

The Academic Value of “Chinese School” Ethical Literary Criticism

Lim Dae Geun

Abstract: This study examines the academic significance of ethical literary criticism. First of all, according to the premise that ethical literary criticism is a complex concept of three conceptual words, we will explore how “literature,” “ethic,” and “criticism” are articulated, and discuss what implications each case has. Furthermore, the meaning of “ethic,” which can be called the key conceptual word among these three, is verified through the etymology of Western and Eastern. Ethic operates in human society as a norm and principle, and ethics studies human behavior, various problems and standards. Ethics is the reason that people who live in groups and people who make up society should possess. Placed in the net of ethical standards, ethical environment, and ethical selection, human subjects always become a being in conflict with values that cannot be attained. The ethical situations openly emerge in times of social transformation. This is because the society in transformation is in a state of confusion and transition with dismantled old order and incomplete new order. Professor Nie Zhenzhao is a scholar who pioneered the discourse of ethical literary criticism in the Chinese school. Based on criticizing Western literary criticism, his discussion establishes claims on the moral and instructive functions of literature through ethical literary criticism, and applies them to practical criticism on world literature.

Key words: ethical literary criticism; literary criticism; ethics, ēthos; Chinese School; Nie Zhenzhao

Author: Lim Dae Geun is Professor at the Hankuk University of Foreign Studies, Manager of Foreign Literature Institute. His recent research is mainly focused on comparative literature and culture between Korea and China, cultural identity and storytelling. This work was supported by Hankuk University of Foreign Studies Research Fund (Email: rooot@hufs.ac.kr).

标题: “中国学派”文学伦理学批评的学术价值

内容摘要: 本文探讨文学伦理学批评的学术意义。首先, 本文把文学伦理学批评视作由“文学”、“伦理”和“学”三大概念构成的综合概念, 对这三个概念的链结 (articulation) 方式及其含义展开论述。其次, 本文从东西方词源

着手，对上述三大概念之核心——“伦理”概念进行诠释。伦理指的是人类社会的运作规范及原理，伦理学是一门研究人类行为和规范的学问。所谓伦理，指的是群体中的个体和社会中的个人所必备的品德。置身于由伦理标准、伦理环境及伦理选择所织成的伦理之网中，人类主体永远无法抵达伦理的彼岸，因此不可避免地成为矛盾的综合体。伦理问题在社会转型期显得尤为突出。这是因为在转型中的社会里，旧的秩序正在瓦解、新的秩序尚未建立，一切都处于混沌的过渡状态之中。聂珍钊教授是中国学派文学伦理学批评话语的创始者。他的理论建立在批判西方文学批评的基础上，通过文学伦理学批评提出了文学的道德建树及教诲意义的创见，并将其广泛应用于世界各国的文学批评实践之中。

关键词：文学伦理学批评；文学批评；伦理学；中国学派；聂珍钊

作者简介：林大根，韩国外国语大学教授、外国文学研究中心总务，主要从事韩中文学与文化比较、文化身份认同与叙事学。

1. Segmentation and Articulation in Ethical Literary Criticism

Ethical literary criticism is born by articulation of at least three conceptual words. In other words, it is a complex concept combined with the concepts of “literature,” “ethic” (or “ethics”) and “criticism.” I have said earlier that to describe contemporary issues and events, a complex concept should be employed rather than a single concept. It is due to the qualitative complexity of the world. It was referred to as “Concept is not lonely” (Lim Dae Geun 141-144). Once it is admitted that ethical literary criticism is a complex concept integrated with some single concepts—“literature,” “ethic” (or “ethics”) and “criticism”—, we can possibly interpret the combination in this following three cases.

Firstly, ethical literary criticism can be regarded as a method of criticism that combines “literature” with “ethics.” This method means a parallel join of two academic disciplines: literature and ethics. Then, it is required to explore the academic object and methodology pursued by each discipline, and to examine what kind of meaning the combination produces. The unity can be expressed as “Literature+Ethics” or “Studies on Literature+Studies on Ethics.” If criticism is added to the combination of literature and ethics as a combination of academic disciplines, it can be regarded as an expanded format of literature criticism and ethical criticism.

