



文苑

WEN YUAN

**Studies in
Language
Literature
and
Culture**



* 文 苑 *
* Wen Yuan *

Studies in Language, Literature and Culture

EDITED BY

Wang Zuoliang (王佐良)

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

Lin Xuehong (林学洪)

Hu Wenzhong (胡文仲)

Hu Zushu (胡祖庶)

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT

Qian Zhaoming (钱兆明)

Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press
Beijing, China

Wen Yuan: Studies in Language, Literature and Culture is published annually by Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press, Beijing Foreign Studies University, Beijing, China.

First published 1987

Printed in the People's Republic of China

文 苑
WEN YUAN

1

王佐良 主编

外语教学与研究出版社出版

(北京西三环北路19号)

外文印刷厂排版

北京怀柔县燕东印刷厂印刷

新华书店北京发行所发行

开本787×1092 1/16 9.75印张 203千字

1987年10月第1版 1987年10月北京第1次印刷

印数1-1,700册

ISBN7-5600-0152-1/H.28

书号: 9215·251 定价: 12.00元

Foreword

Most of the essays and studies in this collection are contributed by faculty members of Beijing Foreign Studies University. They are the fruits of some of the researches undertaken in the university in the last few years. However, in neither the subjects chosen nor the languages covered are they comprehensive: of the 29 languages (Asian, African and European) taught here, they treat only of a few — English, Russian, French, German, Spanish, Portuguese and, of course, Chinese and they deal mostly with literary subjects, though the university has also carried on extensive researches in linguistics and social studies. It is hoped that in future collections of the series some of the omissions will be made good, while other outlets will be found for studies in Asian and African languages.

Partial products that they are, these essays yet reveal some of the current concerns of the faculty: linguistics, intellectual history, comparative literature, critical surveys of a field of learning such as *Honglounmeng* studies, explorations into some aspects of a foreign literature hitherto only dimly known in China, such as the *Kahlschlag* works of West Germany, etc. It will be noted that the essays are all written by their Chinese authors in a European language, mostly English, for the sake of promoting scholarly exchange between China and the outside world. Thus they are, in more senses than one, all cross-cultural studies.

Several essays are from the hands of foreign scholars and writers who either lectured at the university or were met by some of our faculty members on their tours abroad. They include the article on "Individualism in the American Novel: from Melville to Hemingway" by Professor Annette T. Rubinstein, whose book *The Great Tradition in English Literature: from Shakespeare to Shaw* has many admirers in this country, and the study of English syntax, "It's a Fixed Order Language Is English," by Professor M.A.K. Halliday, who has opened so many new windows for British and indeed world linguistics. Two European writers also make their presence here. M. Emmanuel Roblès writes about André Malraux, each with his Chinese memories. Finally, the article on twentieth-century Scottish poetry was proposed by myself when I met its author, Iain Crichton Smith, himself a poet, on my trip to that lovely port, Oban, in western Scotland, in July 1982. I feel happy that the encounter has resulted in such a wide-ranging review, written from an insider's intimate knowledge, of a subject that is only now receiving some attention in this part of the world.

The Chinese title of the series, *Wen Yuan*, means a scholars' hunting ground. Like scholars in other countries, we do our share of hunting, for the old and enduring as well as for the new and significant. But it is also, in the light of the nature and function of this particular university, a meeting ground of languages, literatures, and cultures. What new prospects will unfold as one's linguistic and cultural horizons further expand! I am glad that with the publication of the first number of the series, a small beginning is made towards providing a foothold where one can look out on that larger world.

Wang Zuoliang

Professor of English and Vice-President,
Beijing Foreign Studies University

Contents

Foreword	Wang Zuoliang	(v)
Lu Xun's Lehrjahre in Japan and His Philosophical Quest	Xu Guozhang	(1)
On and Around the Dream — A Survey of Recent Scholarship on <i>Hongloumeng</i>	Zhou Jueliang	(7)
The Globe and the Pear Garden — Some Parallels in Stagecraft Between Shakespeare and Beijing Opera	Wu Qianzhi	(20)
China's New Interest in Foreign Literature — A Survey of Translation Periodicals	Qian Zhaoming	(29)
Malraux et la révolution chinoise	Emmanuel Roblès	(36)
Emmanuel Roblès en Chine	Shen Dali	(44)
On the Causes of the Fall of Men in <i>Paradise Lost</i>	Jin Fashen	(47)
Individualism in the American Novel: from Melville to Hemingway	Annette T. Rubinstein	(55)
Scottish Twentieth-Century Poetry	Iain Crichton Smith	(65)
Die Reduktionsästhetik des Kahlschlags — Wolfdietrich Schnurre als Repräsentant einer literarischen Strömung im Nach- kriegsdeutschland	Xue Siliang	(86)
It's a Fixed Word Order Language Is English	M.A.K. Halliday	(102)
Достижения и проблемы стилистики текста русского языка	Сяо Минь	(115)
Impresiones sobre la pronunciación, la entonación y el habla madrileñas	Cen Chulan	(124)
Algumas análises sintáctico-semânticas sobre os verbos estativos em português	Wang Zengyang	(129)

Lu Xun's Lehrjahre in Japan and His Philosophical Quest

Xu Guozhang (许国璋)

鲁迅青年时期在日本留学七年(1902-1909), 写出若干篇论述中西文化的文章, 其中以收在1926年鲁迅手编的《坟》这一散文集里的四篇尤为富于哲学探索的精神。本文着重讨论这四篇文章。

《人之历史》是一篇科学史论文, 它追溯进化论的起源, 介绍“生物进化说”和“上帝创世说”的冲突, 这种冲突也即是科学和教会之间的冲突。学习科学是重要的, 但学习科学史更是重要的, 因为科学史告诉人们, “科学盛大, 决不缘于一朝”, 科学家是经过对神道和愚妄的斗争而为真理赢得承认的。

