

Briefing of the Research on the Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons in Soviet Russia in the 20th Century¹

LI Yi-jin

College of Literature, Tianjin Normal University

The study of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in Russia began around 1918. The Chapter “Tracing the origin of the Dao” translated by B.M. Alexeyev, the founder of modern Russian Sinology, is the earliest Russian translation of this book. He proposed a lot of problems inspiring future generations to think about, standardizing the direction for the future researchers of “Dragon Study” in Soviet Russia. L. D. Bozdneeva’s textbook *Medieval Eastern Literature* (1970), K. I. Grekina’s Monograph *Chinese Literary Theory in the Early 19-20th century* (1971), V. A. K’ri’vzo’v’s paper *Discussion on Liu Xie’s Aesthetic Views* (1978), I.S. Lisevich’s Monograph *Ideology of Chinese Literature at the Turn of the Ancient and the Middle Ages* (1979), and Li Fuqing’s paper published after the dissolution of the Soviet Union, *Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature* (1994), have made a useful discussion of the concept and terminology, literary theory and aesthetic ideology of *the Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. In the monograph *Tai Chi: the Global Model in Chinese Literature and Culture in the 1-13th Century*, published by K. I. Gorekina in 1995, *Dragon-Carving and Literary Mind* was interpreted by universe ontology, which reflects the rising of new academic trend in the research of “Dragon Study” in Russia. In recent years, young talents begin to join in Russian *Dragon-Carving and Literary Mind* research, and doctoral thesis focused on it have been published, showing a good situation that this research has qualified successors.

Keywords: 20th Century, Russia, the Soviet Union, Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind, Review

Russia is an early country in study of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* (文心雕龙) comparing with Europe and the United States, almost in tandem with China. Vasily Mikhailovich Alexeyev (1881-1951), founder of modern Russian new Sinology, and professor of the Petersburg University and academician, came up with *Liu Xie’s Poetics* in Chinese translation plan drafted for publishing *World Literature* in 1918². In 1920, he wrote a chapter *Chinese Literature* for *Oriental Literature* published by World Literature Publisher. In this chapter he translated Chapter “Tracing the Origin of the Dao” (原道篇) of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* when mentioning the theory of the relationship between Wen (文) and Tao (道) of the ancient Confucianists³. The paragraph is the earliest Russian excerpt of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. The

¹ **Acknowledgements:** This paper is supported by Major projects of the National Social Science Fund for 2016, “The Study of Chinese problems in the western literary theory of the twentieth century” (16ZDA194).

LI Yi-jin, was born in Tianjin in 1948. Professor of the College of Literature of Tianjin Normal University and deputy director of the Researching Center for International Chinese Literature. Mainly engaged in the research on Chinese ancient literary theory and Sino Russian literature relations.

² Алексеев В.М. Труды по китайской литературе: В 2кн.Кн.1/ В.М.Алексеев ;[Сост. М.В. Баньковская; Отв. ред. Б. Л. Рифтин]. М: Вост. Лит.,2002. С.91.

V. M. Alexeyev, A Collection of Chinese Literary Works, volume 1 (Oriental Literature Press, 2002), p. 91.

³ Алексеев В.М. Китайская литература. Избранные труды. М.Наука,1978,с.51-52.

V. M. Alexeyev, Selection of Chinese Literature (Science Press, 1978), pp. 51-52.

complex meaning of Liu Xie's "Wen" concept was noted, and not simply translated into "literature", "letter" or "culture", but transliterated to "Wen", which showed his prudence. He pointed out that Liu Xie "endowed the concept of Wen with a more profound meaning. He regarded it as "the expression of Tao, rather, it is something visible which is related to the invisible and natural creativity. So, Wen is highly intelligent manifestation and excellent diction which connects us with absolutely correct thoughts."⁴

"*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*" was studied in the context of Chinese traditional "arts criticism" by V.M Alexeyev. This framework of arts criticism is comprised of "sketches and marks set up by readers and writers" such as gradation in Zhong Rong's *Poetry* (诗品), lyric speaking in Ssu-kung Tu's *Twenty-four Poems* (二十四诗品) and kinds of poetry and novel criticism in later ages, as well as Liu Xie's "overall and coordinated structure" in the type of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*.⁵ Alexeyev believed that in all critical patterns, the advantage principle is "diachronism", which becomes the methodological basis of the research on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in Russia. Alexeyev pointed out that Liu Xie's work "is performed when the author assessing the literary phenomena and the most excellent on profundity".⁶

V. M. Alexeyev considered Liu Xie's achievements lie in his penetrating understanding of the essence of the development of Chinese literature as a medieval literary theorist. This kind of literature is manifested in "the alternation of (Confucian) phantoms and (Taoist) illusions". He wrote: "(Liu Xie) used Taoist terminology, which come from that era, undoubtedly affecting the poetics dictionary, calling external beauty, gorgeous imagination as 'excessive ornament'. At the same time, as the 'fruit', it has solid fruit factors on the contrary. it came from the flowers, which is natural with the oracle classicism on the Confucian thought. Thus, on one hand, Liu Xie identified the poets of classical beauty with human imprints, on the other hand, the poets of abstract and metaphysical beauty."⁷ Alexeyev pointed out that the internal contradictions of Chinese literature were hidden in the external "world view duality" in the middle ages: "the Confucianism for the orthodox label and the Taoist for internal ideal exploration."⁸

Alexeyev believes that although Liu Xie does not focus much on research of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, he put forward a lot of questions enlightening the thinking of the later generations as a pioneer of Russian research on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, such as he put forward a problem taking Liu Xie's predecessor "*Wen Fu*" (文赋) as an example, namely the existence of a contradiction in medieval Chinese Poetics: Its theorists "have barely distinguish between prose and poetry". "Wen" in Chinese poetics, "is poetry and prose, not only limited to form but also to genre"; but "this requirement is strongly expanded and emphasized when it comes to the style of prose and poetry."⁹ His questions about the concept and connotation of "Wen" in Chinese poetics became the focus of many Russian sinologists researching the ancient Chinese literary theories. Such as the female Sinologist of the Oriental Research Institute of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR, Kira Ivanovna Goregina (Кира Ивановна Гольгина, 1935~2009) illustrated the various genres of ancient Chinese "Wen" based on the definition of various kinds of articles in Liu Xie's *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in her book "Chinese aesthetic literary theory from 19th century to early 20th century"

⁴ V. M. Alexeyev, A Collection of Chinese Literary Works, Volume 1, p.68-69

⁵ V. M. Alexeyev, A Collection of Chinese Literary Works, Volume 1, p.63

⁶ V. M. Alexeyev, A Collection of Chinese Literary Works, Volume 1, p.87

⁷ V. M. Alexeyev, A Collection of Chinese Literary Works, Volume 1, p.130,141

⁸ Алексеев В.М.Китайская поэма о поэте :Стансы Сыкун Ту (837-908).Петроград,1916.с.28.