Secondly, “literary ethics,” the core concept of ethical literary criticism, can be regarded as a combination of “literary ethics” and “study.” This position represents the academic position on literary ethics. The subject of the study can be literary

ethics that encompasses ethics of writer, work and reader. However, it is necessary to reconsider the methodology. In other words, it is the outcome of a combination of research subjects and activities as “Studies on Literary Ethics.” Even if criticism is added here, we can confirm the pattern in which the subject and act of criticism are combined as well.

Thirdly, ethical literary criticism can be regarded as a combination of the three concepts of “literature,” “ethics,” and “study.” This method explains the implications each element has. This combination can be considered together adding to the concept of criticism. In other words, “studies” means “criticism,” “literature” refers to the original text as an object of study or criticism, and “ethics” refers to the standard of study or criticism. Therefore, this combination allows us to identify the object of study/criticism, the method of study/criticism, and the conduct of study/criticism as “Ethical Studies on Literature” or “Ethical Critiques on Literature.”

This idea was derived from the process of examining the academic and critical performance of Professor Nie Zhenzhao (聂珍钊), who is actively leading theoretical and practical criticism on ethical literary criticism. Professor Nie systematically discloses his ideas through an academic work entitled *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism* (文学伦理学批评导论 2014). This article looks forward to further related academic discussions by looking into the theoretic frame of ethical literary criticism presented in the book and strengthening its understanding.

Previously, we looked into the issue of approaching ethical literary criticism as a segmented concept. Professor Nie says that “literary ethics” and “ethics literary criticism” are closely related, but not completely consistent. Examining the two categories, it can be seen that literary ethics covers ethical literary criticism. Ethical literary criticism is the core of the discourse of literary ethics and plays a role in enriching it. Of course, there are also differences between the two. According to him, first of all, “Ethical literary criticism is a research method that studies problems related to writers and literature by reading, analyzing, and interpreting literary works from in terms of ethics” while “literary ethics, based on the theory and principles of ethics, writers, readers, and critics explore and solve the problem of values that distinguish between right/wrong or good/evil in the process of literary creation, reading, and criticism.” Second, “Ethical literary criticism values criticism and interpretation, whereas literary ethics focuses on establishing standards and evaluating good and evil.” Third, “ethical literary criticism focuses on criticizing and interpreting ethical issues depicted in literary works while literary ethics emphasizes a matter of moral value in which writers create works, readers read

literary works, and critics evaluate literary works. In other words, for example, more emphasis is placed on the moral training of writers and critics, professional morality, social responsibility and reader's position, feelings and the acceptance of lessons in reading" (Nie Zhenzhao 99).

In other words, literary ethics deals with literary fields such as creation, reading, criticism, literary education, and literary awards from an academic perspective, while, on the other hand, ethical literary criticism is mainly concerned with reading of literary field. Nevertheless, the values and functions pursued by literary ethics and ethical literary criticism are similar. "By displaying the value of literature itself, it satisfies the literary needs of readers and society so that readers can truly improve moral and cultural discipline through reading literature" (Nie Zhenzhao 99). We also see an explanation on ethical literary criticism. It "is a theory and methodology for reading, interpreting, understanding, analyzing and evaluating literature from an ethical standpoint. It argues that literature is a historically contingent presentation of ethics and morality and that reading literature helps human beings to reap moral enlightenment and thus make better ethical choices. The mission of ethical literary criticism is to uncover the ethical value of literature" (Charles Ross 8).

Whether it is literary ethics or ethical literary criticism, it should be argued through the interaction of literature and ethics. Therefore, inspecting the aspects of literature associated with it as well as the concept of ethics, we can get one step closer to the nature of ethical literary criticism.

2. Concept and Value of Ethics

Then, what is Ethics? Ethics researches from human behavior to various issues and norms. Ethics are norms and principles working in human society. The English word "ethic" originated in the Greek word "ēthos." In his book, *The Art of Rhetoric*, Aristotle says, "All human behavior must occur for one of the following seven causes: coincidence, nature, coercion, habit, calculation, anger, and desire" (Aristotle 88). The word translated as "habit" was "ēthos." Aristotle divides the aspects of human behavior into "intentional acts" or "unintentional acts" and among them, he pointed coincidence and inevitability as the cause of "unintentional acts." The causes of inevitability are coercion and nature. Habits and desires are the causes of "intentional acts." Desire is again distinguished into hope as the rational desire, and anger and craving as irrational desire.

