; Deng Zhongxia 鄧中夏, "Gao yanjiu wenxue de qingnian" 告研究文學的青年, *Zhongguo qingnian* 中國青年, vol.5 (17 November 1923); Yun Daiying 恽代英, "Wenxue yu geming" 文學與革命 [Literature and revolution], *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue shi cankao ziliao*, vol.1.

The reason why I quote at length here is because most critics in mainland China have followed Ye Ziming's viewpoint.⁷⁾ Although some critics have different emphases, such as Zhao Wansheng's aesthetic approach and Yang Yang's attempt at demythifying Mao Dun and his writing,⁸⁾ Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" is not their main focus.

Since it is alleged that the greater part of Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" was a translation into Chinese based on an English translation of Alexander A. Bogdanov's article "The Criticism of Proletarian Art" published in *The Labour Monthly* in Britain in December 1923, it is necessary to reexamine this article.⁹⁾ The following section will, therefore, discuss whether this article is a translation or not and then examine Mao Dun's literary thought and

6) Ye Ziming 葉子銘, *Lun Mao Dun sishinian de wenzue daolu* 論茅盾四十年的文學道路 [On Mao Dun's forty-year literary path] (Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe, 1959), p.44.

7) For examples see Sun Zhongtian 孫中田, *Lun Mao Dun de shenghuo yu chuanguo* 論茅盾的生活與創作 [The life and works of Mao Dun] (Tianjin: Baihua wenyi chubanshe, 1980); Shao Bozhou 邵伯周, *Mao Dun de wenzue daolu* 茅盾的文學道路 [Mao Dun's literary path] (Wuhan: Changjiang wenyi chubanshe, 1959); Zhu Defa 朱德發, A Yan 阿岩 and Zhai Deyao 翟德耀, *Mao Dun qianqi wenzue sixiang sanlun* 茅盾前期文學思想散論 [Essays on Mao Dun's early literary thoughts] (Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1983); Zhuang Zhongqing 莊鍾慶, *Mao Dun de chuanguo licheng* 茅盾的創作歷程 [Mao Dun's path of literary creation] (Beijing: Renmin wenzue chubanshe, 1982)

8) See, for instance, Yang Yang 楊揚, *Zhuanxi shiqi de wenzue sixiang - Mao Dun zaoqi wenzue sixiang yanji* 轉析時期的文學思想 - 茅盾早期文學思想研究 [Literary thought of transformation period - on Mao Dun's early literary thought] (Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1996)

9) Bogdanov's original name is Alexander Malinovsky. The English translation of Bogdanov's article was published as the title of "The Criticism of Proletarian Art" in *The Labour Monthly*, vol.5 (December 1923), pp.344-56. Original Russian version was published in *Proletarskaya kul'tura (Proletarian Culture)*, vol.3 (August 1918). The periodical *Proletarian Culture* was published by the Proletarian Cultural Organisation (Proletkult) and its chief editor was Bogdanov, the head of the Proletkult at that time.

theory before and after this article.

The Article as Translation

In June 1988 Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子 published her survey that Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" was mainly a translation of the English version of Bogdanov's article. She came to this survey after comparing three different language versions, namely Mao Dun's Chinese article, the English translation of Bogdanov's article and a Japanese translation version of Bogdanov's article.¹⁰⁾

Before Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子's survey, it had been assumed that Mao Dun referred to English materials since in his autobiography he mentioned:

At that time by reading a lot of English books and periodicals, I had gained an understanding of the process of Soviet literature and art since the Russian Revolution. As The Normal College of Art invited me to give a lecture before writing it, I gave the lecture as this title. Later I wrote "On Proletarian Art" based on the lecture script.¹¹⁾

It is likely that one of English periodicals which Mao Dun read at the time was the magazine *The Labour Monthly*, considering his good

10) Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子, "Mujun no puroritarira gei jutsu wo ronzu no tenkyo ni tsuite" 茅盾「論無産階級藝術」の典拠について [On the source material of Mao Dun's "On Proletarian Art"], *Mujun kenkyukai kaiho* 茅盾研究會會報, vol.7 (Jun 1988); reprinted in Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子, 中國文藝研究會會報, vol.92 (30 June 1989), pp.5-10; vol.93, (31 July 1989), pp.13-16; vol.94 (31 August 1989), pp.7-9; vol.96 (31 October, 1989), pp.5-7.

11) Mao Dun, *Wo zouguo de daolu*, vol.1, p.251.

ability in English although he had not had an opportunity to study abroad.¹²⁾ Mao Dun even stated that this article was an edited translation when he replied to Zhuang Zhongqing's request to read a draft of his research on Mao Dun in 1964.¹³⁾ Despite this statement, yet Mao Dun did not mention the original source of his article¹⁴⁾.

Mao Dun in fact contradicts himself with regard to his sources. In his early writing he suggested that "On Proletarian Art" may be an edited translation whereas later, in his memoirs of the late 1970s, he wrote that this article demonstrated his own change in literary thought and the theory of the 1920s.

In 1924, I began to consider writing an article about proletarian revolutionary literature based upon works from the Soviet Union. My intention was two-fold: first, to conduct a preliminary investigation of the various aspects of proletarian art; and second, to reexamine my previous literary and artistic views, to replace the maxim of 'art for life's sake' with 'art for the proletariat.'¹⁵⁾

At the same time, Mao Dun summarised the main ideas of the article in over six pages in his autobiography. This statement is the longest discussion of Mao Dun's theoretical writing in his autobiography.¹⁶⁾

12) For the discussion about Mao Dun's English abilities, see Mao Dun, *Wo zouguo de daolu*, vol.1, *op. cit.*, pp.84-85, 95-98; Mao Dun, "Wo yuedu de zhongwai wenxue zuopin" 我閱讀的中外文學作品 [Chinese and non-Chinese creative works of literature I read], *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan* 中國現代文學研究叢刊, vol.1 (1982), p.337.

13) Zhuang Zhongqing 莊鍾慶, *Mao Dun de chuanguo licheng* 茅盾的創作歷程 [Mao Dun's path of literary creation] (Beijing: renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1982), p.43.