V. M. Alexeyev, Chinese Poem on poets: Sikong Tu's Poetry, Petrograd, 1916, p. 28.

⁹ V. M. Alexeyev, A collection of Chinese literary works, Volume 1, p.356, 360, 362

published in 1971. 2002 reply by the school of Oriental and African Studies Moscow State University teacher A. B. Zaharin's (Алексей Борисович Захарьин) vice doctoral thesis of cultural studies, taking *The Formation of Ancient Chinese "Wen" Scope*¹⁰ as subject, analyzed and discussed comprehensively on the concept of "Wen" from ancient to modern China. In addition, Alexeyev attributed Liu Xie's *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* to "field of artistic creation", thinking it is absolutely beautiful with the rhythm of narrative characteristics", "complete and prosodic structure", which all exist in both "paper" and "theory".¹¹ Study on the art of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, although there is none such kind of work on the aspect coming into being till now, will be the talking stock of interested scholars worldwide.

In 1950s, at the beginning of the establishment of PRC, Chinese literature research in Russia once climaxed due to the honeymoon relation of China and Russia, and *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* naturally under Russian Sinologists' attention. On 1959, academician of Academy of Sciences of the USSR, the famous Orientalist Nicola Josefowicz Conrad (Николай Иосифович Конрад, 1891~1970) wrote an article "A Brief Discussion on the History of Chinese Literature" for the book "Anthology of Chinese Literature: Ancient, Medieval and New Times" edited by P.M. Mamaev. In this article, broad prospects of "*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*" research are pointed out. He wrote: "in this treatise, extremely diverse and systematic style of views of art and literature is expressed, in terminology; the author studied the problem on the art literature ranging from creative psychology, aesthetic to philosophy."¹² Entries about Liu Xie and *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* are listed in large and medium-sized tool books such as *Encyclopedia of Concise and Literature, Bolshaya sovetskaya entsiklopediya* and *Chinese literature* published in 1960s in USSR.¹³

In 1970, Moscow State University published the textbook *Medieval Oriental Literature* edited by Professor and sinologist Lyubov Dmitriyevna Pozdeneva (Любовь Дмитриевна Позднеева, 1908~1974), which has 10 pages on the early Middle Ages China poetry theory, mainly introducing Liu Xie. This book is the earliest work on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, although the analysis and interpretation of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* may not be entirely accurate and profound, it has important influence on the spread on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in Soviet Russia due to its authority as a textbook of a national university.

It is necessary to interpose two major academic context faced by Russian *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research in mid twentieth century, namely "Taoist materialism" and "western literature typology parallel".

Since 1930s, the so-called "new Taoist" appeared in Soviet Union who tried to interpret Chinese Taoism as "progressive and revolutionary". Their reasoning logic is: Confucianism is the ideological weapon of

¹⁰ Захарьин А.Б. Формирование концепции «культура» (вэнь) в Древнем Китае. Дис. канд. культурологии. М., 2002. <http://cheloveknauka.com/formirovanie-kontseptsii-kultura-ven-v-drevnem-kitae>

A. B. Zaharin, *The Formation of the "Wen" (Culture) Category in Ancient China*, Candidate thesis on Culture, Moscow, 2002.

¹¹ V. M. Alexeyev, *A collection of Chinese literary works*, Volume 1, p.63, 87

¹² N. I. Conrad, *A Brief Discussion on the History of Chinese Literature*, *Anthology of Chinese Literature: Ancient, Medieval and New Times*, Chief Editor P. M. Mamaev, N. I. Conrad writes "editing specification" and "preface", volume 1. 1959 edition in Moscow, p. 25.

¹³ *DRAGON-CARVING AND THE LITERARY MIND*, *Encyclopedia of Concise Literature*, general editor A.A. Surkhof, *Encyclopedia of the Soviet Union*, Moscow, 1962-1978, volume 1, edition 1962, column 1078-1079.

B. F. Solokin, *Chinese Literature*, volume 3, 1966, column 552-553 (discussion on Liu Xie and his paper).

I. S. Leshevich, Liu Xie, ditto, volume 4, 1967, p. 477.

Chinese reactionary ruling class in the past dynasties, and in Chinese ideology, Taoism is opposed to Confucianism. Therefore, if Confucianism is counter revolutionary, Taoist is revolutionary. If counter revolutionary uses Confucianism revolutionary should be inclined to Taoism. *Brief History Course of Soviet Communist Party (Bolshevik)* was published in 1938, which was regarded as “a new height of dialectical materialism and the real peak of the thought of Marxism- Leninism philosophy” at that time. From then on, the viewpoint connecting between historical progress and materialism began to govern in various fields of social science research in the Soviet Union. A disciple of Alexeyev, Sinologist Apollon Aleksandrovich Petrov (Аполлон Александрович Петров , 1907~1949) published *the Introduction of Chinese Philosophy* in 1940, in which he proposed that materialism and dialectics exist in Taoism theory. ¹⁴ Later, the Soviet Union held a seminar which is organized by Andrey Aleksandrovich Zhdanov (Андрей Александрович Жданов , 1896~1948) who is member of the Political Bureau of the CPC Central Committee and in charge of ideological and political work in 1947. Zhdanov claimed that the history of philosophy is mainly the history of materialism. Idealism philosophy is only allowed to appear in the history of philosophy books as the object to be criticized by materialism.¹⁵ This further promotes the point of view that Taoist is a materialist and progressive becoming a major view in Russian Sinology research.

In the literary scholarship of Soviet Union in 1960s, there appeared an inclination interpreting the special mode of Chinese literature and culture by applying general rule and paradigm of western literary theory. Academician N. I. Conrad proposed the idea that typology parallelism exists between the eastern and western literature, including the Renaissance in his monograph *The West and the East* published in 1966. This view once influenced the study of Sinology and literature of the Soviet Union in 1960s to 1970s. Many research works are filled with western terms such as “folk poets”, “realism”, “Chinese Renaissance”, “Chinese enlightenment” and so on. A series of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research papers published by L. D. Pozdyneyeva in 1970s embodies the influence of the academic background.

In 1971, L. D. Pozdyneyeva published her paper *3-6 Century Chinese Poetic Works and Their Philosophical Basis* in the *Journal of Moscow State University*. In this article, she inherited B. M. Alexeyev’s thought that the propelling force of the development of Chinese literature is “Taoist imagination”. She proposed: “The basis of the views of Chinese medieval poetry art theorists is made up of Taoist philosophy, although Confucianism is mixed here or there.”¹⁶ Pozdyneyeva thought that the content and expression of ancient Chinese philosophy were formed at the same time. “Research form -- rhetoric method is very difficult to separate from the content -- the theoretical view of this or that school.” But “the principle of world view is

¹⁴ Петров А.А. Очерк философии Китая // Китай. История, экономика, культура, героическая борьба за национальную независимость. М.–Л., 1940. С. 251-252..

