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Introduction

The stage of anthologization is crucial for the canonization of literary works. It is notable that, when compiling anthologies, histories and reference books of foreign literatures, the editors usually have to select among diverse translated versions of the same literary text, which, inevitably, is confined by various factors and will influence the future translation of the source text. Based on this assumption, the paper is focused on the anthologization of *Hongloumeng* in English-speaking world during the 1960s, attempting to explore the compilers’ selection among diverse
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translations and explain some complexities related to English readers’ acceptance of Chinese literature.

The Cold War, aftermath of World War II, created a boom of regional studies in the US, where Asian Studies had become one of the hottest topics by the end of the 1950s. Consequently, the 1960s witnessed a remarkable growth of research institutions and programmes on Chinese Studies in English-speaking world: “the number of universities that offer degree programmes in Eastern Asian Studies increased tremendously within 10 years and reached 106 at the threshold of the 1970s”[1]; “as of July 26, 1971, there were a total of 220 Chinese programmes on the college level in the United States”[2]; and in 1972, the number of works devoted to Chinese literature doubled that of 1962 and “most of these are in English”[3].

It is for all these reasons that the textbooks of Chinese literature published in the 1960s bore extremely far-reaching effect, among which An Introduction to Chinese Literature (1966) by Liu Wu-chi, an early textbook considered “attractive” and “reliable”,[4] nourished numerous readers of Chinese literature. Other textbooks worth mentioning include A History of Chinese Literature (1964) by Lai Ming and Anthology of Chinese Literature (1965,1972) by Cyril Birch. Anthologization of Hongloumeng in all these books involves extracting from its English versions. Presumably, the selection among existing English translations of the novel reveals the expectation and preference of intended readers, which will influence the future translation of the novel in English-speaking world.

II. Liu Wu-chi’s Selection among Existing English Translations

An Introduction to Chinese literature by Liu Wu-chi “offers general reliable guidance through the intricacies of developing genres, historical periods, literary movements, and the larger number of major practitioners of two millennia”[5]. Upon its publication by Indiana University Press in 1966, it was widely acknowledged and highly praised as “the best introductory survey in English of the history of Chinese literature” in a variety of book reviews.[6] As a matter of fact, the book is not the earliest one among several “introductory survey(s)” in the 1950s and 1960s. Nevertheless, “during the past few years several attempts have been made to survey the entire span of Chinese literary development. Regrettably, none of these undertakings have achieved more than a minimum of success. It is therefore encouraging to encounter at last a volume, […] that succeeds where its predecessors have failed”[7]. William Schultz is right. As for “its predecessors”, Chinese Literature: A Historical Introduction (1961) by Chen Shou-yi triggered rather
negative reviews from scholars such as James R. Hightower and *Treasury of Chinese Literature* (1965) by Ch’u Chai and Winberg Chai “suffers from the fact” that “the Chais are not professionals”[8]. Compared with these earlier attempts, *An Introduction to Chinese Literature* proved to be a great success in terms of its academic ambition.

Besides, Liu’s *Introduction* is considered a reliable textbook: “the book is a good job done by a professional who is very intent on making things as clear as he can for the students of Chinese literature.”[9] Charles K. Chu regards the intrinsic value of the book as “while worthy of the specialists’ consultation, the book should make interesting and instructive reading for those inclined to be initiated in the field”[10].

The fact that Liu Wu-chi chaired the Chinese Department of Indiana University, the cradle of a great deal of researchers, teachers and translators of Chinese literature, may partly account for the widespread reputation and far-reaching effect of the book. Therefore, it is safe to assume that Liu’s selection of translated texts in this book will influence not only the literary fame of the existing translations but also the mode for future translation of the novel.

There were 4 English versions of *Hongloumeng* available that may serve as references for Liu Wu-chi’s *An Introduction to Chinese Literature*:

1. The first separate edition of *Hongloumeng* in English is translated by H. Bencraft Joly, British Vice-Consulate in Macao. The version is entitled “*Hung Lou Meng, or, The Dream of The Red Chamber*” and includes in two volumes of the complete translation of the first 56 chapters of the original novel. Book I with 378 pages and Book II with 583 pages were published by Kelly & Walsh Ltd. in 1892 and by Typographia Commercial in 1893 respectively.