14) Shiramizu Noriko also suggested that Mao Dun's 'failure' to identify the original source of this article must be connected to Bogdanov's anti-Bolshevik standpoint. See Shiramizu Noriko, "「論無產階級藝術」について" [About "On Proletarian Art"], 中國文藝研究會 ed., *Yecao* 野草 [Wild Grass], vol.43 (March 1989).

15) Mao Dun *Wo zouguo de daolu*, vol.1, p.286.

This change in Mao Dun's statement seems to result from the influence of critics' high estimation of him before his writing of the autobiography.¹⁷⁾ Mao Dun's original attitude to this article seems to be found in the letter written to Ye Ziming in 1957. When Ye Ziming asked Mao Dun to talk about the situation around the article "On Proletarian Art," Mao Dun wrote:

To talk about it, it would be ridiculous. Neither can I remember the article published in *Short Story Monthly* vol.12 or that I wrote "On Proletarian Art" in *Literature Weekly* before 1927. Could you please let me know the name of the author at the time that "On Proletarian Art" was published. If the pen name is not one of my well-known pseudonyms (It cannot be 'Mao Dun' two letters because this pseudonym began to be used when I wrote *Disillusionment*), another person's article might be regarded as mine (for instance, my younger brother had a literary career before went abroad).¹⁸⁾

Interestingly, here Mao Dun is not only unable to remember the article "On Proletarian Art" but also suspects that the article might have been written by his brother Shen Zemin 沈澤民, one of the early members of the CCP and a literary critic. These facts explain why this article hardly ever bears on Mao Dun's thinking.

16) See *Ibid.*, pp.251-56. In the light of this fact, it can be seen that there are differences which demand the researcher's careful attention and discrimination although his autobiography is not only one of the best known of its type on account of its verity and authenticity but also constitute the most significant records for studying Mao Dun.

17) High judgment on Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" was already published in two books in the 1950s. See Ye Ziming, *op. cit.*, pp.40-42; Shao Bozhou, *op. cit.*, pp.19-22.

18) Mao Dun, "Mao Dun tongzhi de ershi si feng xin - (5) Yijiuwuqi nian liu yue san ri xin" 茅盾同志的二十四封信 - (5) 一九五七年六月三日信 [Twenty four letters of Mao Dun comrade - (5) Letter on 3 Jun 1957], *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan* 中國現代文學研究叢刊, vol.4 (1981). Brackets original.

Shiramizu Noriko's Survey and Argument

In 1934 Mao Dun recorded reading Bogdanov's other article "Literary Inheritance" printed in a different volume of *The Labour Monthly*.

Ten years ago, Bogdanov's article in *The Labour Monthly* was published in Britain. I remember the title was precisely "Literary inheritance".¹⁹⁾

Shiramizu Noriko found a clue from the above article to the source of "On Proletarian Art". Three articles of Bogdanov were translated to five divided articles in *The Labour Monthly*.

- ① "Proletarian Poet - I", vol. 4, no. 5, May 1923.
- ② "Proletarian Poet - II", vol. 4, no. 6, June 1923.
- ③ "The Criticism of Proletarian Art", vol. 5, no. 6, December 1923.
- ④ "Religion, Art and Marxism", vol. 6, no. 8, August 1924.
- ⑤ "The Worker's Artistic Inheritance", vol. 6, no. 9, September 1924.

Originally ① and ② were one article entitled "What is Proletarian Poetry?" in the Russian version.²⁰⁾; ③ was the same version as Russian.²¹⁾; Also ④ and ⑤ were published as one article with the title of "The Legacy in Art" in the Russian version.²²⁾ In the light of Mao

19) Mao Dun 茅盾, "Shashibiya yu xianshizhuyi 莎士比亞與現實主義 (Shakespeare and realism)", *Wen shi* 文史, vol.1, no.3 (August 1934).

20) Alexander A. Bogdanov, "Chto takoe proletarskaya poeziya?" [What is Proletarian Poetry?], *Proletarskaya kul'tura*, no.1, July 1918. See John Biggart, Georgii Gloveli and Avraham Yassour, *Bogdanov and His work: A Guide to the published and unpublished works of Alexander A. Bodanov (Malinovsky) 1873-1928* (London: Ashgate, 1998), p.323.

21) Alexander A. Bogdanov, "Kritika proletarskogo iskusstva" [The Critism of Proletarian Art], *Proletarskaya kul'tura*, no.3 (August 1918). See John Biggart, Georgii Gloveli and Avraham Yassour, *op. cit.*, p.325.

22) Alexander A. Bogdanov, "O khudozhestvennom nasledstve" [The Legacy in Art],

Dun's record that he read "The Legacy in Art", it is quite within the realms of possibility that Mao Dun read "The criticism of proletarian art" published in the different volume of the same magazine *The Labour Monthly*(^③ quoted above).

In her survey, Shiramizu Noriko marks a solid line which shows a literal translation and a dotted line which shows a free translation (a similar part). Also, she marks with an asterisk where the original Russian version is omitted, by referring to the Japanese translations of the Russian German versions.

Two months after Shiramizu Noriko's survey, Sun Zhongtian, one of the well-known scholars in the study of Mao Dun, argued that Mao Dun's article was not a translation but a creation and a development despite the fact that the article referred to Bogdanov's article.²³⁾ In his article, Sun Zhongtian asserts that we should distinguish Mao Dun's article from Bogdanov's one since Mao Dun has a strong sense of his own authority and independence in accepting foreign culture and thought, such as literary tendencies in Western Europe and Nietzsche. In October of the same year, Shiramizu Noriko wrote a counterargument against Sun Zhongtian's article with an explanation of her survey, published in *Wild Grass* vol. 43 in March 1989.²⁴⁾ The argument between Sun Zhongtian and Shiramizu Noriko is worth pursuing here at some length because Mao Dun's article cannot be a

Proletarskaya kul'tura, no.2 (July 1918). See John Biggart, Georgii Gloveli and Avraham Yassour, *op. cit.*, p.324.

23) Sun Zhongtian, "Guanyu Mao Dun 'Lun wuchan jieji yishu' de xiezu" 關於茅盾論無產階級藝術的寫作 [About writing of Mao Dun's "On Proletarian Art"], *Wenyibao* 文藝報 (20 Aug 1988). Reprinted in *Fuyin baokan ziliao: Zhongguo xiandai zhuming zuojia yanjiu* 復印報刊資料: 中國現代著名作家研究 (1988), pp.22-23.