A. A. Petrov: An Introduction to Chinese Philosophy, China: History, Economy, Culture and Heroic Struggle for National Independence, Moscow – Leningrad, 1940, p. 251-252.

¹⁵ Дискуссия по книге Г.Ф. Александрова «История западноевропейской философии» 16-25 июля 1947 г. Стенографический отчёт // Вопр. философии. 1947. № 1. С.257.

G. F. Alexandrova, The Summary of Symposium of The History of Western Philosophy (Jul. 16th- 25th, 1947), Philosophical Questions of the Soviet Union, first phase of 1947: p. 257.

¹⁶ Позднеева Л. Д. Трактаты о китайской поэтике III-VI вв. и их философская основа // Вестник Московского университета. М., №2. С.45.

L. D. Posdneeva, Treatises of Chinese Poetics in 3-6 Centuries and their philosophical basis, Journal of Moscow State University, 1971, 2:45.

based on the rhetorical principles.”¹⁷ In this position, by tracing the source of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* discourse system, Pozydneyeva came to a conclusion: Although people never “doubt the Confucian attribute of Liu Xie’s text source of each chapter”, its “source or original version belongs to Taoism”.¹⁸

From the point of view of modern semantics, the meaning of a word is not constant. In addition, the theories of Confucianism and Taoism in China have the same side. At least, Taoist classic ZHOUYI is also a Confucian classic. The author once wrote a paper entitled *Philosophy of the Book of Changes and the construction of the theoretical system of Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*¹⁹, in which the problem that the thinking model and word system of *the Book of Changes* becomes the utterance arsenal of Liu Xie’s literary theory was discussed. It is inadequately persuasive to assert that the theoretical source Liu Xie’s theory belongs to Taoism only depending on the usage of the utterance in *the Book of Changes*. In connection with the above mentioned major view that Chinese Taoism is materialistic and the weapon of progressive force in the academic circle of Soviet Union for a long time, it is obvious that Pozydneyeva’s conclusion is influenced by this academic background.

The inclination of interpreting Chinese literature and culture by viewpoints of western literary theory which was popular in 1960s-1970s in Soviet Union, was also performed in Pozydneyeva’s study on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. Her papers *Comic and its Theoretical Understanding in China* and *Tragic and its First Attempt of Theoretical Understanding in China* were published in the symposium *The Theoretical Problems of the Study on Far East Literature* in Soviet Union, 1974 and 1977. In the two essays, the author used two important categories of western aesthetics, comedy and tragedy, to explore the understanding of the two categories by ancient Chinese, especially focusing on Liu Xie’s theoretical contributions to the two questions. She pointed out that Liu Xie said in the chapter of “Jesting Rhymes and Puzzles”: “Both cases involved making fun of the victims’ outward appearances as a means of venting inner grievances”, which is the same as the Greeks’ understanding that ridiculous is ugly. But in addition, it “can be understood that laughter may be effective of relaxing stimulus. She analyzed “in the past, comic rhymes and puzzles, helped to check crises and ease sufferings” in the end of the chapter of “Jesting Rhymes and Puzzles”, and pointed out, “‘Cleaning’ (Очищение) can be seen in the word ‘SHI’ (author note: Pozydneyeva translated into Снимать, which means extraction). The difference between it and Greek ‘catharsis’ (author note: Katharsis, Russian translation: Катарсис) is that it’s not connecting with the influence of tragedy but also comedy.”²⁰ Pozydneyeva concluded: “the determination of the releasing function of laughter is a natural instinct of human

¹⁷ Позднеева Л. Д. Ораторское искусство и философские школы // Литература древнего Востока. Учебник/ Под ред. Н.И. Конрада. Изд-во Московского университета, 1971. С.313,316.

L. D. Posdneeva, *The Art of Speech and Philosophical School, Far East Literature (text book)*(Moscow State University Press, 1971), p313,316.

¹⁸ L. D. Pozydneyeva, *Works of Chinese Poetics in 3-6 Century and Their Philosophical Foundation*, Journal of Moscow State University, Moscow, 1971, issue 2, p. 40-45

¹⁹ Originally published in *Gain New Knowledge by Reviewing Old – Festschrift for the 50th Anniversary of Literature College of Tianjin Normal University*, published by Nankai University Press in 2008. Later included in *Study on DRAGON-CARVING AND THE LITERARY MIND (8th Edition)* compiled by Chinese DRAGON-CARVING AND THE LITERARY MIND Society, published by Hebei University Press in 2009.

²⁰ Позднеева Л. Д. Комическое и его теоретическое осмысление в Китае // В кн. Теоретические проблемы изучения литератур Дальнего Востока .М.,1974, с.88.

L. D. Pozydneyeva, *Comic Nature and Its Theoretical Understanding in China, The Theoretical Problems of the Study on Far East Literature, Moscow, 1974, p. 88.*

beings, which constitutes Liu Xie's contribution to the concept of Chinese comedy."²¹ On the tragic problem, Pozydneyeva pointed out that Confucius's demand for tragic is "mournful but not distressing", and Liu Xie affirmed that the significance of lament works is the "can hurt in thousand years" in the summary of "AIDIAO" chapter. She said: "In this way, Liu Xie retorted Confucius... and restored the right of 'distressing'."²² According to the above, the view "world view is based on the principle of rhetoric principles" proposed by Pozydneyeva, it should be considered that certain discourse system is always associated with certain world view system. Therefore, strictly speaking, the meaning of thinking expressed in different ethnic languages cannot be translated by holographic. Russian Sinology dean Priest N. Y. Bichurin admitted frankly in his work *Chinese Philosophy*, "I rack my brains to illustrate concepts plain."²³ Thus we think that Pozydneyeva's simple comparison and association between Chinese and western terminology is really necessary for further analysis and discussion. However, in any case, her pioneering works in the Chinese and western comparative poetics should be fully affirmed.

The first paper studying *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* from the aesthetic perspective is *Discussion on the Problem of Liu Xie's Aesthetic Point of View*²⁴, published in Far East Problem Journal in 1978 by Vladimir Alexeyevich Krivzov²⁵ (Владимир Алексеевич Кривцов, 1921~1985), who was the deputy director of the Far East Institute of ASUSSR then. The author briefly introduced the background of the creation of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, Liu Xie's lifetime and the whole contents of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, while focusing on some key issues of Liu Xie's aesthetic point of view: the relationship between content and form, the concept of "Feng Gu"(风骨), the artistic beauty of literary works, theory of creation and law of literature development, the principle of criticism, and so on. The following two points are particularly worthy of the attention of Chinese scholars:

One is Liu Xie's discussion on the view of the relationship between literary content and form. Krivzov pointed out that on one hand, Liu Xie believed form is decided by the content of works, on the other, "he found that in the relationship with content, the form itself is not passive. It has its own inner strength and influences the content. This effectiveness is expressed by the concept of 'potential', and the thought of 'determining the potential according to genre' is proposed."²⁶ Krivzov commented, "Although (Liu Xie's) discussion on the

²¹ L. D. Pozydneyeva, *Comic Nature and Its Theoretical Understanding in China*, The Theoretical Problems of the Study on Far East Literature, Moscow, 1974, p. 88.