For such a reason, "ēthos," the etymology of ethics, has been pointed out as one of the causes of human behavior. This is understood as a choice that requires a

decision as to whether or not a person will perform a specific action. “*Ēthos*” as a word related to human choice behavior means “moral character.” Today, “ethics,” originated in “*ēthos*” and later transformed into French archaic “*etique*” and Latin “*ēthicē*,” meaning “knowledge or study dealing with moral principles.” It wasn’t until the mid-17th century that this term began to be used in the sense of “moral principles of social or personal value” (OED 2020).

The “*ēthos*” went further from the meaning of habit to an element that Aristotle suggested as a requirement for persuasion. Aristotle presented three key factors of persuasion; Logos, Pathos, and *Ēthos*. Logos means logic, Pathos means emotion, and *Ēthos* means trust. Pathos refers to the feelings of the persuaded person, and *ēthos* refers to the trust of the persuader. This trust is formed through the persuader’s *ēthos* including the figure, dress, voice, gaze, and posture as a “habit.” Pathos and *ēthos* suggest that you scrutinize counterpart’s emotional state when trying to convince the other. Simultaneously, it also means that you should know whether the counterpart trust you to some extent. The interaction of the subject’s trust and the other’s emotions becomes a requirement for creating persuasion. However, the trust of the subject is not made by oneself, but is formed by the other. The other’s emotions must be observed by the subject.

Trust as *ēthos* cannot be built easily, but is constructed in context. The process of creating a state of trust also requires internal and external interactions. Emotions can be provisional, but they are also structured by the interaction of internal and external situations. Therefore, *ēthos* and pathos are inseparably related to each other. The concept of “ethics” derived from *ēthos* is no different. Ethics is the reason for the interaction between the subject and the other. The subject is recognized or rejected by the other through one’s own habits. The other decides recognition or rejection considering the various characteristics of the subject. Therefore, ethics becomes the standard and reason for the relationship created in the complex aspects of the subject and the other.

The English word “ethics” was translated into the Chinese character “倫理” by Japanese scholars during the enlightenment period and spread to Korea and China (Lee Hanseop 621). “倫” consists of “人” and “侖.” “侖” means “to think” describing a person (人) dwelling on thoughts while reading a book (冊). It became “倫” with a person (人) added. The ancient Chinese character dictionary *Shuo Wen Jie Zi* (說文解字) interprets “倫” as “group (輩).” Regarding this, Duan Yucai (段玉裁) of the Qing Dynasty said, “It is called “group” when the military sends out a hundred wagons. Likewise, the meaning is extended that a series of the same kind follows one after another. This is also called “group” (軍發

車百兩爲輩，引伸之同類之次曰輩)。” Therefore, “倫” is “a group of people.” In today’s term, it corresponds to “society.” The Chinese translation of “ethics” also means an order that must be observed in human relationships. In other words, ethics is the reason that people who live in groups and people who make up society should possess (Xu Shen, noted by Duan Yucai, 1992).

Ethics as a requirement given to social man always constitutes their implications in relationships. We can see the meaning of ethics at some different levels. First, it is ethics as a standard, that is, ethical standards. Ethical standards are justifiable and ideal goals that humans must keep in their lives. This is the consequence of human society in its long history. Second, it is ethics as an environment, that is, an ethical environment. An ethical environment is a situation and an environment driven when a subject cannot approach or cannot help betraying the ethical standards. The ethical environment surrounding an individual or group always creates specific ethical problems in situations where standards are not met. If the subject can fully reach the ethical standards, human society will become a paradise where everything is all good. However, the subject is always thrown into this ethical environment. Third, it is ethics as a choice, that is, ethical selection. Ethical selection refers to the fate of the subject who is thrown to make a selection from various choices presented by the ethical environment. The subject shows mental agony between the legitimate and ideal goal suggested by the ethical standards and the subject’s desire. In this way, ethics always deals with the conflict between the presented standard and the subject who cannot reach it.

Ethics involves in the issues of the rational and natural will of subject thrown into society. This framework of discourse is based on theoretical elements extracted from the Sphinx story. Professor Nie extracts the concepts of human factor and animal factor through the Sphinx story, and confirms that these factors are the keys to human ethical selection. Human factor and animal factor are the elements that make up the existence of Sphinx which is a combination of humans and animals. This reminds us that humans are a complex combination of nature and culture. This frame of discussion, which is mentioned by Sigmund Freud’s id, ego, and superego, or Lacan’s reinterpretation of the imaginary, symbolic, and real world, leads to important questions about human identity as ethical beings. Therefore, ethics issues are closely related to the study on human identity.