2. In 1929, an English version of *Hongloumeng*, “Dream of the Red Chamber” translated and adapted by Wang Chi-chen, was published by Doubleday Doran Co. in New York and Routledge Ltd. in London simultaneously. The book, with 3 volumes, 39 chapters and 371 pages, consists of selected translation of the first 80 chapters and adaptation of the last 40 chapters of the Chinese original. The translator was then working for Metropolitan Museum of Art and later became Chinese professor in Columbia University.

3. In 1958, another English version of *Hongloumeng* by Wang Chi-chen was published by Twayne Publishers in New York. With 60 chapters and 574 pages, this new version is a substantial extension of Wang’s 1929 version.

4. An English version entitled “The Dream of the Red Chamber” was published by Pantheon Books Inc. in New York in 1957 and by Routledge & Kegan Paul in
London in 1958. The translators are Florence McHugh and Isabel McHugh. This English version is translated from the German version by Franz Kuhn, an outstanding sinologist and translator.

When referring to *Hongloumeng*, Liu Wu-chi commented on 6 extracts of the novel in *An Introduction to Chinese Literature*. The notes explaining the source of references clearly show Liu’s selection among diverse translations.

13. Cf. *Dream of the red Chamber*, translated by Chi-chen Wang, (rev. ed. 1958), p.7. It is omitted in *The Dream of the Red Chamber*, tr. by Franz Kuhn (in German), English tr. by Florence and Isabel McHugh. Both Wang’s and Kuhn’s versions are incomplete translations of the novel.

16. Last lines of the often quoted “Flower-burial Song” in the novel. Cf. Wang, p. 219; it is omitted in Kuhn.

17. Cf. Wang, pp.219-221.

18. Cf. Wang, pp.278-279.

19. Kuhn, pp.578-579; Wang, p.561(a summary, not a translation).

21. Cf. Wang, pp.5-6, Omitted in Kuhn.[11]

Liu Wu-chi didn’t mention a word about Joly’s version which was remote in time. Among the six extracts quoted, five are from Wang’s 1958 version and only one is from McHugh-Kuhn’s version. In Note 13 and 16, Liu explains that he quoted the verse lines from Wang’s 1958 version since they are omitted in McHugh-Kuhn’s version. From other notes, it can be found that even when the extracts are translated in both versions, Liu chose to quote from Wang’s version. The only quotation from Kuhn’s version is due to Wang’s summary instead of translation of the episode. To summarize, Liu Wu-chi’s choice fully expresses his preference for Wang’s version.

However, neither general readers’ reception nor the intrinsic value of the two versions seems to support Liu’s personal preference. Both of the two versions involve adaptation and compression of the novel. The difference lies in that McHugh-Kuhn’s version is aiming at “general reader interested in Chinese literature”,[12] while Wang’s version is intended for “most readers”. Accordingly, Kuhn attaches much more importance to the literariness of the novel, trying to maintain the original rhythm and narrative structure in translation, while Wang has taken great efforts to simplify the novel by means of translating the first 80 chapters but summarizing the last 40 chapters, which leads to hastened rhythm and unbalanced structure and makes the version less readable. Therefore, when it turns to general readers’ reception, McHugh-Kuhn’s version is considered better representing the “greatness” of the “matchless novel”. Consequently, it gets a better record of
republication than Wang’s version, which shows a more positive acceptance by the book market.

Different from general readers and book sellers, Liu Wu-chi preferred Wang’s version out of the following reasons: (1) Note 13 implies that Wang’s version surpasses McHugh’s version in that the former is translated directly from Chinese, while the latter is based on the German translation of the novel; (2) Compared with McHugh who are amateurs, Wang Chi-chen is a professor of Chinese, which seems to enhance the reliability of the translation; (3) Both Liu and Wang are convinced by “the results of his (Dr. Hu Shih) exhaustive investigations”[14] about the complex problems of the authorship and formation of the original novel; (4) Consequently, Liu’s comments focus on the first 80 chapters of the novel, discussing only one episode from the last 40 chapters, which is in accordance with Wang’s choice: “I have reduced the amount of space given to the last forty chapters, […] only about one-tenth space is to given to Kao. It is, therefore, essentially Tsao Hsueh-chin that I am giving to the reader”[15].