24) Shiramizu Noriko, "「論無產階級藝術」について" [About "On Proletarian Arts"], 中國文藝研究會 ed., *Yecao* 野草 [Wild Grass], vol.43 (Mar 1989), pp.37-53.

translation if Sun Zhongtian's discussion is valid.

As Sun Zhongtian indicates, Mao Dun obviously shows a distinctive attitude in which he reached out to Nietzsche with the only means that were to help him attain two goals: changes in the life of society and the achievement of truth. Sun Zhongtian argues with two examples that this attitude was preserved in Mao Dun's article. Sun Zhongtian writes:

Bogdanov's article only expresses: "The soul of the proletariat and its organisational basis are collectivism.": Mao Dun not only regards "the proletarian soul as collective," but also emphasises that it is "anti-patriarchal and non-religious." This is not only a sort of development and creation but also coincides with the cultural conditions of our country.²⁵⁾

The following table adopted from Shiramizu Noriko's survey includes equivalent statements in Mao Dun and Bogdanov according to Sun Zhongtian's account.²⁶⁾ In order to be seen effectively, I put the same numbers in the relevant places of the quotation and separated the sentences from the paragraphs. The solid line shows a literal translation while the dotted line a free translation (a similar part).

25) Sun Zhongtian, *op. cit.*, p.22.

26) Mao Dun, "Lun wuchan jieji yishu 論無產階級藝術 [On Proletarian Art]", *op. cit.*, pp.507-08; A. Bogdanov, "The criticism of proletarian art", *op. cit.*, p.345.

table 1

Mao Dun		Bogdanov
<p>[1] The soul of the proletariat is collective, anti-patriarchal and non-religious. However, the peasant's thought is the direct opposite.</p> <p>Although tenants amongst peasants are the proletarian class and most owner-peasants are also oppressed and suffering from earning a living.</p>	←	<p>[1] there are deep distinctions between them on points of principle. The soul of the proletariat, its organisational basis, is collectivism, fellowship, co-operation; it becomes conscious of itself as a class in the degree that this basis develops in its life and penetrates it.</p>
<p>[2] yet, in fact, the peasant's thought is mostly inclined towards individualism, patriarchy, religion and superstition.</p>	←	<p>[2] Peasants and small freeholders are mostly inclined toward individualism, toward the spirit of personal interest and private ownership; they are "petty bourgeois" - an incorrect inhabitant of the city, but expressing correctly the real character of the vital strivings of the peasantry.</p>
	↙	<p>[2] Besides, the patriarchal order of the family household preserves among the peasants the spirit of authority and religion; the inevitable narrowness of horizon characteristic of the village and the dependence of backward agriculture on elemental forces (which to the peasant are mysterious) all tend to produce the same result.</p>

A comparison between Mao Dun's account with the latter part of Bogdanov's article above indicates conclusively that Mao Dun's statement "anti-patriarchal and non-religious" is condensed from the latter paragraphs of Bogdanov's discussion rather than the development and creation that Sun Zhongtian calls it.

To argue his opinion, Sun Zhongtian gives another example:

In Mao Dun's article, the problem of succeeding cultural traditions and historical inheritance is constantly emphasised as being of great importance. Mao Dun observes: "I do not agree that we are not willing to use the inheritance of the old generation out of reason but would determinedly like to create bare-handed," and goes on to say "the proletariat should learn the technique of form from their old generation. This is not only the right that the proletariat should have, but also great respect which the fruit of painstaking labour of the old genius should be held in. In addition, this by no mean contempts dignity of revolutionary proletarian artists.²⁷⁾

It is evident that in his article Mao Dun constantly insists that proletarian literature should learn the artistic technique from literatures of preceding generations. Moreover, Mao Dun's writing that Sun quotes above is certainly not the translated part from Bogdanov. In the fifth chapter Mao Dun writes about artistic heritage at great length in terms of form and content

The genuine literary heritage for the proletarian class, on the contrary, lies with the 'old school' literature, damned by modern new schools as behind the times. This is the literature of revolutionary romanticism and of classicism of the previous ages. Why so? This is because revolutionary romanticism is the product of the capitalist class at the peak of its prosperity. It is the product of the healthy consciousness of a social class. We want what is healthy as our mode, not what is decaying and abnormal. We believe that new content will inevitably creates new form by itself. However, it is also necessary to begin with the past. Proletarian writers should understand the works of the previous ages and approve that art of the previous ages is an important heritage.²⁸⁾

27) Sun Zhongtian, *op. cit.*, p.22.

28) Mao Dun, "Lun wuchan jieji yishu", *op. cit.*, pp.515-519.

This shows not only Mao Dun's positive attitude to artistic heritage but also his concrete way of using it. By contrast, Bogdanov is, in general, well-known for his advocacy of a radical break with most traditional and bourgeois artistic conventions whereas Lenin implicitly accepted them.²⁹⁾ Comparing Mao Dun's article with Bogdanov's one, Sun Zhongtian commences with criticism of Bogdanov: "as we know, Bogdanov is the representative of the 'proletarian culture group' in the early literary activities of the Soviet Union. Lenin and the Party Central Committee censured this group for enhancing a negative nihilist attitude to traditional culture and carrying into effect 'complete independent activity' apart from the influence of the party and the state of the Soviet Union."³⁰⁾ This criticism is likely to be a general view having been unchanged after the introduction of Bogdanov into China in the late 1920s. Even in the West Bogdanov has been evaluated similarly till quite recently.³¹⁾

However, in fact Bogdanov, like Lenin, refers to the 'cultural heritage,' a respect for the 'great masters,' and a certain 'cooperation of generations' that would allow the best of the past to become the foundation for the future.³²⁾ This view is revealed in the article to

29) See Katerina Clark, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual* (Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981), pp.70-71.

30) Sun Zhongtian, *op. cit.*, p.22.

31) In early 1917 Bogdanov founded the Proletarian Cultural Organisation (Proletkult). One tendency, "futurist" proletarianism, advocated a radical break with most traditional and bourgeois artistic conventions. A secondary tendency, "pure" proletarianism, arose in reaction to the futurists. The "pure" proletarians withdrew from Proletkult in early 1920 to organise a group known as Kuznitsa (The Smithy)' 80 percent of the members came from a working-class background. See Katerina Clark, *op. cit.*, pp.70-71.