²² Позднеева Л. Д. Трагическое и первые попытки его теоретическое осмысление в Китае. // В кн. Теоретические проблемы изучения литератур Дальнего Востока. М., 1977, с. 79.

L. D. Pozydneyeva, *Tragedy and Its Initial Attempt in Chinese Theoretical Understanding*, The Theoretical Problems of the Study of the Far East Literature (1977), p. 79.

²³ Quoted from K. I. Grakina, V. F. Solokin, *Study on Chinese Literature in Russia*, Russian Academy of Sciences Oriental Literature Publishing Company, Moscow, 2004 edition, p. 4.

²⁴ LI Shaoyong and QI Tianju's excerption was published in *Trend of Literature Research*, Issue 24, 1980. LI Qingjia and WANG Yonghao's complete translation was published in *Study on Ancient Literature Theory*, Edition 11. The translation quoted here is translated by author from the original in *Journal of Far East Problem*.

²⁵ V. A. Krivzov, born in Moscow in 1921, graduated from Moscow Orient College in 1949. In 1958, he entered the Institute of Diplomacy of Ministry of Foreign Affairs of USSR. In 1963, he received his candidate degree in philosophy by paper *Aesthetic Thoughts in Ancient China (from Sixth Century B.C. to Second Century A.D.)*, and got a doctor's degree in 1970. From 1950 to 1968, he worked in the Soviet foreign ministry. He had been the Soviet ambassador to China from 1951 to 1955, and 1963 to 1966, the Soviet ambassador to Japan from 1958 to 1960. He served as the Soviet consul general to Shanghai from 1960 to 1962. From 1968, he became the deputy director of the Far East Institute of ASUSSR and the vice chairman of Soviet-Sino Friendship Association.

²⁶ Кривцов В.А. К вопросу об эстетических взглядах Лю Ся// Проблемы Дальнего Востока №1, 160.

V. A. Krivzov, *Discussion on Liu Xie's Aesthetic Point of View*, Far East Problem, Moscow, 1978, Issue 1, p. 160.

relationship between form and content is simple, his view on this perspective is profound and profitable”.²⁷

The other is that Liu Xie proposed the explanation of concept “Feng Gu”. “Feng Gu” is a controversial problem in the study on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. The traditional understanding classifies the “wind” and “bone” to the content or form of a work, such as “wind is the meaning, bone is the rhetoric”, or “wind is the emotion, bone the meaning” and so on. Krivzov considered, the two categories of “Feng” and “Gu” both contain the requirements for the content and form of the works, but each has a particular focus. He pointed out: “the concept of ‘Feng’ is associated with ‘Qi’, a very famous concept in Chinese philosophy and aesthetics.... ‘Feng’ is the embodiment of the moving ‘Qi’ in art”.²⁸ He said, “Liu Xie’s view is based on the the ebullience theory of creation.... But the emotional world and the rational world are inseparable, so the ‘FENG’ also contains the ideological direction of literary works.” Meanwhile, “the expression of thought and emotion is also helped by the language that changes according to the emotion expressed. Thus, the concept of language and its temperament are also included in ‘Feng’”.²⁹ For “Gu”, Krivzov considered, “The word ‘Gu’ means bone. For literary works, the ‘Gu’ is interpreted by Liu Xie as ‘force’, which is the enrichment of language and content in certain perspective according to a certain point of view.” He said, “‘Gu’ and ‘Feng’ are the same, which mean the content and its expressing tool – language, but not from the viewpoint of liveliness and flexibility, but from the power, accuracy and uniformity of expression.”³⁰ We believe that Krivzov’s interpretation is inspiring or even breakthrough for the long-lasting debate of “Feng Gu” in the study of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*.

In 1979, Igor Samoilovich Lisevich (Игорь Самойлович Лисевич, 1932~2000), researcher of Orientalism Institute of ASUSSR published his monograph *Chinese Literary Thoughts in Ancient and Medieval Times*. The purpose of this book is to introduce some unique conceptual category in Chinese ancient literary thoughts to Russian and western readers, but not to specialize in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. However there are more than 40 references of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in this book, covering the chapters of “Tracing the Origin to the Dao” (《原道》), “Interpreting Fu, or Rhyme- prose” (《论赋》), “Hymn and Eulogy” (《颂赞》), “Jesting Rhymes and Puzzles” (《谐隐》), “Shensi, or Imagination” (《神思》), “‘Wind’ and ‘Bone’” (《风骨》), “Continuity and Change” (《通变》), “Feeling and Art” (《情采》), “Comparison and Metaphor” (《比兴》), “Literature and the Times” (《时序》) and so on. Most of the quoted original texts are translated from the English version by the author, and some have also been consulted to Chinese scholars. Most of the translation is accurate, unobstructed and easy to understand by Russian readers, from which the author’s profound Sinology essentials can be seen.

Some of the quote of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* in I. S. Lisevich’s monograph takes the nature for study, reflecting the author’s understanding of the literary thoughts of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. A feature of Lisevich’s interpretation of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, is that he paid attention on correct the tendency of vulgar sociology and mechanical materialism existed in previous research on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, and made efforts on making a realistic explanation of Liu Xie’s literary thoughts. Such as the basic literary concept problems explained in Liu Xie’s “Tracing the Origin to the Dao” chapter, Lisevich especially emphasized the importance of the category of “Wen”(figure, characters),

²⁷ V. A. Krivzov, Discussion on Liu Xie’s Aesthetic Point of View, Far East Problem, Moscow, 1978, Issue 1, p. 160.

²⁸ V. A. Krivzov, Discussion on Liu Xie’s Aesthetic Point of View, Far East Problem, Moscow, 1978, Issue 1, p. 160.

²⁹ V. A. Krivzov, Discussion on Liu Xie’s Aesthetic Point of View, Far East Problem, Moscow, 1978, Issue 1, p. 160.