Even though Liu mainly quoted from Wang’s version, he expressed his regret in Note 13 that none of the two existing versions published in the 20th century was complete.

III. Lai Ming and Cyril Birch’s Dissatisfaction with Existing Translations

Different from Liu Wu-chi’s An Introduction to Chinese Literature, Lai Ming’s A History of Chinese Literature and Cyril Birch’s Anthology of Chinese Literature both anthologize Hongloumeng in a way that suggests the compilers’ dissatisfaction with the existing English translations of the novel.

Lai Ming’s A History of Chinese Literature was published by Casell & Company Ltd. in 1964. In Chapter XV “The Novels of Ching Dynasty”, Hongloumeng is introduced and commented under the title “The Love Romance: Red Chamber Dream”. A short passage from the novel about “Purple Cuckoo testing Pao-yu’s feelings” (慧紫鶴情辞试莽玉) is offered after the introduction.[16] In spite that the extract is translated in both Wang’s and McHugh’s versions, Lai Ming chose none of them but made his own translation. By contrast, when talking about Shuihuzhuan and Xiyouji, he quoted the extracts directly from Arthur Waley’s Monkey and Pearl Buck’s All Men are Brothers, the only English translations of the two indigenous Chinese novels existing then.[17] Lai Ming didn’t explain, but his choice implied that he was satisfied with none of the existing English translations of Hongloumeng.

Cyril Birch’s Anthology of Chinese Literature (II) was published by Grove Press
in 1972, in which Birch accused both Wang's and McHugh-Kuhn's versions of spoiling the rhythm of the original novel. "Existing translations of the novel abridge not only by excluding entire episodes but by constant compression of the text to speed the narrative. But Ts'ao Hsueh-ch'in's forte is the unhurried exploration of every nuance of a situation."[18] It's for this reason that Birch, when anthologizing Hongloumeng, made his own translation, attempting to represent the rhythm of the original,[19] "In the following extract, therefore, we move at the author's own pace as he builds up phrase by phrase the vivid mosaic of Phoenix's vengeance."[20]

13 years before the publication of the anthology, Birch had already criticized both Wang's and McHugh-Kuhn's translations severely in his review, "What then is lost? The answer is surprising. Kuhn omits almost all verse. Wang omits the fascinating description of the Ta-Kuan-yuan, all reference to Hiso-hung and Pao Yü's last dream vision."[21] The criticism out of a professional reader's academic concern is obviously different from book reviews of other types. For instance, Peggy Derdin in New York Times Book Review paid some general compliments on both of the two books[22], while Birch's review explored relevant details and represented scholarly readers' thirst for better translation than the existing ones.

Compared with Lai Ming and Cyril Birch, Liu Wu-chi views the two versions more optimistically. However, his regret expressed implicitly in Note 13 still shares some common ground, i.e., the professional readers' dissatisfaction with existing English translations of Hongloumeng and their expectation for a complete translation that can better serve as reference for academic studies of the novel in English-speaking world.

IV. Professional Readers' Expectation and It's Influence on Future Translation

The Choice of An Introduction to Chinese Literature and other reference books in the 1960s has greatly influenced the literary fame of existing English translations of Hongloumeng. Meanwhile, the similar expectation shared by these books has induced complete translations of many classical Chinese works in the 1970s, including David Hawkes' English translation of Hongloumeng. Besides, the professional readers' thirst for "academic translation" may partly explain the unpopularity of Yang Hsien-Yi and Gladys Yang's translation of Hongloumeng in English-speaking world.

1. The Literary Fame of Wang Chi-chen's and McHugh-Kuhn's Versions

Aiming at slightly different audiences, both Wang's and McHugh's versions
mainly take general or non-professional readers into consideration and try to fulfill their demands. As a consequence, these two versions are more popular among general readers than those preceding and following them, which can be shown by some statistics. According to I-Share, the resource sharing union catalog of 80 libraries in Illinois, the collections of these two versions are both larger than that of Hawkes’ version published later in the 1970s. Meanwhile, McHugh-Kuhn’s version is republished more than Wang Chi-chen’s version, showing a better acceptance by the book market.