《科学史教篇》旨在指出西方科学史上的教训。当时中国向西方寻求救国之道, 往往“眩至显之实利, 慕至肤之方术”, 看不到基础科学是根本, 技术是枝叶。舍根本而就枝叶, 不可能创立科学大业。

《摩罗诗力说》是一篇文学论文, 鲁迅用印度教义中的摩罗神(Mara)代表“争天拒俗”的大勇精神, 他认为那时的中国(1907)需要具有这种勇气的“精神界战士”。

“摩罗”相当于基督教义里的撒但, 一直被认为魔鬼, 在鲁迅看来是敢于向传统挑战的斗士。鲁迅在文章里着重分析了《旧约·创世记》和英国叛逆诗人拜伦的一个诗剧《该隐》。他为《创世记》的撒但做了翻案文章, 申述了他的反抗精神; 对于敢于揭露“上帝不仁”的该隐表示同情。青年鲁迅对于西方文化的态度是“首在审己, 亦必知人, 比较既周, 爱生自觉。”

在《文化偏至论》里鲁迅多处提到尼采的“超人”哲学。但是, 尼采是冷言讽世的山中隐士, 鲁迅则是“以至诚之声, 致吾人于善美刚健”的精神界战士。

读鲁迅青年时期的文章, 可以看出鲁迅战斗精神的源始。

In 1906, in his fourth year in Japan, Lu Xun decided on a drastic change in his study plan: he abandoned medicine for the study of literature. This move led to the writing of a number of critical essays which taken as a whole form one culture's perception of another — and of itself. The four essays¹ that are selected for this study divide quite naturally into two kinds: (1) Three essays on science and one on culture: *Man in Retrospect*, *Lessons from the History of Science*, and *Extremist Trends in [Western] Culture*. These look at, respectively, the theory of evolution and how it was arrived at; the question which should be given first priority in China's attempt to learn from the West: the pure sciences or the applied sciences?; and the things which in Lu Xun's view China should not learn from the West: extreme materialism and ultra-democracy. (2) *The Mara Spirit in Poetry*, a full-length literary essay in which Lu Xun, using a Hindu deity for Byron's Satan, discusses eight European poets who “fought God and conventionality.” Byron's Satanic hero, Cain, was singled out for a sustained analysis which reveals the young Lu Xun as a disbeliever and deconstructionist.

2

1. These four essays 《人之历史》, 《科学史教篇》, 《文化偏至论》, 《摩罗诗力说》 first published in *Henan* (《河南》), a monthly magazine printed by Henan students in Tokyo, December 1907 — August 1908. Collected into a one-volume edition of essays, 1922, titled *Fen* (《坟》). Now in Volume 1 of the *Complete Works of Lu Xun*. 《鲁迅全集》人民文学出版社, 1958.

I would think a review of these four essays should be relevant to a comparatist forum² since Lu Xun himself took it to be his duty to reach for a "state of perceptiveness by comparing his own culture with that of foreign lands."

Nor need we doubt that Lu Xun was well equipped for the task he set for himself. When a child he had had a thorough grounding in China's classical lore and in his boyhood was an avid reader of Yan Fu's celebrated translation³ of Thomas Henry Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*, a work which shocked China's intellectuals who had enjoyed millennia of cultural peace into the dire necessity of survival. During his four years in Japan he had undergone training in science and languages and had cultivated a love for Western philosophy and aesthetics. Some of his student friends in Tokyo, intellectually equally alert, had started a magazine to which Lu Xun was asked to contribute. Lu Xun, however, had little taste for occasional journalism; he chose to discuss the fundamentals: the conflict between science and orthodoxy in Western history, the question of educational priorities in the light of Western experience, and the question of authority versus freedom. Naturally the essays were the work of apprenticeship, but it was the apprenticeship of an intellect fully alive to new ideas and forms from the Western tradition, but particularly to the spirit of disinterested learning in science and to independence of mind as a philosophic creed, and both were to find voice in the uncompromisingly critical Lu Xun that blossomed forth a decade later.

Lu Xun was critical of the way China reacted to Darwinism. Made known to China by Yan Fu in the idiom of classical Chinese, the message of struggle and survival went home to many Chinese intellectuals of the day, who read in it the grim choice between adaptation to new values and conservatism followed by extinction. Darwinism became popular almost overnight — but in modish phrases only. It had a strong appeal because it was taken in the spirit of an alarm call. There was however a different reaction, of which Yan Fu himself was an eminent example. Yan Fu had a way of identifying a Western concept with some statement in the Confucianist canon, finding for instance induction and deduction already enunciated in the *Book of Change*. This could very well be true but, Lu Xun argued, "if everything said by our ancient sages were so good, why should we bother about change and reform, since we would do well enough by abiding by their ancient wisdom?"⁴ Lu Xun looked at the problem from a different dimension. He examined the path the theory of evolution had traversed, and it was shown to be a tortuous one. After all, the battle between evolutionism and creationism and later between evolutionism and catastrophism⁵ was one that lasted through centuries. "Science did not become great in one day,"⁶ he said. Lu Xun's originality lies not in introducing the idea of evolutionism to China — the credit must belong to Yan Fu alone — but in presenting the emergence of the theory against the proscription of orthodoxy and bigotry. He saw that perhaps China had more to learn from the history of Western science than from science itself, and that was something rare among his contemporaries.

The same emphasis is found in the next essay, *Lessons from the History of [Western] Science*, in the writing of which Lu Xun had clearly T. H. Huxley's *Progress of Science* before him. Huxley, surveying the progress of science from Bacon onwards, had spoken of

2. The Sino-American Symposium on Comparative Literature, held in Beijing, August 29-31, 1983.

3. Yan Fu's translation titled *Tian Yan Lun* 《天演论》 appeared in 1898.

4. "古人所说的事，没一件不好，遵行还怕不及，怎敢说到改革?" *Complete Works*, 1959, Vol. 1, p. 388.