The subject is always placed in a social context. Ethical issues are more noticeable in an unstable society than in a stable one. The ethical situation stands out in times of social transformation. This is because the society in transformation is in a state of confusion and transition with dismantled old order and incomplete

new order. Thus, the ethical notion is in an uneasy process of transformation. In this uneasy process, the power relationship between the subject and the other is maximized. Ethical issues cannot be considered apart from power relations. For example, following Franz Fanon’s discussion, we come across the concept of “ethical recognition,” which means the respect for the difference between the subject and the other. The subject and the other acquire ethics through mutual recognition (Pramod K. Nayar, trans. by Ha Sangbok 228). A discussion on recognition can be found in Hegel’s words. In his arguments on self-consciousness, the master and the slave in a power relationship build a relationship through a struggle for recognition. However, the power relationship formed in this way is not fixed, but constantly changes through the negation of negation (Lee Spinks, trans. by Lim Seok-Jin 220-234). In this process of denial, change, and transformation, ethical issues push the subject into fundamental agony and anxiety while demanding constant decisions.

Ethics is different from the implications of law or justice, which are other values that make up society. According to Friedrich Nietzsche, “law and justice are interpretations of life created by the dominant force to limit the desire for revenge of the inferior and weak,” but “Morality is a unique invention developed by the weak and hostile to exert control over active and noble beings (Lee Spinks, trans. by Yoon Donggu 148). This argument shows that ethics is a discourse that should be discussed in the multi-layered power relationships. Therefore, such a sophisticated matter of ethics becomes a fundamental question for understanding and explaining human beings. It is impossible to discourse on humans, society, and culture regardless of ethics. Literature, the oldest historical product of human stories as a medium, remains the most essential art genre that makes a discourse process practically possible. In that sense, it can be said there is “the close affinity” between the ethics and literary criticism “as kindred disciplines” (Jovito V. Cariño 384).

3. Ethical literary Criticism by “Chinese School”

Literature is a true reflection of human life. The ethical standards, ethical environment, and ethical selections given to humans create countless ethical issues that we encounter in relationships. Literature has described this situation through the most plausible stories since ancient times.

Ethical literary criticism is an academic attempt to articulate literature and ethics. Professor Nie Zhenzhao insists on the meaning of “literary ethics” on the level of reflecting Western-centered literary criticism. This is a critical practice on orientalism in the field of literary criticism. Ever since modern times, Orientalism has been influential as a method of literary criticism. Professor Nie largely divides

literary criticism that has dominated Chinese literature circles since the reform and opening up into three areas; formalism criticism, cultural research criticism, and political and social criticism. He regards this limitation of criticism as a lack of an ethical stance. He said that “in literature studies such criticism has been studying the relationship between literature and politics, morality, gender, and ethnicity, and has claimed “moral evaluation” or criticism on modern social and culture, but in the end, they returned to their original positions in form, culture, gender, environment, etc. All of them revealed a lack of ethics that the overall characteristic of the basis of criticism (Nie Zhenzhao 3-4).

However, this stance does not mean a return to another Occidentalism. Rather, his position is closer to the side that in the new era, Western criticism and Eastern ethical literary criticism should create a new literary criticism on the basis of ethics while dialogue and encounter. In doing so, it is expected that ethical literary criticism will be able to secure an oriental identity among Western discourses, and will emit a new charm of literary criticism.

Professor Nie “initiated Ethical Literary Criticism in China in the year of 2004. Since then, the new critical paradigm has gained more and more attention in the global intellectual community” (Chen Lizhen 389). He makes his academic position secure by exploring the historical flow of ethical criticism centering on United States. His book, *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*, starts as follows “Since the 1960s, as the civil rights movement, anti-war movement, student movement, women’s liberation movement, counter-cultural movement, and environmental protection movement have been promoted, literary criticism theory has emerged that emphasizes the moral view of ethics. For example, feminism, neo-historicism, black literature, and cultural criticism have developed a great flow of ethical criticism” referring Wayne Clayton Booth as “an outstanding scholar representing Western ethical criticism” (Nie Zhenzhao 1). Based on Bachchin’s dialogue theory, he believes that his criticism started from the recognition that “the basic task of ethics criticism is to pay attention to the ideology inherent in the work and its impact on the readers.”