Nevertheless, Wang’s version is more prestigious than McHugh’s version in another sense. Even though both of these two versions are criticized by professional readers, Wang’ version is relatively better accepted by scholars, which most probably attributes to the influence of An Introduction to Chinese Literature that quotes from it. For several decades, Wang’s version, as the first English version of Hongloumeng directly translated from Chinese in the 20th century, remained authoritative in college libraries. With I-Share taken as an example again, it can be found that the number of Wang’s version ranks the first, even higher than that of Hawkes’ version which is now universally acknowledged. Besides, in spite of the fact that McHugh’s version was reprinted more than Wang’s, all the republication occurred before the 1970s, while the simplified edition of Wang’s version was reprinted in 1989 even after all the five volumes of Hawkes-Minford’s version became available, which suggested a more persistent literary fame than McHugh’s version. The 15th edition of New Encyclopaedia Britannica published in 1993 referred to Hongloumeng 6 times, mentioning Wang’s version twice but none of other versions.

2. “The Age of Total Translation”: the Mode for Translation of Classical Chinese Literature in the 1970s

When talking about the translation of classical Chinese literature in English-speaking world, C. T. Hsia depicts its trend as “in fiction as in poetry, the age of tantalizing discovery has been succeeded by one of total translation (emphasized by this author)”[24]. Here, refers to the first half of the 20th century, especially from the 1920s to 1950s. Due to America’s pivot toward Asian after World War I and the intimate relationship between US and China around World War II, the mainstream media in US promoted a favorable image of China. Publishing houses and book sellers followed this trend and stimulated general readers’ “fascination about China”[25] by a series of books. Apart from the two English
translations of *Hongloumeng*, the abridged translations of some other classical Chinese novels and a bunch of literary works written about China, such as Lin Yutang’s and Pearl Buck’ works, got published in this period and some of them even became best-sellers and gained sustained reputation. However, when entering the 1960s, “the once hungry reader is now overfed and appears jaded” and due to “its failure to compete with [...] serious Western literature, with popular genre fiction, and with film, TV, and other forms of audio-visual entertainment”[26] the attraction of classical Chinese literature to general Western readers reduced drastically.

On the other hand, however, as the statistics demonstrate in the introduction, the Cold War created a boom of regional studies in the United States and research institutions and programmes related to Chinese Studies in US flourished in the 1960s. Therefore, *The increasing number of scholarly readers of Chinese literature took the place of general readers and began to form the overwhelming majority of the intended audience* (emphasized by this author). They need to make academic readings of Chinese literature, while the existing abridged translation which had been popular among general readers could no longer meet their demands. For instance, When Li Chi reviews *Anthology of Chinese Literature*, he agrees with Birch’ disapproval of existing translations of *Hongloumeng* and praises Birch’s own translation because “the strong point of Ts’ao Hsueh-ch’in is thus well brought out”[27]. And in James J.Y. Liu’ s “The Study of Chinese Literature in the West: Recent Development, Current Trends and Future Prospects” in 1975, he emphasized that “many important works of Chinese literature remain untranslated, or lack adequate translations”[28].

The expectation implied by the way of anthologization in the books such as *An Introduction to Chinese Literature* and the same opinion shared by other scholars specializing in Chinese literature show that the existing abridged translations failed to fulfill the need of the major intended audience, i.e. the professional readers. Thus, since the 1960s, the English translation of Chinese literary works has gradually entered a new phase, being published by university presses and sponsored by non-profit funds. The publication of complete translations of a lot of classical Chinese works in the 1970s was called “the age of total translation” by C. T. Hsia.

“The age of total translation” embraced numerous “classic” translations of Chinese classics. In 1973, the first volume of the first complete English translation of *Hongloumeng* was published; in 1975, the first comprehensive anthology of classical Chinese poetry, *Sunflower Splendor*, was published, and *The Columbia Book of Chinese Poetry*, *The Columbia Book of Later Chinese Poetry* and *Waiting*
for the Unicorn: Poems and Lyrics of China’s Last Dynasty came into being successively; In 1977, the first complete English translation of The Journey to the West and Master Tung’s Western Chamber Romance were published and the latter received National Book Award of America. Following this trend, the relatively comprehensive translations of The Three Kingdoms and Chin Pin Mei got published soon after. For most of the classical Chinese works mentioned above, there had already existed abridged English versions that were well accepted. An upsurge of new translations of these works by scholars of Chinese literature in the 1970s was due to the urgent need of professional readers in English-speaking world.