5. Catastrophism, advanced by Georges Cuvier, whom Lu Xun discusses in some detail. *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 158-161.

6. "科学盛大，决不缘于一朝。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 167.

Bacon's pleadings for science as a means of winning material advantages by the investigation of Nature. However, sixty years after Bacon's death, the practical results were by no means apparent. "Descartes, Newton, and Leibnitz had opened up new worlds to the mathematician, but the acquisitions of their genius enriched only man's ideal estate," and helped no man to either wealth or comfort. Lu Xun wrote: "What the world gained was wealth of the mind, but little in the improvement of livelihood."⁸ A true scientist, in his view, should be dedicated to the search for truth and to that only, and practical advantages need not be his primary concern. Chinese students in Japan studying practical subjects were, in Lu Xun's words, "lured by the most immediate gains, and the most superficial of technologies".⁹ He advised the study of fundamentals instead of peripherals, taking the pursuit of knowledge to be a good in itself.

In evaluating evolutionism as in the ordering of educational priorities Lu Xun displayed a philosophical insight which was to give verve and piquancy to his maturer essays.

The amount of reading that must have gone into the writing of *The Mara Spirit in Poetry* is considerable, though it is fair to admit that most of it is secondary. For the chapters on the Polish and Russian poets, the main source was two books by George Brandes, the Dane whose many volumes already existed in English translation, of which Lu Xun apparently looked at *Poland: A Study of the Land, People and Literature* (for Mickiewicz, Slowacki, and Kransinski) and *Impressions of Russia* (for Pushkin and Lermontov). I found no evidence of Lu Xun using anything of Brandes' *Naturalism in England* (Vol. IV of the *Main Currents in Nineteenth Century Literature*) when writing on Byron and Shelley, though there was no reason why he should not have access to that work. There were in addition Japanese works¹⁰ on Byron, Shelley and Pushkin which Lu Xun scholars in Japan have identified as sources. Petofi was a different case. Lu Xun had found a copy of his poems, a German translation, in a Tokyo bookshop and had read it in great excitement; for biography he used F. Riedl's *History of Hungarian Literature*.

Yet what might appear as desultory reading was in fact a systematic search for poets of the Byronic school and although there was not much to show for a firsthand knowledge of workmanship or achievement, probably that had not been young Lu Xun's intention to start with. The point was to show each poet's rebellion against authority and convention and a critical biographical account could serve that purpose well enough.

Lu Xun's study of Byron, or rather of his *Cain*, was, however, entirely original. The choice of *Cain* must have been deliberate, for a Chinese choice of a Byron poem in Lu Xun's day could have been either a love poem or a patriotic poem and *Cain* was neither. It was a poem of reasoned argument between *Cain* the rebel and his god-fearing father, Adam; and one had to read the Book of Genesis in an entirely unorthodox spirit to see the critical message. Lu Xun did exactly that. This is what he said of Satan:

How did Satan come into being? Christian teaching has it that he was once a master of spirits. Spurred by ambition he rose against God, was defeated and thrown into Hell and frequently earned the name devil. In view of this, was not the devil God's own creation? Yet when Satan stole into Paradise, one word from him and it threw into chaos the

7. *Collected Essays of Thomas Henry Huxley*, Vol. 1 *Progress of Science*, 1894, p. 49.

8. "世人所得，仅脑海之富而止，国之安舒，生之乐易，未能获也。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 174-175.

9. "眩至显之实利，慕至肤之方术"。 *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 171.

10. Among others, Yasugi Sadanori 八杉貞利, *Shishu Pushikin* (詩宗プーシキン) (*Pushkin the great poet*), 1906; Nobori Shomu 昇曙夢, *Rokoku Shijin To Sono Shi* (露国詩人と其詩) (*Russian Poets and Their Poetry*), 1907; Sueda Minoru 米田実, *Bairon* (バイロン) (*Byron*), 1906, Hamada Yoshisumi 濱田佳澄, *Sheri* (雪莱) (*Shelley*), 1900.

Garden of Eden where once beauty and virtue and peace reigned undisturbed. Could he have done so if he had not been a powerful being? On the other hand, a garden under God's care was ruined by Satan: Where was God's omnipotence? Further, having created an evil being, God went on to punish it, and the punishment was extended to man. Where then was God's mercy?¹¹

Now this is a complete reversal of the Christian doctrine, and though it would be pointless to say that Lu Xun was the first to have said this, there is no mistaking a critical intelligence from an alien culture making its own judgment of Western accepted values.

Next, Lu Xun discusses the question: Is God happy? Partly interpreting and partly quoting *Cain*, he wrote: "God, being the cause of unhappiness, cannot himself be happy. What happiness can there be for one who creates destruction?"¹²

A related question is asked of Adam by *Cain*: If God is good, why should there be evil at all? Adam's answer is, evil is the path to good. On this Lu Xun comments: "So this is the way God creates good. He will first leave you in cold and hunger, then give clothing and food; first in pestilence, then give succour; first in sin, then dispense forgiveness."¹³

Where Byron simply says, "Strange good, that must arise from out/Its deadly opposite!"¹⁴ Lu Xun expands doubt into satire, and presents three specific performatives in place of one general constative. With what will surely appear as unChristian relentlessness Lu Xun examined a Canonical myth of the West and weighed its worth.

His evaluation of the myths of the Forbidden fruit and the Flood is equally striking, decomposing each by a superb metaphor. He calls the pre-Temptation Adam and Eve "caged beasts" who "aware of nothing and knowing nothing, are simply there for the pleasure of God." And he adds: "But for Satan's temptation, there would have been no offspring of man."¹⁵ In other words, the temptation is not just one for knowledge, but for sex. The knowledge-deprived are necessarily sex-deprived.