32) The difference is one of emphasis. Both assume a 'critical assimilation' of the past was necessary, but Lenin places the accent on assimilation whereas Bogdanov

which Mao Dun refers. Bogdanov writes:

The Proletariat must learn artistic technique from its predecessors in the first place. It is necessary to learn the technique of art, not from these organisers of the decadence of life, but from the great masters of the arts, who came at the period of the rise and flowering of the classes now decaying – the revolutionary romanticists and the classics of different times. Of course, the new contents will inevitably work out new forms: but it is necessary to start with the best of the past. The proletariat should not forget the respect we owe to the great dead who trod smooth the way for us, who bequeathed us their spirits, and from their graves extend to us their helping hand in our striving to this ideal.³³⁾

Therefore, the views which Mao Dun expresses concerning cultural heritage and proletarian art as anti-patriarchal and non-religious, are in fact the views of Bogdanov. Sun Zhongtian is wrong in submitting that Mao Dun has two different views from Bogdanov.

Drawing a parallel between the two versions in great detail, it is clearly the third, fourth and fifth chapters of the five that are mostly translated from Bogdanov's version. The second chapter is largely plagiarised from Bogdanov and the passages in Bogdanov which Mao Dun does not use are largely pertinent only to the situation in the Soviet Union. Thus, there are detailed descriptions and examples in Bogdanov not found in Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" but the fact that they were not used is almost certainly because they were irrelevant to Mao Dun's situation. At the same time, although the second chapter apparently constitutes Mao Dun's original style and

stresses criticism. See Zenovia A. Sochor, *Revolution and Culture: The Bogdanov-Lenin Controversy* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988), p.182.

33) Bogdanov, "The Criticism of Proletarian Art," *op. cit.*, pp.353-356.

thoughts, but it is difficult to appraise his writing as creative and different in idea from Bogdanov because it is not different from Bogdanov's main ideal. The first chapter, as Shiramizu Noriko observes, seems to be Mao Dun's original writing.³⁴⁾ Therefore, it is clear that the rest of Mao Dun's "On proletariat art" except the first chapter was written on the basis of Bogdanov's English version, combining a direct translation with a free translation.

Bogdanov

The fact that Mao Dun's article is mostly a translation of Bogdanov's article raises the sensitive issue that the original writer Bogdanov³⁵⁾ is not such a lineal Marxist theorist as K. Marx, F. Engels, V. I. Lenin, and G. V. Plehanov.

There was a deep rooted political confrontation between Lenin and Bogdanov as well as a philosophical dissension in the 1910s and 1920s although both of them had been founder-members of the Bolshevik faction of the Russian Social Democratic Party (RSDRP) in Geneva in 1904.³⁶⁾ In May 1909, in his *Materialism and Empirio-criticism*, a work which after 1917 acquired canonical status in Marxist-Leninist philosophy, Lenin sought to discredit Bogdanov by proclaiming Bogdanov's ideas inconsistent with Marxism, and in June 1909 he

34) Shiramizu Noriko, *op. cit.* pp.44-48.

35) For a brief account of Bogdanov's life, see Zenovia A. Sochor, pp.6-12. For a detailed account of Bogdanov's rehabilitation, see John Biggart, "The Rehabilitation of Bogdanov", John Biggart et al. eds., *op. cit.* pp.3-39.

36) For a detailed account of the relationships as rivals between Bogdanov and Lenin, see Zenovia A. Sochor, *op. cit.*, pp.3-160.

contrived the expulsion of Bogdanov and his supporters from the 'Bolshevik Centre'. After the October Revolution, Bogdanov played an important role as a leader of Proletkult, which grew into a big organisation having over four hundred thousand workers as affiliates when Lenin's political power had not settled down yet. Proletkult's demand for creating pure proletarian culture resulted in the insistence on complete independence from governmental and party institutions. This demand caused inevitable collision with the party. Lenin felt the danger to his political power and subordinated Proletkult to the party in spite of his relatively more open attitude to cultural discourses at the time.³⁷⁾ Lenin condemned Bogdanov with a malicious intention:

It is clearly evident that under the guise of 'proletarian culture' Bogdanov represented to the workers bourgeois and reactionary views.³⁸⁾

It can be said that the common negative estimation in the Soviet Union and China has been largely influenced by Lenin's criticism.³⁹⁾ As

37) In 1920 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union denounced the Proletkult as being of petty-bourgeois social origin and of a decadent and 'idealist' inspiration and made a decision of subordinating Proletkult to the party. See Herman Ermolaev, *Soviet Literary Theories 1917-1934: The Genesis of Socialist Realism* (New York: Octagon Books, 1977), pp.9-26. For Lenin's insistence of subordinating Proletkult to the party, see V. I. Lenin, "On Proletarian Culture", *On Literature and Art*, (Moscow: Progress Publishers, 1978).

38) Lenin, V. I., Werke, Bd. 14, *Materialismus und Empiriokritizismus* (Dietz Verlag, Berlin, 1985) Jung-Ho Park trans., 유물론과 경험비판론 [Materialism and Empirio-criticism], (Seoul: Dolbegae, 1992), p.41.

39) According to Ermolaev, Lenin's criticism can be summarised to three: Lenin viewed the creation of proletarian culture as untimely even impossible in the Russia of the early 1920's though he did not reject pointblank the possibility that such a culture could exist in the future. The second reason was "Lenin's distrust of Bogdanov, who, together with Lunacharsky, belonged to the political group Vpered (Forward, 1909-1917), which disagreed with Lenin on a number of political, philosophical, social, and cultural issues. Lenin branded its members as Machists followers of the

a result, Bogdanov's ideas were stigmatised as heretical. This political twist reflects distorted views on Bogdanov's original. Considering this distorted view, the following section will compare Mao Dun's view with Bogdanov's.

3. Comparison of Mao Dun and Bogdanov

In so far as Mao Dun article "On Proletarian Art" is mostly based on Bogdanov, it is necessary to observe to what extent Mao Dun's literary thought in the period around 1925 is influenced by Bogdanov.