³⁰ V. A. Krivzov, Discussion on Liu Xie’s Aesthetic Point of View, Far East Problem, Moscow, 1978, Issue 1, p. 160.

pointing out the ontological root of Liu Xie's "Wen" and "literature", thus revealing the aesthetic foundation of Liu Xie's literary view. He wrote: "Liu Xie researched literature by considering it as the embodiment of a sort of 'literary concept', which was inherent by the world from original, and only emerged in the process of its 'self-awareness' during the gradual evolution of the universe later."³¹ After introducing Liu Xie's statement of "language originated in Tai Chi (太极), the Great Primal Beginning", Lisevich explained: "That is to say, the origin of the article lies beyond the edge of the real world, which is like the pupa of a beautiful butterfly in the future. According to Liu Xie's point of view, literary ideas have existed in their own cocoons – Tai Chi".³² Lisevich considered Liu Xie's "Tao" as the combination of Chinese traditional concept and the "law" concept of Buddhism. He pointed out: "Liu Xie started his career of creation in Buddhist temples, and died as a monk. It cannot be ruled out that in his consciousness, traditional Chinese 'Tao' is also combined with the 'law' concept of Buddhism."³³ He also objected to the fact that some Chinese theorists decided that Liu Xie was a materialist only based on some of his superficial remarks. He didn't think that pointing out the idealistic nature of Liu Xie's theory was to depreciate its historical value. He quoted Lenin's words: "intelligent idealism is closer to intelligent materialism than stupid materialism."³⁴

Lisevich published some creative and enlightening view for Chinese researchers on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* on Liu Xie's problems such as "Shensi, or Imagination" theory, "Feng Gu" theory and the view of the development of literature in his book.³⁵ In his monograph an important methodological principle of research on Chinese ancient literary theory was proposed, which is to "choose from those categories formed from many centuries and is suitable for China, and used by the authors of the documents being researched", rather than from the westernized categories filtered and translated by western literary theory. He said: "Because all the other attitudes mean that consciousness that we are accustomed to have been set up from start."³⁶ In order to ensure the accuracy of the concept category of ancient Chinese literary theory research, he even analyzed the original meaning from the "most ancient" primitive shape for "objects" belonging to "the most important", such as "Wen", "De" (德), "Feng", and so on. This principle is still used by young Russian scholars until today. Such as the doctoral dissertations of philology of Lidia Vladimirovna Stegenskaya (Лидия Владимировна Стеженская), *The Category of Liu Xie's Literary Thoughts*³⁷, inherited and learned from this method.

In 1960s, the Hungarian Sinologist F. Tokei (Tokei Ferenc, Chinese name DU Keyi, 1930-2000) published a book discussing Chinese literary genre theories in Middle Ages in Hungarian, in which a lot of materials in Liu Xie's *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* were cited. In 1971, Du Keyi published the English version of this book, subtitled "*Liu Xie's Poetic Genre Theory*"³⁸. The book published in English by

³¹ Лисевич И.С. Литературная мысль Китая на рубеже древности и средних веков. М.: Наука, 1979, с.18.

I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.18.

³² I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.19.

³³ I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.128.

³⁴ I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.128.

³⁵ LI Yijin, *DRAGON-CARVING AND THE LITERARY MIND* in Russia, Tianjin Normal University, Issue 2, 1994, p.64,66-69.

³⁶ I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.6.

³⁷ Стеженская Л.В. Категория литературной концепции ЛЮ Се. Москва, 2014. http://dibase.ru/article/23102014_178529_stezhenskaja

³⁸ Tokei F. *Genre theory in China in the 3rd-6th centuries (Liu Hsieh's theory of poetic genres)*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado. 1971.

Hungarian sinologist Tokei Ferenc in 1971 extremely inspired the fashion of studying ancient Chinese literary genre. Correspondingly, Kira Ivanovna Goligina, the Russian female sinologist of the Institute of Orientalism of the Soviet Academy of Sciences, published her treatise titled *Chinese Aesthetical Literary Theory at the Beginning of the 19-20 Century*³⁹ in 1971, too, in which all genres of ancient Chinese literary were elaborated based on the definitions categorized in the “*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*”. She had the opinion that the definition of literary always be defined genre, and literary theory not only such kind of theory, but also literary criticism.⁴⁰ However, K. I. Goligina encountered an unsolved conundrum that the unclear and illogical definitions on the Genre category came across in the “*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*” from time to time. And obvious contradiction came into formation: how was the very thorough and rigorous theoretical system set up based on the lax concept of genre?

Later, Chief researcher Boris Livovich Li Fuqing (Борис Львович Рифтин, 1932~2012) of the Russian Academy of Gorky World Literary Research Institute, published the paper titled *The Genre in Medieval Chinese Literature*⁴¹ in 1994. On the one hand, he did not deny the importance of studying the traditional Chinese literary genre theory, but on the other hand he pointed out that “with modern standards, it is difficult to understand Liu Xie's classification principle at last.”⁴² Li Fuqing successfully refer to traditional interpretation of Chinese scholars, guide people to pay attention to the “style” concept, which is often used by Liu Xie from the “book of history”, pointing out that “the ‘body’ of this term can be understood as very different concepts, the first style, there are some more general concepts.....”⁴³ It can even be used in broader categories, such as literary style, style, form and theme.

In the studies of Chinese ancient literary theory by I. S. Lisevich, K. I. Goligina et al in 1970s, the characteristics of the development of ancient literary theory of China was also discussed. I. S. Lisevich pointed out: “Chinese literary concept is not a separate set up, but have unlimited access to them even in all possible choices are general law system in line with the concept of the world.”⁴⁴ When he analyzed the development path of ancient Chinese literary terms, he saw “the limitations of the evolution of Chinese literary thought”. He pointed out: “we should not be ambivalent about the historicity of these terms and the historicity of Chinese literary thoughts as a whole.”⁴⁵ So he divided into “special function of cultural code marks makes all the cultural tradition without interruption (such as Dao and De - the author note)”, “they actually have great inertia

³⁹ K. I. Goligina, *Chinese aesthetical literary theory in the beginning of 19-20 Centuries*, Moscow, Science press, 1971 edition. K. I. Goligina, *WEN in Medieval literary theory – definition of aesthetical literary theory*, History and philology studies, volume 2, Moscow, 1972.

⁴⁰ K. I. Goligina, *Chinese aesthetical literary theory in the beginning of 19-20 Centuries*, Moscow, Science press, 1971 edition, p.3.

⁴¹ Translated by author, and published in *Sinology Study* volume 15. Beijing: Xueyuan Press Apr. 2013 edition, p.109-137. LI Fuqing's *Discussion on the Genre in Medieval Chinese Literature*, published on *The Eternal Memory: An Anthology of the International Symposium on LI Fuqing's Chinese Cultural Research* edited by FENG Jicai. Tianjin: Tianjin Social Science Institute Press, Aug. 2013, p. 163-176.

⁴² Рифтин Б.Л. Жанр в литературе китайского средневековья. // Историческая поэтика: Литературные эпохи и типы художественного сознания М.: Наследие, 1994. с.282.

B. L. Riftin, *The Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature, Historical Poetics. The literary age and the types of artistic perception*, Moscow, Heritage Press, 1994, p. 282.