Of Noah before and after the Flood the analysis is more sustained and goes deeper: "Forty days and nights of rain flooded the earth and killed all living things but left Noah and his family unhurt. The flood receded and children were born to Noah's family and the line of descent continues to this day."¹⁶ "It is no wonder," says Lu Xun, "that being descendants of Noah, men should think ill of Satan the rebel. Tremblingly and fearfully they worshiped God, taking their progenitor Noah as model and living by precept and tradition, in the hope that if another flood should visit the earth, they too would receive a *secret word* from God and seek safety in an ark."¹⁷

The passage clearly aims to answer two questions: Why is Satan hated? And why is

11. "夫撒但何由昉乎? 以彼教言, 则亦天使之大者, 徒以陡起大望, 生背神心, 败而堕狱, 是云魔鬼。由是言之, 则魔亦神所手创者矣。已而潜入乐园, 至美善安乐之伊甸, 以一言而立毁, 非具大能力, 曷克至是? 伊甸, 神所保也。而魔毁之, 神安得云全能? 况自创恶物, 又从而惩之, 且更瓜蔓以惩人, 其慈又安在?" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 209-210.

12. "神为不幸之因。神亦自不幸, 手造破灭之不幸者, 何幸福之可言?" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 210.

13. "神之为善, 诚如其言: 先以冻饿, 乃与之衣食; 先以疫, 乃施之救援; 手造罪人, 而曰吾赦汝矣。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 210.

14. *Cain, A Mystery*, Act II, Sc. ii, *Poetical Works of Lord Byron*, Oxford, pp. 525-526.

15. "不识不知, 惟帝是悦, 使无天魔之诱, 人类将无由生。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 205.

16. "遂作大雨四十昼夜, 洪水泛滥, 生物灭尽, 而挪亚之族独完, 水退居地, 复生子孙, 至今日不绝。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 206.

17. "而人之恶撒但, 其理乃无足诤, 盖既为挪亚子孙, 自必力斥抗者, 敬事主神, 战战兢兢, 绳其祖武, 冀洪水再作之日, 更得密诏而自保于方舟耳。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 206.

God feared? And both answers point to Man's desire of self-preservation, which demands the denial of Satan the interferer and the worship of God who presumably is the dispenser of blessings. It is as mundane and as commonplace as that, and the whole edifice of conventionalized faith is found crumbling as reason cuts the ground from under the foundation of unquestioned acceptance.

To the Mara spirit in poetry Lu Xun returns again and again, each time offering a somewhat different definition, but always retaining the central theme of "fighting God and conventionality."¹⁸ If fighting both means being ostracized by the world, the Mara poet is ready for that eventuality. Never follow the ways of the world, never curry favour from the multitude, but be dedicated to truth and be ready to defend it, Lu Xun seems to have said. Directing his glance homewards, he cried: "Where are to be found the militants in our realm of letters? Where the men with the sincerest voice, to lead us to virtue, beauty and fortitude? And where the voice that warms our hearts, to lift us out of the cold and aridity?"¹⁹ And in fact he found none, for there was none to fulfil the role he himself was to play in 1918 and later, when China was enwrapped in a revitalizing literary movement.

In *Extremist Trends in [Western] Culture* Lu Xun echoed many Nietzschean sentiments against the multitude and modern civility, and quite understandably many Lu Xun scholars have found it embarrassing to discuss Nietzsche's influence on Lu Xun; but even granting that there did exist such an influence, it need not follow that Lu Xun was imitative. One need not explain away the parallels, for they are there; rather it is important to see that Lu Xun, dissecting the complex cultural and ethnic experience which was China, had little need to be imitative. This is what Lu Xun wrote:

Nature has left men with a great many disharmonies, and men have had a great many wiltings and degenerations and retrogressions all of their own making, but Life takes no backward journey. Men, motivated by a desire for the perfect, will keep on advancing, barbed obstructions notwithstanding.

Defying death, Life laughs and dances and forges ahead, the dead bodies notwithstanding.

What is a path? It is trodden and made where there was none, where there used to be a thorny undergrowth.²⁰

Some twenty years earlier, Nietzsche had said comparable things on *paths*: "Tausend Pfade giebt es, die nie noch gegangen sind; tausend Gesundheit und verborgene Eilande des Lebens. Unerschöpft und unentdeckt ist immer noch Mensch und Menschen-Erde."²¹

There are a thousand paths which have never been walked on, the hermit in the mountain said, wisely; we need a thousand paths, walk and make them, the committed participant, Lu Xun, urged.

Finally, what is the Mara spirit? Lu Xun may have owed the idea to Southey, whom he

18. "争天拒俗"

19. "今索诸中国,为精神界之战士者安在?有作至诚之声,致吾人于善美刚健者乎?有作温煦之声,援吾人出于荒寒者乎?" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 234.

20. "自然赋与人们的不调和还很多,人们自己萎缩堕落退步的也还很多,然而生命决不因此回头……人类渴仰完全的潜力,总是踏了这些铁蒺藜向前进……"

"生命不怕死,在死的面前笑着跳着,跨过了灭亡的人们向前进。

"什么是路?就是从没路的地方践踏出来的,从只有荆棘的地方开辟出来的。" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 434.

21. Also sprach Zarathustra, Nietzsche, *Sämtliche Werke*, de Gruyter, Berlin, Bd IV, S. 100.

mentioned in his essay. But Mara poetry is not Satanic poetry as understood by Southey, nor perhaps as Byron, consciously or otherwise, ever conceived of it; nor as in Indian mythology, which provides the name; it is a type deliberately constructed by Lu Xun. "Of all poets, I have included those who were dedicated to opposition [to authority] and committed to action, and had themselves rejected by the multitude."²² Also he said it is poetry of great sincerity and warmth (how unByronic!) and aimed to lift the suffering masses out of cold and aridity (how Chinese, how anything but Nietzsche!). It is a distinct concept and very much Lu Xun's own. It is, to use a modern phrase, Lu Xun de-constructing many an accepted construct, however revered that might be.