Futurism and Revolutionary Literature

In his article "On Proletarian Art" Mao Dun reveals a change in his attitude to futurism, an important element of the Soviet avant-garde in the 1910s and 1920s. Whereas Bogdanov sets a limited value on such avant-garde approaches as futurism and symbolism, Mao Dun totally denies futurism:

Bogdanov: From the 'latest' literary tendencies one may learn some small details, in which they are frequently very skilful.⁴⁰⁾

Austrian philosopher Ernst Mach." The third reason was "Lenin's fear that socially alien elements, like the Futurists and the decadents, who had invaded the ranks of the Proletkult, would spread anti-Marxist views on art." See Herman Ermolaev, *op. cit.*, pp.15-16.

40) A. Bogdanov, *op. cit.*, p.353.

Mao Dun: Why do we say that the futurist school and the other schools like expressionism and symbolism cannot be considered models for proletarian literature? It is because they are only reflections of the abnormal psychology generated in a time of decline of the old social class. the latest new schools like futurism and symbolism are entirely of no value.⁴¹⁾

Mao Dun's interest in futurism, like his many other interests in Western literature and literary theories, had already begun in the early 1920s.⁴²⁾ Mao Dun paid a great deal of attention to the development of futurism in the West and to its possible use in Chinese literature. On more than one occasion, he traced futurism from Marinetti in Italy to the futurist poets in Soviet Russia. In his early article "The current development of futurist literature" in 1922 Mao Dun writes a great deal on futurism and Mayakovsky while admiring its 'fearlessness' and 'dynamics':

It seems to represent the fearless, destructive spirit of the Bolshevik Party. After you have read the poem, you may hate it, you may like it, but you will not be able to remain indifferent to it, devoid of reaction. It pierces your heart, demanding that you pay attention to it and take position.⁴³⁾

Futurism in Russia, Mao Dun observes, draws its tremendous dynamics and revolutionary force from the destruction of the old society and the creation of the new. Its relation to society being more profound, it is therefore more artistically sound: Russian futurism, prophesies

41) Mao Dun, "Lun wuchan jieji yishu," *op. cit.*, pp.516-517.

42) For the discussion of futurism in Mao Dun's trilogy *Eclipse*, see Marston Anderson, *op. cit.*, pp.134-136; Yu-shih Chen, *Realism and Allegory*, pp.72-75.

43) Mao Dun, "Weilaipai wenxue de xianshi" 未來派文學的現勢 [The current development of futurist literature], *Xiaoshuo yuebao*, vol 13, no.10 (October 1922), p.4.

Mao Dun, will flourish in the coming years.⁴⁴⁾ Mao Dun's praise for Mayakovsky and futurism continues in his article "Mayakovsky, A revolutionary poet of Soviet Russia" in 1924: "even though it has no relations to proletarian culture, yet it truly expresses the revolutionary spirit of the proletariat. Mayakovsky never disappoints but is full of fiery progressive spirits."⁴⁵⁾ Mao Dun chooses Mayakovsky not only because he is at that time an acknowledged poet, for "he understands perfectly the spirit of the October Revolution and succeeds with his pen that brings forth flowers in describing and celebrating it,"⁴⁶⁾ but also because Mayakovsky is a futurist, hence a proponent of the modern avant-garde trend with which Mao Dun sympathises.

Mao Dun's attitude to futurism, as observed above, changes into a negative view in his article "On Proletarian Art" in 1925. This change is also represented in his article "On LEF," written just after "On Proletarian Art."⁴⁷⁾ LEF (1923-1929) is the abbreviation of the Left Front of Arts (LEF), organised in 1923 by Mayakovsky and futurists in Russia. As an offspring of Russian futurism, LEF evinced certain characteristics of this movement.⁴⁸⁾ Mao Dun's article "On LEF" consists of two parts; the first being a translation of F. Rubiner's article "A Public Disputation on Futurism" published in *International Press Correspondence* on 9 August 1923, the organ paper of the Third International, which reports the situation of its open forum concerning

44) *Ibid.*, pp.4-5.

45) Mao Dun, "Suweiai Eluosi geming shiren - Maxiakaofusiji" 蘇維埃俄羅斯的革命詩人 - 瑪霞考夫斯基 [Mayakovsky, A revolutionary poet of Soviet Russia], *Wenxue zhoubao* 文學週報 [Literature Weekly], vol.130, July (1924), p.1.

46) *Ibid.*

47) Mao Dun, "Guanyu 'Liefu' de" 關於'烈夫'的 [On LEF], *Wenxue zhoubao*, vol. 195 (October 1925), pp.190-192.

48) For more detailed discussion on LEF, see Herman Ermolaev, *op. cit.*, pp.72-75.

LEF. The second part is Mao Dun's preface and postscript appended before and after the translation. The translation is a critique of futurists not only because futurists regard literature and art as tools of revolution but also because their thought has nothing to do with communism and the proletarian ideal. Consenting to this view, Mao Dun writes:

This news was heard last July when the debate on LEF was heated. At the time of speaking, the futurist school in Russia has already declined and received severe critiques by Soviet critics, for example, such as A. Lunacharsky and A. Bogdanov. In consequence, fervent young people have already returned to the right way.⁴⁹⁾

This change clearly results from the influence of Bogdanov. This influence of Bogdanov is also reflected in Mao Dun's view during the Revolutionary Literature debate. When Mao Dun criticises revolutionary literature advocated by the Creation Society and the Sun Society in 1928, Mao Dun compares them with futurists:

Although they approach the 'new literature' with high hopes and expectations, yet they wind up disappointedly shaking their heads for the simple reason that the 'new literature' exposes itself as unable to shake off the shackles of 'slogan literature.' From 1918 to 1922, the Russian futurists produced a large body of 'slogan literature' and told the Soviet Russian proletariat that these works were produced for it, but the proletariat was not grateful, the peasants did not even attempt to disguise their distaste for these writers, they welcomed instead Pasternak and Pilnyak, who smelled somewhat putrid to the futurists.⁵⁰⁾

49) Mao Dun, "Guanyu 'Liefu' de", *op. cit.*, p.192.