⁴³ B. L. Riftin, *The Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature, Historical Poetics. The literary age and the types of artistic perception*, Moscow, Heritage Press, 1994, p. 267.

⁴⁴ B. L. Riftin, *The Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature, Historical Poetics. The literary age and the types of artistic perception*, Moscow, Heritage Press, 1994, p. 233.

⁴⁵ B. L. Riftin, *The Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature, Historical Poetics. The literary age and the types of artistic perception*, Moscow, Heritage Press, 1994, p. 233.

and the next level of concepts (such as the author notes, get variation)". At the same time, Lisevich also appealed not to oversimplify this variation, because they were brought in by foreign researchers. They were forced to find their "more or less suitable term"⁴⁶ when they analyzed the traditional concept of unification. Lisevich wrote, "For ancient and Medieval Chinese, Wen is always a literary living tree, which can produce new shoots, but cannot leave their roots." He said, "Chinese consciousness is to grasp its whole and put its meaning in gorgeous patterns. If his vision is merely resting on a flower, this flower is totally equivalent to a part of the tree." For it - Lisevich also pointed out that the China traditional literary theory "set", he wrote: "the old term meaning keeps alive, and new one is preconditioned on the old". Meanwhile, "limits exist in everything between which the transformation means spoliation to the non-existence foundation".⁴⁷ In other words, the meaning of the ancient Chinese literature term should be supplemented or replaced, which is not appropriate to the subject, but the term itself holds on some part of the original meaning. Every article of the stylistics in "*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*" embodies the traits.

K. I. Goligina called personal views of the Chinese ancient literary theorists "general opinion". She said: "Maybe because of this, in Chinese Medieval literary thoughts and aesthetics, we seldom find personal system that is consistent with the rules and of a single thinker's clear view, but often the system of schools and even broader philosophical factions."⁴⁸ Unlike I. S. Lisevich, she tends to emphasize the dynamic nature of the traditional Chinese philology. She saw its movement mainly in "the unique overcoming of the theme tradition which is established by a new interpretation of famous views. These views were first thought to be unshakable although they were believed to be incorrect by the old interpretation". Goligina believes that the new interpretation established "another kind of environment of logical relationships" around the views of the predecessors.⁴⁹ "Citation" or "allusion" is called "another way to inherit tradition". She pointed out that this method has been widely popularized in poetics papers, but they are "changing the formula by using a substitute from its superposition as an intermediary".⁵⁰ That is to say, the so-called personal opinions expounded by ancient Chinese literary theorists are actually the reprint of the opinions from the authoritative scholars in the past, mainly the ancient sages. Even some opinions have been outdated, or believed to be incorrect, people cannot easily overturn them, even to protect all sorts of bend over backwards or resurrect them through their own interpretation, and ultimately achieve the purpose of proving themselves in the name of the ancients. This situation that the authors note themselves by classics often appears in the quotation of ancient sages in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. It can be seen that Goligina's analysis conforms to the actual situation.

In the Soviet sinologists' general works introducing Chinese literature in 1970s-1980s, *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* has also been highly praised and fully affirmatively evaluated. For example, in the large reference books and text books such as *Soviet Encyclopedia, History of World Literature*, and so on,

⁴⁶ B. L. Riftin, *The Genre of Chinese Medieval Literature, Historical Poetics. The literary age and the types of artistic perception*, Moscow, Heritage Press, 1994, p. 235-236.

⁴⁷ I. S. Lisevich, *The Chinese Literary Thoughts at the Turn of the Ancient and Medieval Times*, Moscow, Science Press, 1979, p.236.

⁴⁸ K. I. Goligina, *Chinese aesthetical literary theory in the beginning of 19-20 Centuries*, Moscow, Science press, 1971 edition, p.4.

⁴⁹ K. I. Goligina, *Chinese aesthetical literary theory in the beginning of 19-20 Centuries*, Moscow, Science press, 1971 edition, p.4-5.

⁵⁰ K. I. Goligina, *Chinese aesthetical literary theory in the beginning of 19-20 Centuries*, Moscow, Science press, 1971 edition, p.5.

Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind is called “classic of Chinese literature”, “unquestionable authority”⁵¹ and “the peak of (literary) theory in middle ages”⁵². In addition to these general evaluations, these treatises also involve some specific problems of Liu Xie’s literary theory more or less. Such as it was pointed out in the paper *Literary Thoughts (Chinese literature in 3-8 Centuries)* by A. N. Gerlohovcev, I. S. Lisevich and B. L. Livovich in *History of World Literature*, Liu Xie’s works are the response to the creative form respect inherent in that era”.⁵³ In the entry “Liu Xie” of *Soviet Encyclopedia*, Lisevich believed that “in the unity of emotion and its linguistical expression, Liu Xie emphasized the first place of content above the form.”⁵⁴ All of the authors of above mentioned *History of World Literature* pointed out, “his book is all aimed at opposing empty writing decoration, and for ‘substantial’ literature.”⁵⁵ According to these researchers’ view, Liu Xie’s substance is understood as internal (emotional) and external (structural) content, and presented to his works as “spiritual fullness, structural neatness and language expression.”⁵⁶ They quoted Liu Xie’s words to prove his understanding of the importance of the author’s personality, which is, “the writer is suited to his own heart” (author’s note: “when mind is born, speech appears”)⁵⁷. The process of literary creation is set up in litterateurs’ “conveying the spirit and portraying the image with the change of things and phenomena (author’s note: portraying the things changing with objects)”.⁵⁸

Historian Rudolf Vsevolodovich Viatkin (Рудольф Всеволодович Вяткин, 1910~1995) has also written *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research papers in the Soviet era. He is candidate in history, and associated professor of Military Foreign Language College of the Soviet Union. He published his paper *Liu Xie’s Views on Historiography* in 1974, and translated the full text of *Historical Writings Chapter of Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* for this paper.⁵⁹

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union in 1991, the mainstream of the social ideology has greatly changed. As a frontier of literature and art, the literary theory first appeared obvious “road sign conversion”. The openness and diversification of the theory have prompted many innovative works in the study of Sinology. “*Tai Chi*”: *World Mode in Chinese Literature and Culture in 1-13 Century* published by K. I. Goligina in 1995 is the representative work of the academic trend.

The book “*TaiChi*”: *World Mode in Chinese Literature and Culture in 1-13 Century* studies the relationship between ancient Chinese mythology, poetry later novels and the religious rituals and astrology in ancient times with the view and methodology of mythological archetype. But in the third section “the concept of world reality and literary theory” of the third chapter of this book, *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* was deeply researched and discussed. Through the investigation on the prose in 3-6 Centuries, Goligina noticed

⁵¹ I. S. Lisevich, entry Liu Xie in *Soviet Encyclopedia*, Moscow, 1975 edition, volume 14, p. 56.