22. "今则举一切诗人中，凡主意在反抗，指归在动作，而为世所不甚愉悦者悉入之……" *Complete Works*, Vol. 1, p. 197.

On and Around the Dream

—A Survey of Recent Scholarship on Honglouloumeng

(1976 — 1982)

Zhou Jueliang (周珏良)

这是一篇目录学性质的文章。鉴于《红楼梦》这部书已成为世界各国学者们研究的对象，在我国从七十年代后期起“红学”又有了一个大发展，本文试图把1976年后半年到1982年底国内（不包括台湾和香港）对《红楼梦》的整理、出版、翻译、研究工作和对作者曹雪芹的研究进行综述、评价，以供国外研究者参考。全文共分书目；作者和续书者传记；作者问题，版本，脂评和其他评点；影印古本，新出版本，译本；评论性书籍和文章；以及关于曹雪芹的佚著和遗物的发现等部分。文章对近年来有关这些方面的书籍文章加以叙述，对其中重要的并作出评价。较详尽的有对1982年人民文学出版社出版的中国艺术研究院红楼梦研究所校注本《红楼梦》的得失的估价，指出这个本子虽有许多长处，如前八十回用庚辰本做底本并校以其它脂评本，使一般读者能见到这一比较接近曹雪芹手稿的版本，注释也比以前所出版本详尽等等，但仍有许多不足之处，尚不能成为定本。在评论方面，本文指出多数作品是评论社会背景，思想内容和书中人物的，对全书结构做出艺术评价的文章尚少，此外对《红楼梦》语言进行的研究也远远不够，尚待研究工作者继续努力。

The study of the eighteenth century Chinese novel *Honglouloumeng*¹ has long been a subject of international scholarship and ever since the late seventies there is an unprecedented bloom of “Redology.”² The present survey will mainly assess the achievement of years beginning with 1976. Owing to the vastness of the subject, work done in Taiwan, Hong-kong and places outside China will not be included.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A reprint of the revised edition of *A Honglouloumeng Bibliography*³ by Yisu (1962) was issued in 1981. It is still the fullest bibliography of editions, translations, criticisms, etc. up till the year 1954. The companion work to this by the same author in the *Aids to the Study of Classical Literature Series*⁴ was reprinted in 1980. It supplies primary information, historical, biographical, textual and critical on the book and its author Cao Xueqin available since his lifetime till the year 1917. Hu Wenbin's *Bibliography of Honglouloumeng*⁵ is far from an adequate continuation of the Yisu bibliography as it claims to be. It relies too much on secondhand information. Its selection of critical works is arbitrary, and its accuracy questionable. It should be used with great care. Two pioneer works in the history of *Honglouloumeng* criticism appeared respectively in 1980 and 1981, Guo Yushi's *A Concise*

-
1. Traditionally known in English translation as *The Red Chamber Dream*.
 2. 红学 (Hongxue), a convenient term to include all branches of *Honglouloumeng* studies.
 3. 一粟, 《红楼梦书录》, Shanghai Classics Publishing House, (上海古籍出版社).
 4. 一粟, 《红楼梦卷》, 《古典文学研究资料汇编》, Zhong Hua Book Company, (中华书局), 1963.
 5. 胡文彬, 《红楼梦叙录》, 《社会科学战线丛书》, Jilin People's Publishing House, (吉林人民出版社), 1980.

History of Honglouloumeng Criticism,⁶ and its continuation, and Han Jinlian's *A History of Redology*.⁷ None of these is comprehensive and in many places they can supplement each other, but a really scholarly work on this subject is still to be written. An essay attempting to survey the work done in the field since 1949 has provoked much controversy. This is Liu Mengxi's "Thirty Years of the Study of *Honglouloumeng*".⁸ The main point of contention is the assessment of the "craze" for *Honglouloumeng* study during 1973-1974, which was a time when the "Cultural Revolution" was still going on. Liu's view is that something positive could be credited to this "craze", which was found especially offensive to his critics. As the polemics was carried on with considerable bad-tempered bickerings and pent-up grievances, which might not arouse much academic interest, I would refer anyone wishing to know about the pros and cons to a few typical articles: Ding Zhenhai: "My Views on the *Honglouloumeng* Craze During the 'Cultural Revolution'",⁹ Liu Mengxi's article in reply to Ding's criticism,¹⁰ and two survey articles respectively sympathetic to Liu (Shi Yan: "A Report on A Debate on the Study of *Honglouloumeng*")¹¹ and Ding (Luo Yuan: "A Summary of Letters to the Editor Regarding the *Honglouloumeng* Craze during the 'Cultural Revolution'").¹² The journal *Essays and Studies on the Red Chamber Dream* (ESRCD)¹³ carries a current bibliography of articles appearing in newspapers and magazines since January 1977.