50) Mao Dun, "Cong Guling dao Dongjing" 從牯嶺到東京 [From Guling to Tokyo], *op. cit.*, pp.187-188. Translations are adopted from John Berninghausen and Theodore

Mao Dun's critical view of revolutionary literature seems to have already been formed in his article "On Proletarian Art" under the influence of Bogdanov. Mao Dun, in his article "On Proletarian Art," states:

Proletarian literature is not the same as revolutionary literature. Revolutionary literature rebels against the past and is in essence destructive. The proletariat as a class seeks freedom growth, and the realisation of its historical mission. Much post-October Revolution poetry celebrates the heroic killing of its enemies by the Red Army. This cannot be considered mainstream proletarian literature. Also there is an erroneous view that instigation and agitation are the only goal of art.⁵¹⁾

This shows that Mao Dun not only takes his critical standpoint in examining the relationship between literature and revolution in the late 1920s under the influence of Bogdanov, but also represents his critical attitude towards the advocacy of revolutionary literature already begun before 1925.

While Mao Dun adopts most views on revolutionary literature from Bogdanov's article, Mao Dun translates 'literature influenced by the soldiers' in Bogdanov's article into 'revolutionary literature'.⁵²⁾ This change reveals that Mao Dun intends to express his criticism of the contemporary polemic on revolutionary literature, adopting Bogdanov's critique of 'literature influenced by the soldiers'. In other words, Mao Dun is influenced in two ways by Bogdanov in his article "On

Huters, eds., *op. cit.*, p.41.

51) Mao Dun, "Lun wuchan jieji yishu", *op. cit.*, pp.508-513.

52) A. Bogdanov, *op. cit.*, pp.346-347.

Proletarian Art." One is that Mao Dun changes his attitude towards futurism from positive to negative by referring to Bogdanov's article. As a result, in the debate on revolutionary literature in the late 1920s Mao Dun comes to use futurism as a character of the advocates, such as the Creation Society and the Sun Society. Secondly Mao Dun begins to form concretely his critical standpoint of regarding the discourse on revolutionary literature as 'slogan literature' in 1925 under the influence of Bogdanov's notion that instigation and agitation are not the only goal of proletarian art.

Writer and Class Approach

Although Bogdanov's article is obviously influential in Mao Dun's view on futurism and revolutionary literature, Mao Dun reveals views different from Bogdanov's in his other articles at the time. In the articles written between 1925 and 1928, Mao Dun places a positive value on the role of the petit-bourgeois in the course of revolution. Mao Dun, for instance, expresses the opinion that the life of the petit-bourgeois class should be made the subject of fiction in his essay "From Guling to Tokyo" whereas Bogdanov establishes a formula emphasising the proletarian class consciousness.⁵³⁾ Class consciousness is one of the most significant elements in Bogdanov's cultural theory through which the proletariat should make their own culture.⁵⁴⁾ The emphasis on the class consciousness inevitably reflects the author

53) Mao Dun, "Cong Guling dao Dongjing", *op. cit.*

54) Zenovia A. Sochor, *op. cit.*, pp.131-140.

since in Bogdanov's discussion the work of art is regulated by the class consciousness of the 'organiser' by which Bogdanov means the author in the process of creating art. For Bogdanov, the notion of the class consciousness is based on the proletariat not on the petit-bourgeois.

In his article "The Criticism of Proletarian Art" referred to by Mao Dun, Bogdanov asserts that proletarian literature is not peasant literature because peasant literature describes only the hardships of peasant life, uninformed by the proletarian class consciousness. Besides, Bogdanov criticises peasant literature as petit-bourgeois:

There are deep distinctions between them *on points of principle*. The soul of the proletariat, its organisational basis, is collectivism, fellowship, co-operation: it becomes conscious of itself as a class in the degree that this basis develops in its life and penetrates it. Peasants and small freeholders are mostly inclined toward individualism, toward the spirit of personal interest and private ownership: they are 'petty bourgeois.'⁵⁵⁾

In terms of the class consciousness of writer, on the one hand, a comparison between Bogdanov's article and Mao Dun's article "From Guling to Tokyo" shows that Mao Dun adheres to his own view despite Bogdanov's influence. On the other hand, this comparison questions to what extent Mao Dun forms his class approach to literary theory around 1925.

To observe Mao Dun's literary view around 1925, it is necessary to compare "On Proletarian Art" with his other writings at the time. Mao Dun's articles before and after the article are the following:

55) A. Bogdanov, *op. cit.*, p.345.

August	1924	"The World War and Literature" ⁵⁶⁾
	1924	"The Reminiscence at the Occasion of the 10 th Anniversary of the Outbreak of the World War" ⁵⁷⁾
March	1925	"Various Feelings" ⁵⁸⁾
	1925	"A Study of Characters" ⁵⁹⁾
	1925	"Ready-made Wish" ⁶⁰⁾
July	1925	"To Those Who are Interested in the Study of Literature" ⁶¹⁾
September	1925	"The New Mission of Writers" ⁶²⁾
October	1925	"On LEF" ⁶³⁾
November	1926	"The Reason Why Chinese Literature Could Not Develop Soundly" ⁶⁴⁾

In the articles above, in "Various feelings," and "The reason why Chinese literature could not develop soundly" Mao Dun does not touch

56) Mao Dun, "Ouzhou dazhan yu wenxue" 歐洲大戰與文學 [The World War and literature], *Xiaoshuo yuebao*, vol.15, no.8 (Aug 1924).

57) Mao Dun, "Ouzhan shinian jinian" 歐戰十年紀念 [The reminiscence at the occasion of the 10th anniversary of the outbreak of the World War], *Xuedeng* 學燈, vol.133 (Aug 1924). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.456-459.

58) Mao Dun, "Zagan" 雜感 [Various feelings], *Literature Weekly*, vols. 158 and 159 (Feb 1925). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.460-461.

59) Mao Dun, "Renwu de yanjiu" 人物的研究 [A study of characters], *Xiaoshuo yuebao*, vol.16, no.3 (Mar 1925). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.467-494.

60) Mao Dun, "Xiancheng de xiwang" 現成的希望 [Ready-made wish], *Literature Weekly*, vol.164 (Mar 1925). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.495-498.

61) Mao Dun, "Gao youzhi yanjiu wenxuezhe" 告有志研究文學者 [To those who are interested in the study of literature], *Xuesheng zazhi*, vol.12, no.7 (Jul 1925). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.520-538.