Nevertheless, Professor Nie sees through the limitations of Western ethical criticism, which has been carried around mainly in the United States. He said the following about the point where American ethical criticism is being criticized.

In the history of Western literature criticism, ethical criticism has always faced skepticism and opposition. One of the important reasons for this is that although ethical criticism has a long origin and can be traced back to ancient

Greece, it has not yet established a complete and systematic theoretical system, especially because it lacks its own clear methodology. Even a series of published ethics-related studies do not clearly establish whether ethical criticism is a study on the ethics of literature or a criticism method for studying literature. (Nie Zhenzhao 159).

Therefore, Professor Nie’s ethical literary criticism is an attempt to supplement the limitations of ethical criticism that Western literary critics missed. In order to supplement the criticisms presented above, Professor Nie’s ethics literary criticism establishes a systematic theoretical system and tries to establish a clear methodology. For this purpose, he stipulates that “literature ethical criticism is a criticism method that reads, analyzes, and interprets literature from an ethical perspective”, and suggests three literary roles that it should play as follows.

First, “using literary texts as the main subject of criticism, anatomize of each model of ethical selections placed in a specific historical environment in the complex ethical relations of different life phenomena described in the text from the perspective of ethics, namely, human and self, human and other, human and society, and human and nature.” Second, “by analyzing the motives and processes of ethical decisions, we reveal the moral inspiration that each choice conveys to us.” Third, through this, “providing experiences and lessons for the advancement of human civilization by presenting an effective moral example” (Nie Zhenzhao 5-6).

This effort shows in the pursuit of Chinese ethical literary criticism. The ethical literary criticism he proposed is setting his role as a kind of “Chinese school.” The following is a concrete quotation of what the ethical literary criticism aims as a “Chinese School.”

1. Chinese ethical literary criticism attempted to effectively solve specific literary issues by converting literary ethics to ethical literary criticism methodology.
2. Chinese ethical literary criticism regards the teaching functions of literature as the basic function of literature, and theoretically established its own position of ethical literary criticism.
3. Chinese ethical literary criticism replaced the concept of ethical criticism with the concept of ethical literary criticism, so that ethical literary criticism was changed from subjective moral criticism to objective criticism, thereby solving the problem of literary criticism and the breakoff of history.
4. As Chinese ethical literary criticism is establishing the its own

terminology such as ethical environment, ethical order, ethical confusion, ethical dilemma, ethical taboo, ethical selection, etc. and discourse system, ethical literary criticism could become a tool to easily control literary criticism. (Nie Zhenzhao 8-9).

The first was to set up a critique methodology of literary ethics to present solutions to specific literary issues. This means that while Western-centered literary ethics has been mainly developed at the level of theory and discourse, it is intended to use it as a useful tool for evaluating literary texts by presenting the methodology of literary ethics at the level of method. Regarding this, Professor Nie said, “From the beginning, the Chinese ethical literary criticism focused on exploring basic theories and constructing a methodology. In particular, the practice of ethical literary critics was regarded as meaningful” (Nie Zhenzhao 9). Many scholars agree that the value of Ethical literary criticism lies in the setting of methodology. For example, in an article on the problem of constructing the theory of Ethical Literary Criticism, Yang Gexin said, “The value lies not only in the theory or criticism itself, but in the methodological value of constructing the criticism theory” (Yang Gexin 3).

The second is related to the debate over the function of literature. Literature functions are generally classified as entertainment/instructive, aesthetic/ethical, personal/community functions. The Chinese ethical literary criticism supports the instructive, ethical, and community function whereas excludes the entertainment, aesthetic, and personal functions. Particularly, the instructive function is regarded as the proper function of literature. Professor Nie said, suggesting the discipline of literature, the goal and function of literature is a moral lesson, not an aesthetic against some perspectives such as “literature is aesthetic art,” “the essence of literature is aesthetics” and “the first function of literature is aesthetics.” Although, in the process of reading literature, readers enjoy the aesthetic function, it is merely a method and a process for literature to approach a lesson” (Nie Zhenzhao 9).