⁵² A. N. Gerlohovcev, I. S. Lisevich, B. L. Livovich et. al, *Literary Thoughts (Chinese Literature in 3-8 Centuries)*, *History of World Literature* edited by Golgi Institute of World Literature of ASUSSR, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984 edition, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵³ *History of World Literature*, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵⁴ I. S. Lisevich, entry Liu Xie of *Soviet Encyclopedia*, Moscow, 1975 edition, volume 14, p. 56.

⁵⁵ *History of World Literature*, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵⁶ *History of World Literature*, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵⁷ *History of World Literature*, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵⁸ *History of World Literature*, volume 9, Moscow, Science Press, 1984, volume 2, p. 106.

⁵⁹ Вяткин Р.В. Историографические взгляды Лю Се// История и культура Китая.(Сб. памяти акад. В.П. Васильева).М.,1974. С.217-235. Перевод главы 16 «Ши чжуань» (История и их толкования) на с.221-228.

R. V. Viatkin, *Liu Xie’s Views on Historiography*, *Chinese History and Culture (Vasiliyev’s festschrift)*, Moscow, 1974, p. 217-235. Translation of Chapter 16 *Historical Writings (history and its interpretation)*, p.221-228.

“some common points in knowledge of reality and art” in literary theory including *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, which is in ancient China, “the concept of ontology creates a consistent, universal system connecting everything in the world. The first coordination of this system is artistic and practical activities.” And “the work performing the all-inclusive of language art and cosmic connection is Liu Xie’s *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*”⁶⁰. In this book, she translated “Wen” into “combination of symbols”, thinking the title of “*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*” “can be translated literally into ‘the heart contained in the combination of symbols carving out the dragon’”. “Literary works are ‘dragons carved by the heart of words’.”⁶¹ She said: “There are two metaphorical combinations in the title of Liu Xie’s thesis: ‘Wenxin’(文心) – ‘heart in the combination of symbols’, which is the thought appearing to humans from the heaven”; while ‘Diaolong’(雕龙) – ‘carving dragons’ – are the realization of these thoughts in the article.”⁶² On Goligina’s interpretation of literary concepts of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* from Chinese ancient universal ontology, the author discussed in paper *Goligina’s Universal Ontological Interpretation of Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* (Russian Literature and Art, Beijing Normal University, 2003, Issue 4), the readers may refer to by themselves.

It is believed that through the interpretation of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, in the judgments Goligina reached on Chinese culture especially the on the Chinese cultural characteristics in 3-6 Centuries, there are at least two inspiring points. One is the discovery of the nature of transcendental symbolism of Chinese art because of the association between Chinese “WEN” and “Tao of the universe”. Another Russian contemporary female sinologist, researcher of St. Petersburg branch of the Oriental Institute of Russian Academy of Science, M. E. Kravzova (Марина Евгеньевна Кравцова, 1953~) discussed on it in her book *Ancient Chinese Poetry: An Attempt at the Analysis of Cultural Logic* as follows: “In European literature, every author makes a self-evaluation from its uniqueness. But the poems of Chinese writers are often identified as from the unique thoughts of the variation of the theme that has been fixed in the standard text.”⁶³ The interpretation of the two Russian female scholars is exactly the same. It reflects that the contemporary Russian sinology – literature researchers’ new thought of breaking the limitation of traditional philological interpretation, and connecting literature research to Chinese philosophy, historical culture and national psychology.

Second, Goligina’s analysis on the literary concept of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* helps us to understand how research on literary form factors became the hotspot of the literary theorists including Liu Xie and his predecessors and descendants, in the condition that metaphysics became the social mainstream trend of thoughts. Because all forms of “patterns” are related to “Tao”, and the embodiment of the universal principles,

⁶⁰ Голыгина К.И. Великий предел -Китайская модель мира в литературе и культуре(I - XIII вв.). Москва: Издательство фирма «Восточная литература» РАН, 1995.с.147.

K. I. Goligina, “TaiChi”: World Mode in Chinese Literature and Culture in 1-13 Century, Moscow, Oriental Literature Publishing Company of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1995, p. 147.

⁶¹ K. I. Goligina, “TaiChi”: World Mode in Chinese Literature and Culture in 1-13 Century, Moscow, Oriental Literature Publishing Company of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1995, p. 147.

⁶² K. I. Goligina, “TaiChi”: World Mode in Chinese Literature and Culture in 1-13 Century, Moscow, Oriental Literature Publishing Company of the Russian Academy of Sciences, 1995, p. 148.

⁶³ Кравцова М.Е. Поэзия Древнего Китая :Опыт культурологического анализа. СПб: Центр «Петербургское Востоковедение»,1994.с10

M. E. Kravzova, *Ancient Chinese Poetry: An Attempt at the Analysis of Cultural Logic*, St. Petersburg, Petersburg Orientalism Center, 1994, p. 10.

these “patterns” have their independent meanings and have the qualification to be discussed seriously. So *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* used so much length discussing the origin of various styles, and the phonology, antithesis, rhetoric, sentences and other form problems. In the past, from the social historical perspective of literature research, we always attributed the appearance of formalistic style of writing in the Southern Dynasties to the decadent and declining of the nobles and landlord class. From the perspective of the development of literature and language, it is considered a necessary stage for people to develop the recognition of the characteristics of literary language. Now, in addition to the perspective of philosophical ontology, we can say that there is one more reasonable explanation of this phenomenon.

After the dissolution of the Soviet Union, young generation sinologists such as Professor V. V. Maliavin (Владимир Вячеславович Малявин, 1950~) of College of Asia and Africa of Moscow State University and M. E. Kravzova who later transferred to be the professor of Philosophy Department of University of St. Petersburg are also the researchers still working on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research. Maliavin published a translation of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* with the title “Cultivation Vitality for Creation”⁶⁴ in *Anthology of Taoist Philosophy* in 1994 (author’s note: which is chapter of “Nourishing qi, or Vital Energy”). M. E. Kravzova composed “Liu Xie” and “*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*” entry for “Chinese Spirit and Culture” chapter of the third volume “Literature, Language and Characters” of the *Encyclopedia*, introducing the survey of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, Liu Xie’s lifetime and the basic situations of literature and literary theory in that time.

In recent years, another Russian scholar who has published speech in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research is Professor Vladimir Josephovich Braginski⁶⁵ (Владимир Иосифович Брагинский, 1945~) of college of Asia and Africa of University of London, who is an expert on Orientalism and ancient Malay literature. He published his monograph *The Type of Literature in the Middle Ages of the East*⁶⁶ in Moscow in 1991, in which there was translation of Origin of Tao Chapter of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* from English to Russian. Braginski referenced the translation of Chinese- American scholar SHI Youzhong (1902~2001)⁶⁷, and used the fragmented translation of the monographs of Chinese Literary Theory of another Chinese- American scholar Liu Ruoyu (1926~ 1986)⁶⁸ as supplement.⁶⁹ In 2004, the book was revised and

⁶⁴ Лю Се .Взращивание жизненной силы благодаря творчеству./ Пер. В.В. Малявина //Антология даосской философии /Сост. В.В. Малявин, Б.Б.Виноградский. М.,1994. С.390-392

Liu Xie, Cultivation Vitality for Creation (be suspected to be YANGQI chapter), translated by V. V. Maliavin, *Anthology of Taoist Philosophy*, edited by V. V. Maliavin, B. B. Vinogradov, Moscow 1994, p. 390-392.