62) Mao Dun, "Wenxuezhe de xin shiming" 文學者的新使命 [The new mission of writers], *Literature Weekly*, vol.190 (Sep 1925). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.18, pp.539-541.

63) Mao Dun, "Guanyu Liefu," *op. cit.*

64) Mao Dun, "Zhongguo wenxue buneng jianquan fazhan zhi yuanyin" 中國文學不能健全發展之原因 [The reason why Chinese literature could not develop soundly], *Literature Weekly*, vol.4, no.1, (Jan 1926). Here refer to *Mao Dun quanji*, vol.19, pp.102-110.

anything relevant to proletarian literature at all. In the article "The World War and literature", one sees a clear class approach, that means a class analysis of World War I which had an imperialist, conquering character. This may be observed even better in Mao Dun's essay written on the day of the tenth anniversary of the outbreak of the hostilities:

Ten years ago this day a great massacre began, the greatest in the history of mankind. Workers of all nations were adroitly deceived by the capitalists (the ruling class) and compelled in tens of millions to go to battle fields and there lay down their lives. If the blood they shed had not been in vain, it should suffice to purify the world, but results of their fight have secretly been usurped by the imperialists and made to reinforce their power. Consequently, the children and grandchildren of proletarians fallen on the battlefields must even today bear an exploitation on the part of capitalists which is ten times worse than it had been before the war."⁶⁵⁾

Although there is a strong class attitude to current political issues in the quotation above, yet this view is lacking in the literary issues. In the article "Ready-made wish" there is also a lack of explanation of proletarian literature.

In the article "A Study of Characters", which became a chapter of his more extensive work, *Outline of the Study of Novel* published in 1928, Mao Dun takes note of the most diverse works on the novel written towards the end of the last and the beginning of the twentieth century. Although Mao Dun deals with the characters which he considers to be the main constituent of a literary work, he just considers class as one of thirteen elements in describing characters.

65) Mao Dun, "Ouzhan shinian jinian," *op. cit.*, p.456. Brackets original.

Mao Dun's article "To Those Who Are Interested in the Study of Literature" is coloured with a very moderate tone different from "On Proletarian Art." As Marian Galik point out, it is due to the fact that *The Student Magazine* in which the article "To those who are interested in the study of literature" was published, was owned by Commercial Press and the managers did not like any expressions of radical thought.⁶⁶⁾ Nonetheless, this article illustrates Mao Dun's principle aesthetic concept which includes four questions: What is literature? What is literature capable of doing for the masses? Can anybody become a writer? What are the duties of contemporary writers? In Mao Dun's discourse only the aesthetic view is constantly emphasised: "Literature is an expression of a totality of conceptions (images), by means of words. These conceptions (images) were at first put into harmony and arranged into order by our aesthetic views (on the basis of our critical attitude) and were preserved to us."

1925 Mao Dun publishes the article "The new mission of writers" quoted as evidence of Mao Dun's new progress with "On Proletarian Art" by many critics.

Although Mao Dun clearly express his class view and interest in proletarian art in this article, he seems to recognise them rather vaguely, but never elaborates on the literary issue. He states:

The present mission of writers is to grasp the spirit of national and class revolutionary movement and express it by deep and great literature and cause this spirit to spread among the people, to penetrate into the brains of the oppressed so that the wave of their growing movement for their own liberation be maintained and that this encourage

66) Marian Galik, *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*, op. cit., p.94.

them towards an increased and more enthusiastic revolutionary movement. …… The fresh atmosphere of the proletarian class would open a new era, and its literature besides expressing real human life, would trace the way to a better, more beautiful future.⁶⁷⁾

This class approach, however, is lacking in a literary issues. Literature has its own life, peculiar existence, its immanent development. This is Mao Dun's conviction in those years. To literature he applies standards different from those used in socio-political problems.

4. Concluding Remarks

Mao Dun's article "On Proletarian Art" published in 1925 has been treated as one of Mao Dun's most significant writings up to the present. While "On Proletarian Art" indeed bears the first recorded evidence of Mao Dun's understanding of class-oriented literary views, to regard the article as a sign of a qualitative transformation of Mao Dun's literary orientation is but an exaggeration. By investigating the source of "On Proletarian Art" and examining the argument between two opposite opinions between Shiramizu Noriko and Sun Zhongtian, this study challenges the originality of this essay and points out the striking similarities between Mao Dun's piece and the English translation of Bogdanov's essay "The Criticism of Proletarian Art"

67) Mao Dun, "Wenxue zhe de xin shiming," *op. cit.*, pp.540-541. Translation adopted from Marian Galik, *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*, *op. cit.*, pp.89-95.

published in the British magazine *The Labour Monthly* in 1923.

In so far as Mao Dun article "On Proletarian Art" is mostly based on Bogdanov, it is necessary to observe to what extent Mao Dun's literary thought in the period around 1925 is influenced by Bogdanov and to what extent Mao Dun reveals his own views as apposed to Bogdanov's. My observation shows that Mao Dun is influenced in two ways by Bogdanov. One is that Mao Dun changes his attitude towards futurism from positive to negative by referring to Bogdanov's article. As a result, in the debate on revolutionary literature in the late 1920s Mao Dun comes to use futurism as part of his attack on his opponents, the alleged advocates of futurism including these in the Creation Society and the Sun Society. Secondly, Mao Dun begins to form concretely his critical standpoint of regarding the discourse on revolutionary literature as 'slogan literature' in 1925 under the influence of Bogdanov's notion that instigation and agitation are not the only goal of proletarian art. Before and after 1925 although Mao Dun has a class attitude to current political issues, he fails to go deeply into the class approach in literary theoretical issues although the significance of his criticism can be found in its ground-breaking attempt to distinguish proletarian literature from being mere 'slogan literature'.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

- Mao Dun 茅盾, *Mao Dun quanji* 茅盾全集 [Complete works of Mao Dun], Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1984-89.
- Mao Dun, *Wo zouguo de daolu* 我走過的道路 [The road I have taken], vol.2,

Hong Kong: Sanlian shudian, 1984.