Third, ethical literary criticism is distinguished from moral criticism. While explaining the concept of ethics earlier, we linked it to “morality,” but strictly speaking, ethics and morality have different implications. Of course, it is clear that both are very contiguous concepts. While morality refers to some belief about right and wrong, ethics refers to the normative criterion of human conducts and decisions. Thus, morality includes various levels, from individual to community values, but ethics primarily concerns the value criterion of the social community. Therefore, moral and ethical rightness do not always coincide. Since morality can be a personal level, it can sometimes be against to ethical values. This is in line with the

position that affirms the community functions of literature and denies the individual functions. The argument to distinguish ethical literary criticism from moral criticism means that the evaluation of literature will not be reduced to individual values.

Fourth, the discourse is systematized through critical terms of literary ethics. Professor Nie’s work uses various terms related to ethical literary criticism. Terms are the starting point for describing specific objects and phenomena. By creating terms through new naming and conceptualizing them, objects and phenomena can proceed to a new stage of criticism. In particular, brain text, animal factor, sphinx factor, ethical predicament, ethical construction, ethical knots, ethical line, ethical selection, ethical paradox, ethical identity, ethical deconstruction, and ethical chaos are new terms actively used. Of course, some of these may not be the first cases created by Professor Nie, but nonetheless, his attempts to explain his theoretical system by enriching the discourse of ethical literary criticism conceptualizing these terms more elaborately were attributed to him.

Through this process, the “Chinese School” ethical literary criticism can play a different role from the existing literary criticism methodology. The ethical literary criticism of the “Chinese School” showed a clear position on issues such as the debate on the origin of literature, the literary language, and the literary aesthetics.

First, regarding the origin of literature, the labor theory of origin was denied and the ethical expression theory was raised. In other words, it adopted the position that literature was not originated from human labor, but from the desire to express ethics. On that basis, it is considered that the driving force for creating literature is based on “the desire for humanity to share moral experiences” Second, he adopted text theory while denying the existing theory that regards the artistic component of literature as language. It is argued that an opinion that literature is an art of language stems from the confusion between language and text, and that is why literature as text has been relatively disregarded. Therefore, since only texts composed of letters can become literature, it is regarded as “literature is the art of text.” Third, it also opposes the position that literature is viewed as an ideology or aesthetic ideology. Regarding this, literary materialism is advocated as “literature exists as a medium of text, that is, in the form of a concrete material text”, and “literature is essentially a material form, not an ideology” (Nie Zhenzhao 9).

In order to establish such an argument, Professor Nie conceptualizes it through the fundamental question of “what is literature” and organizes the debates surrounding literature while immersing in the work of comparing the concepts of literature and literary science. The ethical literary criticism established through this process is “not only explaining the characteristics of ethics and morality of literature

or the ethics issues of literary creation, but also from the perspective of ethics and morality studying various phenomena such as literary works, literature and society, literature and writers, and the relationship between literature and readers.” The “various phenomena” suggested by Professor Nie are as follows.

(1) The relationship between the artists and their work, the artist’s ethical morality, the characteristics and causes of such an idea, the background period, and the process of its formation (2) The influence of the artist’s ethical and moral view on the creation (3) The relationship between work and various moral phenomena in real world (4) The question of how literature reproduces the ethical and moral phenomena of reality in the fictional world (5) The moral tendency expressed by the work (6) The relationship between the author’s moral view and the moral tendency expressed by the work (7) Depiction of morality performed by the artist in one’s work (8) The author’s moral evaluation on characters in the work (9) Readers’ appreciation of the artist’s moral view and the moral tendency of the work (10) Readers’ valuation of artist’s moral view and moral tendencies of the work (11) The influence of the moral tendency of the work on readers and society (12) The question of how to evaluate the artist and the work from the perspective of ethics (13) The moral view of the artist and the relationship between morality tendency expressed in the work and tradition (14) The influence of the author’s moral view and the moral tendency expressed in the work on contemporary and future writers and literature (Nie Zhenzhao 9-10).

Through this process of argument, ethical literary criticism tries to draw a conclusion different from traditional criticism by analyzing the cases of literary texts from both east and west. Professor Nie’s text analysis extends from Greek mythology (Oedipus myth) and English literature (Thomas Hardy, Hemingway, Eugene O’Neill) to Chinese modern poem. These texts become a model that can show that the argument of ethical literary criticism can be applied to universal literary texts.