⁶⁵ Vladimir Josephovich Braginski (1945~), Russian and British orientalist and philologist, one of the excellent experts on ancient Malay literature in world. Doctor of philology, professor of college of Asia and Africa of University of London.

⁶⁶ Брагинский В.И. Проблемы типология средневековых литератур Востока. М.,1991.

V. I. Braginski, *The Typology of Literature in the Middle Ages of the East*, Moscow, Editor room of Eastern Literature of Science Press.

⁶⁷ SHI Youzhong, from Fuzhou of Fujian. In 1926, he entered the Research Institute of Philosophy Department of Yanjing University in Beijing. In 1939, he got his ph. D. in University of South California in Los Angeles. He taught at various universities. From 1945, he had been professor of University of Washington in Seattle until his retirement in 1973. His English translation of *Wenxindiaolong* was published by Columbia University in 1959. In 1971, Chinese and English contrast edition of *Wenxindiaolong* was published by Zhong Hua Book Company in Taipei. In 1983, Chinese and English revision of *Wenxindiaolong* was published in the Chinese University of Hong Kong.

⁶⁸ Liu Ruoyu, originally from Beijing, a Chinese American literature researcher, specialized in Chinese literature and comparative poetics. In 1948, he graduated from Department of Western Languages of Beijing Fu Jen University. In 1952, he got his master’s degree in Bristol University in the UK. He has taught in many universities in the UK, US, and Hong Kong. In 1967, he became professor in Stanford University, and had been head of Department of Asian Linguistics from 1969 to 1975. He was professor of Chinese literature and comparative literature in 1977.

⁶⁹ *The Literary Mind and Carving of Dragons. A Study of Thought and Pattern in Chinese Literature*[by Liu Hsieh]/Trans .and annotated by Vineent Yu-chuns Shih,Hong Kong, 1983. Liu J.J.Chines Theories of Literature .Chicago;London,1975.

renamed *Comparative Study of Traditional Asian Literature: from Rethinking Tradition to Neo Traditionalism*, and published in English⁷⁰, from which the characteristics of *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research of Russian overseas scholars can be explored.

Braginski thought that Chinese medieval literature is a “regional literature with the commonality of Chinese- Far East Literature”. Its emergence is actually the result of providing self awareness for the “poetics” of Chinese literature.⁷¹ Braginski pointed out that Liu Xie’s *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* worked hard to act as a regional literary “standard” through a series of comparative studies. So his book “reached the evolution of literary theory only in general style.”⁷² In relation to the “general” and “body” summarized in the chapters of style in Liu Xie’s *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, which is trying to draw a macroscopic uniform standard for literature, we believe that Braginski’s statement is justified. Braginski also pointed out that Liu Xie’s WENXINDIAOONG studied Chinese medieval poetics, in which “most concepts of a complete set of Chinese poetics were aggregated.”⁷³ Another protruding characteristic of V. I. Braginski’s research on the category of literary theory in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*, is that he compared Liu Xie’s theoretical term with similar categories in Arabian and Indian poetics, so that his academic advantage as an orientalist on Malay language was exerted.

In twenty-first Century, we are pleased to see that *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research in Russia began to have young academic rookies to join, showing the situation just unfolding, and having qualified successors. Such as mentioned above, Lygia Vladimirovna Stegamskaya’s candidate dissertation *The Category of Liu Xie’s Literary Thoughts* in 2014. Besides introduction and conclusion, this paper is divided into 3 chapters. In the first chapter “*Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind: the age, author, text structure*”, there are three sections: the first section “Liu Xie and his time, problems in biographical research”; the second section “textual structure”; the third section “Liu Xie’s treatise and the Confucian classics at the end of the fifth Century”, in which three classics of the etiquette in the fifth Century and the *Shang Shu* at the end of the fifth Century were introduced. In the second chapter “literature in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* – core category of philosophical thoughts”, there are three sections: the first section “Analysis on book title and problem of artistic conception”, in which “Literary Mind” and “Dragon-Carving” is interpreted; the second section “general theories of ‘Wen’ in Chinese traditional thoughts in ancient and early middle ages and the category of traditional knowledge”, in which chapters of “Tracing the Origin to the Dao”(《原道》), “Venerating the Sages”(《征圣》), “Modeling on the Classics”(《宗经》), “A Proper Understanding of Apocrypha”(《正纬》) and “Evaluating Sao, or the Songs of the South”(《辨骚》) are interpreted as “hub theory” in *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*; The third section “Category of ‘Wen’ in the treatise: from philosophy to literary theory”, in which “‘Wen’ as a general philosophic category” and “literary categories ‘Wen’ and ‘Bi’” is discussed. In the third chapter “category of artistic methos”, divided into two sections, “antithesis” and “metaphor” is discussed. This new Russian book on *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research will be

⁷⁰ Braginskiy V.I. *The Comparative Study of Traditional Asian Literatures: From Reflective Traditionalism to Neo-Traditionalism*, L., N.Y., 2004.

⁷¹ Poetics, or the Writer’s Theory, is a branch of study of literature and art, which specializes in the author’s personality and his creative ideas.

⁷² V. I. Braginski, *The Typology of Literature in the Middle Ages of the East*, Moscow, Editor room of Eastern Literature of Science Press, 1991 p.54.

⁷³ V. I. Braginski, *The Typology of Literature in the Middle Ages of the East*, Moscow, Editor room of Eastern Literature of Science Press, 1991 p.54.

commented in other articles in the future. Chinese “Dragon Theory” researchers have reason to look forward with confidence, more fruitful results will be got in Russian *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind* research in new century, and new contribution will be made for the prosperity and development of “Dragon Theory” on a world- wide scale.

Translated by LI Meng (Master of Engineering, lecturer in Tianjin Chengjian University)

The 19th century is commonly classified as the "Golden Era" of Russian literature. During this period, many new forms of writing were introduced by poets and novelists. Romanticism was established, the modern Russian language was materialized, and some of the greatest novelists were introduced in Russia to the world. These writers are still considered some of the greatest writers and poets in world literature and include Alexander Pushkin, Nikolai Gogol, Anton Chekhov and Fyodor Dostoyevsky. At the start of the 19th century, Russia was an Imperial nation ruled by Tsar Alexander I. Russia was still using the idea of serfdom, which prevented them from making any significant economical progress during most of the 19th century.