Mao Dun, "Mao Dun tongzhi de ershi si feng xin - (5) Yijiuwuqi nian liu yue san ri xin" 茅盾同志的二十四封信 - (5) 一九五七年六月三日信 [Twenty four letters of Mao Dun comrade - (5) Letter on 3rd June 1957], *Zhongguo xiandai wenzue yanjiu congkan* 中國現代文學研究叢刊, vol.4 (1981)

Xiaoshuo yuebao 小說月報 [Short Story Monthly], vols. 12-22, Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1921-1931. reprinted by Shumu wenzue chubanshe, 1981.

Secondary Sources

Biggart, John, Georgii Gloveli and Avraham Yassour, *Bogdanov and His work: A Guide to the published and unpublished works of Alexander A. Bogdanov (Malinovsky) 1873-1928*, Aldershot: Ashgate, 1998.

Bogdanov, Alexander A., "The Criticism of Proletarian Art", *Labour Monthly*, vol.5, no.6 (December 1923)

Chen, Yu-shih, *Realism and Allegory in the Early Fiction of Mao Tun*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1986.

Clark, Katerina, *The Soviet Novel: History as Ritual*, Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press, 1981.

Ermolaev, Herman, *Soviet Literary Theories 1917-1934: The Genesis of Socialist Realism* New York: Octagon Books, 1977

Galik, Marian, *Mao Tun and Modern Chinese Literary Criticism*, Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1969.

McDougall, Bonnie S. and Kam Louie, *The Literature of China in the Twentieth Century* London: Hurst and Company, 1997.

Shao Bozhaou 邵伯周, *Mao Dun de wenzue daolu* 茅盾的文學道路 [Mao Dun's literary path], Wuhan: Changjiang wenyi chubanshe, 1959.

Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子, "Mujun no puroritarira gei jutsu wo ronzu no tenkyo ni tsuite" 茅盾「論無產階級藝術」の典據について [On the source material of Mao Dun's 'On Proletarian Art'], *Mujun kenkyukai kaiho* 茅盾研究會會報, vol.7 (June 1988); reprinted in Shiramizu Noriko 白水紀子, *中國文藝研究會會報*, vols.92-96 (1989)

Shiramizu Noriko, "「論無產階級藝術」について" [About "On Proletarian Art"], *中國*

- 文藝研究會 ed., Yecao 野草 [Wild Grass], vol.43 (March 1989)
- Sochor, Zenovia A., *Revolution and Culture: The Bogdanov-Lenin Controversy*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1988.
- Sun Zhongtian 孫中田, *Lun Mao Dun de shenghuo yu chuanguo* 論茅盾的生活與創作 [The life and works of Mao Dun], Tianjin: Baihua wenyi chubanshe, 1980.
- Sun Zhongtian 孫中田, "Guanyu Mao Dun 'Lun wuchan jieji yishu' de xiezu" 關於茅盾論無產階級藝術的寫作 [About writing of Mao Dun's "On Proletarian Art"], *Wenyibao* 文藝報 (20 August 1988). Reprinted in *Fuyin baokan ziliao: Zhongguo xiandai zhuming zuojia yanjiu ziliao* 復印報刊資料: 中國現代著名作家研究 (1988).
- Yang Yang 楊揚, *Zhuanxi shiqi de wenxue sixiang - Mao Dun zaoqi wenxue sixiang yanjiu* 轉析時期的文學思想 - 茅盾早期文學思想研究 [Literary thought of transformation period - on Mao Dun's early literary thought], Shanghai: Huadong shifan daxue chubanshe, 1996.
- Ye Ziming 葉子銘, *Lun Mao Dun sishinian de wenxue daolu* 論茅盾四十年的文學道路 [On Mao Dun's forty-year literary path], Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe, 1959.
- Zhu Defa 朱德發, A Yan 阿岩 and Zhai Deyao 翟德耀, *Mao Dun qianqi wenxue sixiang sanlun* 茅盾前期文學思想散論 [Essays on Mao Dun's early literary thoughts], Jinan: Shandong renmin chubanshe, 1983.
- Zhuang Zhongqing 莊鍾慶, *Mao Dun de chuanguo licheng* 茅盾的創作歷程 [Mao Dun's path of literary creation], Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe, 1982.

<국문제요>

1925년에 출판된 마오둔의 <프롤레타리아예술론>은 마오둔의 문학론이 문학혁명에서 혁명문학으로 가는 중요한 전환점으로 평가받아 왔다. 특히 문학의 계급성에 대한 마오둔의 관점이 1920년대 중반기 이미 확립된 것으로 대륙 연구계에서 주목해 왔다. 그러나 일본학자인 시라미즈 노리코는 이 글이 소련의 문예이론가인 보그다노프의 글을

대부분 번역했음을 밝히면서 그 진위여부에 논란을 제공했다. 보그다노프는 러시아혁명 초기 가장 강력한 전국적 노동자문화정치조직인 프롤레트쿨트의 지도자로서 레닌과 경쟁하다 실각한 문예이론가로 소련에서 반혁명분자로 낙인찍히고 중국에서도 비판의 대상이었다는 점에서 쟁점들을 다시금 검토할 필요가 있다.

본고는 시라미주 노리코와 논쟁하면서 마오둔과 보그다노프 시각의 차이를 강조한 孫中田의 입장을 비판적으로 접근하는 한편 마오둔이 보그다노프의 글을 참고하면서 일으킨 변화에 대해 1925년 전후에 발표된 글들을 비교하며 분석한다. 마오둔은 보그다노프의 글을 통해 기존에 미래주의에 대한 긍정적 입장에서 비판적 시선으로 전환하는 기회를 얻는다. 1920년대 말 혁명문학 논쟁에서 마오둔이 소련의 미래주의에 빗대 혁명문학 논자들을 비판하는 시각은 1925년 전후 보그다노프의 글을 통해 받은 영향이 관련되어 있음을 확인할 수 있다. 혁명문학 논쟁에서 '슬로건 문학'과 프롤레타리아문학을 구분하여 논의를 전개하는 마오둔의 선구적 역할은 여전히 인정되지만 문학에서 계급문제에 대한 마오둔의 탁월한 인식을 보여주었다는 지금까지의 평가는 재검토되어야 함을 본고는 밝히고 있다.

주제어: 마오둔, 프롤레타리아 문학, 보그다노프, 번역, 미래주의, 문학의 계급성

원고접수일	심사일정	1차수정	게재확정	출간
2010. 3. 25	2010. 4. 30	2010. 5. 2	2010. 5. 7	2010. 5. 31