4. Conclusion

This article started with a discussion on how the concept of ethical literary criticism can be established, and examined the fundamental issues that “ethics” should deal with, and ethical literary criticism as a criticism method that articulates literature and ethics as its representational achievements. Especially, by examining the

implications and characteristics of ethical literary criticism led by Professor Nie Zhenzhao of China, the possibility of expanding this perspective was also covered. The discussion on ethical literary criticism gained widespread support from literary researchers both in and outside China. The “International Conference on Ethical Literary Criticism” started in 2005 and the “Interdisciplinary University (Graduate) Students” Forum for Ethical Literary Criticism” started in 2020 prove that ethical literary critiques are gaining considerable responses from both the academic and educational levels. We can see the achievements of the academic conferences on the subject of Ethical Literary Criticism in the interview to scholars from 8 countries by Chen Lizhen (Chen Lizhen 389-414). In particular, the efforts of scholars in China are confirmed by the publication of a series of recent research results. They have led the practice of ethical literary criticism on world literature through a series of books, such as *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism* (文学伦理学批评理论研究 Nie Zhenzhao & Wang Songlin, 2020), *Ethical Literary Criticism of English Literature* (英国文学伦理学批评 Xu Bin, 2020), *Ethical Literary Criticism of American Literature* (美国文学伦理学批评 Su Hui, 2020), *Ethical Literary Criticism of Japanese Literature* (日本国文学伦理学批评 Li Exian, 2020), *Ethical Literary Criticism of Chinese Literature* (中国文学伦理学批评 Huang Hui, 2020). The ethical standards that human subjects thrown into the context of society cannot overcome forever and the ethical environment surrounding them, and the problems of ethics selection will be expected to continue to lead more academically active discussions. Furthermore, I hope that the results of this practice can be better accumulated in the criticism of Korean literature.

Work Cited

- Aristotele. *Rhetoric and Poetics*. Trans. Cheon Byunghee. Seoul: Soop, 2017.
- Ross Charles. “A Conceptual Map of Ethical Literary Criticism: An Interview with Nie Zhenzhao.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 7.1 (2015): 7-14.
- Chen Lizhen. “Rejuvenation and Innovation: The Past, Present and Future of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 3.3 (2019): 389-414.
- Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel. *Philosophy of Mind*. Trans. Lim Seok-Jin. Seoul: Hangilsa, 2005.
- 黄晖: 《中国文学的伦理学批评》。北京: 北京大学出版社, 2020 年。
- [Huang, Hui. *Ethical Literary Criticism of Chinese Literature*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]
- Jovito V. Cariño, “Literary Criticism as a Philosophic Praxis.” *Forum for World Literature Studies* 11.3 (2019): 375-389.
- Lee, Hanseop. *Dictionary of Korean Words from Japan*. Seoul: Korea University, 2014.
- Lee Spinks. *Friedrich Nietzsche*. Trans. Yoon Donggu. Seoul: LP, 2009.

李俄宪：《日本文学的伦理学批评》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年。

[Li, Exian. *Ethical Literary Criticism of Japanese Literature*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

Lim, Dae Geun. *Cultural Contents Studies*. Seoul: Haneum, 2021.

聂珍钊：《文学伦理学批评导论》。北京：北京大学出版社，2014 年。

Nie, Zhenzhao. *Introduction to Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2014.

聂珍钊、王松林：《文学伦理学批评理论研究》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年。

[Nie, Zhenzhao & Wang, Songlin. *A Study on the Theory of Ethical Literary Criticism*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

OED. *Oxford English Dictionary*. London: Oxford University, 2020. (online)

Pramod K. Nayar. *Franz Fanon*. trans. Ha Sangbok. Seoul: LP, 2013.

苏晖：《美国文学的伦理学批评》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年。

[Su, Hui. *Ethical Literary Criticism of American Literature*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

徐彬：《英国文学的伦理学批评》。北京：北京大学出版社，2020 年。

[Xu, Bin. *Ethical Literary Criticism of English Literature*. Beijing: Peking UP, 2020.]

许慎、段玉裁注：《说文解字注》。台北：天工书局，1992 年。（影印本）

[Xu, Shen. *Note of Shuo Wen Jie Zi*. note. Duan Yucai. Taipei: Tiangong Shuju, 1992. (facsimile edition)]

杨革新：“从文学思潮到文学批评理论：文学伦理学批评的理论构建”，《文学跨学科研究》5.1（2021）：1-6.

[Yang Gexin, “From Literary Trends to the Theory of Literary Criticism: The Theoretical Construction of Ethical Literary Criticism.” *Interdisciplinary Studies of Literature* 5.1 (2021): 1-6.]