BIOGRAPHY

More than Shakespeare, the author of *Honglouloumeng*, Cao Xueqin, is a difficult writer to do a biography of. He left no signature, not to say a will. Not a single page of his holograph manuscript is extant, nor did any editions of his novel appear in his lifetime, being not quite finished when he died. The dates of his birth and death are controversial, and his parentage and genealogy are affording chances for conflicting scholarly speculations. A serious attempt at reconstructing the life of Cao is Zhou Ruchang's *Cao Xueqin, A Short Biography*,¹⁴ which appeared in 1964 and a revised edition was published in 1980. Appendix 1 in the book states in succinct terms the points of contest on Cao's birth and death dates, his parentage and his native place. One significant essay bearing on the death date of the author is Yu Pingbo: "The Comment on Volume I of the Xikui Shuwu Copy of *the Story of the Stone*"¹⁵ which argues strongly for the date 1763. An article by Zhang Chengwang holds that the birth date of Cao should be 1715.¹⁶ Xu Gongshi, agreeing with Mei Tingxiu, fixes Cao's death date in March 1764.¹⁷ But all these, except that of Yu Pingbo, are new interpretations of old material rather than anything based on new discoveries. Feng Qiyong

6. 郭豫适:《红楼梦研究小史稿》1980,《红楼梦研究小史续稿》1981, Shanghai Literature Publishing House, (上海文艺出版社)。

7. 韩进廉:《红学史稿》, Hebei People's Publishing House, (河北人民出版社), 1981。

8. 刘梦溪: "红学三十年", in his *New Studies on Honglouloumeng* (《红楼梦新论》), China Social Sciences Publishing House, (中国社会科学出版社), 1982。

9. 丁振海: "也谈 '文革' 中的评红热", *Literary Review* (《文学评论》), No. 3, 1981。

10. 刘梦溪: "读 '也谈文革中的评红热' 书后", *ibid.*

11. 石言: "红学争鸣报导", *Studies on Honglouloumeng* (《红楼梦学刊》), here after *Xuekan*, No. 4, 1981。

12. 罗源: "关于 '文革' 中 '评红热' 问题讨论的来信综述", *Literary Review* No. 6, 1981。

13. 《红楼梦研究集刊》

14. 周汝昌:《曹雪芹小传》, Baihua Publishing House (百花文艺出版社), Tianjin, revised ed., 1980。

15. 俞平伯: "记 '夕葵书屋' 石头记卷一' 的批语", *ESRCD* I, 1979。

16. 章诚望: "试谈曹雪芹的生年", *Xuekan*, No. 2, 1981。

17. 徐恭时: "文星陨落是何年", *Xuekan*, No. 2, 1981。梅挺秀: "曹雪芹卒年新考", *Xuekan*, No. 3, 1980。

did a lot of research into the extant copies of the genealogy of the Cao family and ascertained that Cao Xueqin's father was Cao Fu and that he descended from the Caos of Liaodong (in the northeast of China) and not those of Feng-ruen (in Hebei province).¹⁸ He also gives a rather detailed account in an article published in *Wenwu*¹⁹ of two versions of the biography of Cao Xi, Cao Xueqin's great grandfather, which contains some hitherto unnoticed material on Cao's family history.

Some research has been done on the lives of two other persons having to do with the writing of *Honglouloumeng*. I mean Gao E and Cheng Weiyan, who together edited and completed the text of the novel and put out the first printed edition in 1791. Gao was either the author or reviser of the last part (forty chapters) of the novel which was generally believed to be left unfinished by Cao Xueqin, and Cheng was the publisher and possibly the co-editor and co-reviser with Gao E. An article discussing the birth date of Gao E was done by Shang Daxiang²⁰ and many of the archive records of Gao's official positions and so on were published in the Second Series of Archive Records of the Ming and Qing Dynasties²¹ in 1979. For many scholars Cheng Weiyan was thought to be a mercenary book-trader who published *Honglouloumeng* for profit, and hence the doubts about the authenticity of his text and the underestimation of his edition. However, in 1976 an article by Wen Lei based on new material discusses his birth and death dates (c. 1745 — c. 1818), his native town and his social position, showing that he was probably from a poor genteel family, who, though never holding an official position, had many respectable friends among the nobility and officials.²² Besides, he was a poet and painter of sorts and some of his paintings are extant, one being an album of Arhats in finger painting.²³ So it is possible that, not being merely the publisher, he also had a hand in the editing of the 120-chapter text of *Honglouloumeng*.

AUTHORSHIP, TEXT, ANNOTATIONS

A controversy on the authorship of *Honglouloumeng* was started by two articles of Dai Bufan²⁴ in which he argues that Cao Xueqin's role in the creation of the masterpiece was revising and supplementing an older work mentioned in Chapter 1 of the novel as *Fengyue Baojian* (*A Mirror for the Romantic*). The author of this original work, according to Dai, was a Cao Zhucun,²⁵ who was a cousin of Cao Xueqin's father and the prototype of the Brother Stone²⁶ mentioned in the same chapter of *Honglouloumeng* and often referred to in Zhiyan Zhai ("Chih-yen Chai" according to the Wade System) annotations. Two scholars agree with Dai on that Cao Xueqin based his work on *A Mirror for the Romantic*, but each has his own interpretation of the identity of its author. Wu Shichang takes him to be the famous commentator Zhiyan Zhai ("Red Inkstone"), whom he has long identi-

18. 冯其庸：《曹雪芹家世新考》，Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1978.

冯其庸：“《五庆堂重修辽东曹氏宗谱》考略”，*Xuekan*, No. 1, 1979.

19. 冯其庸：“曹雪芹家世史料的新发现”，*Wenwu* (《文物》) No. 3, 1976.

20. 尚达翔：“高鹗生卒年考略”，*Xuekan* No. 4, 1981.

21. 《明清档案史料丛编》第二辑，Zhong Hua Book Company.

22. 文雷：“程伟元与《红楼梦》”，*Wenwu* 10, 1976.

23. 史树青：“跋程伟元罗汉册及其它”，*Wenwu*, 2, 1978.

24. 戴不凡：“揭开《红楼梦》作者之谜……”，*Northern Review* (《北方论丛》) I, 1979. “石兄与曹雪芹”，*ibid.*, III, 1979.

25. 曹竹村.

26. 石兄.

fied as being a Cao Shuo with the informal name of Zhu Jian.²⁷ Zhou Shaoliang argues that the author of the *Mirror* was Cao Xueqin himself, and that he had another work *The Storm of the Stone*; and by putting together these two old manuscript works of his own, he produced the final work *Honglouloumeng*.²⁸ Of course, under this interpretation Cao Xueqin still retained the total authorship of the book. There are articles taking issue with Dai's view and try to prove that Cao Xueqin's sole authorship is unquestionable. These include Zhang Jinchi: "Who was the Author of *Honglouloumeng*?"²⁹; Bai Dun: "The Study of *Honglouloumeng* Should be Based on Facts;"³⁰ Deng Qingyou: "Cao Xueqin Wrote *Honglouloumeng* with a Masterly Hand."³¹ Considering the intricacy of the problem we may well expect that no easy solution is forthcoming. However, two articles by Zhu Nanxian³² supply odd information related to the authorship of the last forty chapters, which are at times informative and interesting.

Textual problems of *Honglouloumeng* fall roughly into two groups, those concerning the first eighty chapters and those concerning the last forty chapters. Studies of the former concentrate on the evaluation of the extant transcripts of the various Zhiyan Zhai annotated versions and their relationships, those of the latter mostly on evaluation of the text as published by Cheng Wei yuan and detection of parts that might have been in Cao's own hand.

One important study of the transcript of the Jimao (1759) version is by Wu Enyu. In Chapter 7 of his *Studies on Cao Xueqin*³³ he argues, mainly from paleographic evidence, that the original version for this transcript was borrowed from the Cao family and the transcript was made by order of the Manchu Prince of Yi,³⁴ who and his father were both friends of the Caos. By similar evidence, he also identified an odd volume of a transcript of *Honglouloumeng* (Chapters 56, 57, 58 and two fragments of Chapters 55 and 59) kept in the Museum of Chinese History, Beijing, as being a missing volume of the same transcript. His research of course greatly enhances the importance of the transcript. Feng Qiyong's book *On the Transcribed Copy of the Gengchen Version*³⁵ makes a detailed analysis of this copy and the transcribed copy of the Jimao version and concludes that the former was copied from a transcript of the latter and not a motley composite as claimed by Wu Shichang.³⁶ He also regards this transcript as based on the last version available in Cao's lifetime and in value only next to a holograph manuscript. An article by Wei Tan³⁷ takes the view that the two transcripts were from the same source but not one from the other. Two essays evaluating the incomplete transcript of the Jiaxu version respectively by Zhou Shaoliang³⁸ and Ji

27. 曹硕字竹涧。See Wu Shih-Ch'ang: *On the Red Chamber Dream*, Part II, Oxford, 1961; also "论《石头记》的‘旧稿’问题", *ESRCD*, I, 1979.

28. 周绍良: "雪芹旧有《风月宝鉴》之书", *Xuekan*, I, 1979.

29. 张锦池: "《红楼梦》的作者到底是谁?", *Northern Review*, No. 3, 1979.

30. 白盾: "红楼梦研究也要实事求是", *Social Sciences of China* (《中国社会科学》), No. 3, 1981.

31. 邓庆佑: "雪芹橡笔著红楼", *Xuekan*, 4, 1981.

32. 朱南铣: "《红楼梦》后四十回作者问题札记"上,下, *ESRCD*, VI, VII, 1981.

33. 吴恩裕: 《曹雪芹丛考》, Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1980.

34. 怡亲王(弘晓)。

35. 冯其庸: 《论庚辰本》, Shanghai Literature Publishing House, 1978.

36. See Wu Shih-ch'ang: *On the Red Chamber Dream*, Chapter IV, Part I, Oxford, 1961. Also 吴世昌: "论脂评《石头记》(七十八回本)的构成、年代和评语", 《红楼梦探源外编》, Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1980.

37. 魏潭: "‘己卯本是庚辰本的底本说’质疑", *ESRCD*, II, 1980.

38. 周绍良: "读甲戌本《脂砚斋重评石头记》散记", *ESRCD*, III, 1980.

Zhiyue³⁹ take the date of the original version to be some time before that of the transcript of the Gengchen version, while a reprinted old essay by Wu Shichang⁴⁰ holds that the version is of a much later date.

One old transcript of a 120-chapter version of *Honglouloumeng* has attracted the attention of scholars. This is the so-called Qianlung Transcript of A 120-chapter Draft of *Honglouloumeng*,⁴¹ generally known as *Menggao Ben*.⁴² In an article by Wu Shichang in 1963 and reprinted in a book of his essays on *Honglouloumeng*⁴³, the original version of the first eighty chapters of this transcript is shown to be one earlier than that of Jimao. The last 40 chapters Wu takes to be based on probably more than one version on which Gao E made his revisions. He further speculates, upon evidence in the transcript, that Gao, like the author Cao Xueqin, had repeatedly worked on his manuscript and did not just make a hasty job of it as generally believed. Another scholar, Lin Guanfu,⁴⁴ made a study of the same transcript and found that the first seven chapters of the transcript were based on a version near to that of Jimao but from Chapter 8 up to Chapter 80 the version differs from those of all other extant transcripts, and many readings in it are better than those in other versions. About the last 40 chapters the writer discovered that 21 of them follow the text of the 1792 Cheng Weiyuan edition but the other 19 chapters have a text different from the Cheng edition, which is characterized by economy of expression and in many places superiority of style.

Articles discussing the last forty chapters and Gao E's role in them present a variety of often conflicting views. Zhou Shaoliang's article "On the Last Forty Chapters of *Honglouloumeng* and Gao E's Role Therein"⁴⁵ presents the view that there was a manuscript of these chapters left uncompleted by Cao Xueqin and Gao's role was mainly editorial. The writer cites as evidence statements of Cheng Weiyuan and Gao E in their prefaces to the 1791 edition and eighteenth century references to the existence of a 120-chapter version before the Cheng-Gao edition, thus concluding that Gao only edited what was already in existence. Another article by the same author⁴⁶ attempts a chapter by chapter examination to separate possible original writing by Cao Xueqin from parts supplied by Cheng and Gao. The findings are often interesting but not always convincing. Zhou Ruchang advances in a long article the view that the last forty chapters were supplied by a group of ghost writers employed by Heshen, prime minister, under Emperor Qianlong's tacit orders.⁴⁷ He includes Gao and Cheng among those writers. He bases his argument mainly on a new interpretation of data already known. Wang Changding challenges the argument and thinks Zhou's view untenable.⁴⁸ Wu Shichang in an article⁴⁹ makes, with formidable erudition, ingenious guesses of incidents in the plot of the last forty chapters as planned by Cao Xueqin from the names of some of the characters in the novel, such as Baochai, Xiren, Sheyue, Xiaohong and Qian-

39. 季稚跃, "也论《脂砚斋重评石头记》(十六回本)的底本正文", *Xuekan*, IV, 1981.

40. 吴世昌, "残本脂评《石头记》的底本及其年代", 《红楼梦探源外篇》, Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1980.

41. 《乾隆抄本百二十回红楼梦稿》, Zhong Hua Book Company, 1963.

42. "梦稿本。"

43. 吴世昌, "《红楼梦稿》的成分及其年代" in 《红楼梦探源外编》referred to earlier.

44. 林冠夫, "谈杨本——红楼梦版本论之一", *ESRCD*, II, 1980.

45. 周绍良, "论《红楼梦》后四十回与高鹗续书", *ESRCD*, II, 1980.

46. "略谈《红楼梦》后四十回哪些是曹雪芹原稿", *ESRCD*, VI, 1980.

47. 周汝昌, "《红楼梦》‘全璧’的背后", *Xuekan*, IV, 1980, I, 1981.

48. 王昌定, "读‘《红楼梦》全璧的背后’——与周汝昌同志商榷", *Xuekan*, IV, 1981.

49. 吴世昌, "《红楼梦》原稿后半部若干情节的推测……", *ESRCD*, 1980.

xue.⁶⁰ Since the discovery of the Zhiyan Zhai annotated versions of *Honglouloumeng*, Gao E and Cheng Weiyuan have long been ostracized for tampering with the text of the first eighty chapters and supplying a continuation of the story in the last forty chapters which distorts the original intention of Cao Xueqin. But the fact is that for nearly two hundred years the novel has been read and liked by readers in this “tampered” text and it seems unfair that the two men responsible for publishing it should be given no credit at all. Two short articles, however, attempt to give a more balanced assessment of the labor of these two earliest editors. Wu Zuxiang⁵¹ and Shuwu⁵² both think that Cheng and Gao should be thanked for giving the public a completed text and keeping in general to the tragic ending as intended by the author. The critic Bai Dun goes a step further and gives the view in a newspaper article⁵³ that Gao E supplied a *dénouement* to the book better than what Cao Xueqin might have intended.

No one taking a scholarly interest in *Honglouloumeng* can afford to neglect the Zhiyan Zhai annotations.⁵⁴ Research on them centers around the identity of Zhiyan Zhai and the light they throw on the novel as regards the life of its author, its historical background and its artistic merits. Zhiyan Zhai has been identified with different persons by different scholars. Recent writings discussing this problem include Dai Bufan's three articles⁵⁵ which argue that he was Cao Fu⁵⁶ and not the model for Baoyu in the novel, nor the Brother Stone, supposed author of *The Mirror for the Romantic*, and that Zhiyan and Qihu, another annotator, were not the same person. A new book devoted exclusively to the study of these annotations is the *Preliminary Studies of the Zhiyan Zhai Annotations* by Sun Xun.⁵⁷ It gives a comprehensive account of the various annotated versions, analyzes the various theories about the identity of the author, and gives a critical and historical evaluation of the annotations. It is so far the only book of its kind.

One set of Zhiyan Zhai annotations was published for the first time in selections, that of the “transcript in the mansion of a Mongolian prince.”⁵⁸ This transcript has 120 chapters of which the first eighty chapters are transcribed from a version with Zhiyan Zhai annotations. The editors, Chen Yupi and Liu Shide, selected 623 of the annotations which appear only in this transcript.⁵⁹ The annotations are mostly critical and moralistic and do not seem to be very significant. Another set of Zhiyan Zhai annotations are those in the now lost transcript formerly in the collection of Jing Yingkun, known as the “Jing transcript.”⁶⁰ This transcript contains annotations not found in other transcripts and has aroused interest in scholars.⁶¹ A thorough study of these notes has to wait for their open publication, which so far have been available only in private editions.

50. 宝钗，袭人，麝月，小红，茜雪。

51. 吴组缃：“魏绍昌《红楼梦版本小考》代序”，*Xuekan*, III, 1981.

52. 舒芜：“‘说到辛酸处，荒唐愈可悲’——关于《红楼梦》后四十回的一夕谈”，*ESRCD*, II, 1980.

53. 白盾：“试论高鹗续作之功”，*Guangming Daily* (《光明日报》), Feb. 15, 1982.

54. A general name for annotations and comments found in most transcripts of the eighteenth century versions of the first 80 chapters of *Honglouloumeng*. They were mostly done by someone signing his name as Zhiyan, but there are some signed with the name of Qihu and others.

55. 戴不凡：“脂批考”一，二，三，*ESRCD*, I, II, III, 1979-80.

56. 曹頌。

57. 孙逊：《红楼梦脂评初探》，Shanghai Classics Publishing House, 1981.

58. 蒙古王府本。

59. 陈毓麒、刘世德：“蒙古王府本《石头记》批语选辑”，*ESRCD*, I, 1979.

60. 靖（应赜）本。

61. e.g. 周汝昌：“《红楼梦》及曹雪芹有关文物叙录一束”，*Wenwu*, 2, 1973.