Another distinctive feature of “the age of total translation” is that professionals as translators of Chinese literature completely took the place of amateurs. Take the English translation of Hongloumeng as an example, the translators in the 19th century were diplomats or custom officials instead of “professionals”; among the translators from the 1920s to 1950s, the McHughs were amateurs and Wang Chi-chen’ who, though later became professor of Chinese at Columbia University, was not an expert in Hongloumeng; in the 1970s, David Hawkes was an expert in Classical Chinese literature as well as in Hongloumeng. In fact, it was Reverend Bramwell Seaton Bonsall who accomplished the first complete English translation of Hongloumeng; he was a missionary in China and began to translate when he retired in the 1940s. After he finished his translation in 1966, his family contacted two publishing houses, both of which refused them. Compared with Reverend Bonsall, David Hawkes, professor of Chinese at Oxford University with the “orthodoxical” educational background of a scholar specializing in Chinese literature, was so favored by Penguin Books that he was invited to translate the novel in advance. The choice of publishing houses shows obvious preference. It might be assumed if it were in earlier historical periods, amateurs such as Reverend Bonsall would have been given a chance to publish their translations. However, when professional readers formed overwhelming majority of the intended audience after the 1960s, their urgent need for “academic translation” led to publishers’ rejection of such possibility.

Apart from the translator’s identity as outstanding scholar specializing in Chinese literature, the academic value demonstrated by Hawkes’ version of Hongloumeng addresses the need of professional readers in “the age of total translation”. Firstly, the version consisting of five volumes is a complete translation, in which Hawkes tries to “translate everything”[29] and thus it can serve as perfect source of citation for researchers of Chinese literature. Besides, the introduction or preface of each
volume probes into relevant problems and proposes very convincing arguments concerning "Redology". Therefore, Hawkes' version has gained universal acknowledgement among scholars of Chinese literature in English-speaking world. As is found in previous chapters, before the publication of Hawkes' version, reference books of Chinese literature in English seldom quoted from already existing translations of Hongloumeng. Whereas after the publication of Hawkes' version, the compilers of most of the histories, anthologies and textbooks directly quoted from it instead of making their own translations.\[30\] The professionals trust the translation and regard it the equivalent of the novel in English-speaking world.

3. Reflections on the Unpopularity of Yangs' Version in English-speaking World

Yang Hsien-Yi and Gladys Yang's English translation of Hongloumeng consisting of three volumes was published by Foreign Language Press in Beijing from 1978 to 1982. As an "exporting" translation, it rivals Hawkes' "importing" translation in terms of the quality of translation. However, Hawkes' version is much more influential and more widely acknowledged than Yangs' version among English-speaking readers, which can be exemplified by the fact that most of the histories, anthologies and introductions of Asian or Chinese literature in English only quote or anthologize the extracts from Hawkes' version. (It's also the choice of The Longman Anthology of World Literature.)\[31\] In relevant academic works, the authors usually list both of the two versions as reference, but only quoting from Hawkes' version in practice.

What causes the unpopularity of this version? In fact, Yangs' translation is well known for its careful selection among various versions of the source text and faithful and smooth rendition of the novel, preserving most of the cultural images and offering concise notes. Gladys Yang calls their version a "crib",\[32\] i.e., very close translation aiming at the learners of source language, which should have been very helpful for the students and researchers in English-speaking world. However, because of the nightmare of "Cultural Revolution" that haunted the entire span of translating, editing and publishing process of Yangs' version, the interference of the publishing house out of political concern had spoiled the superb translation and caused negative effect among the target readers.

The most obvious interference of publishing house is that Yangs' version yields no preface or introduction and the translators have no chance to utter their voice. There only exists a "Publisher's Note" that is full of groundless assertions and prejudice, assuming class struggle to be the only theme of Hongloumeng and attacking the
"new Redologists" in an extremely radical way:

After the May 4th Movement there appeared a group of 'new Redologists' headed by Hu Shih. Their "researches" into this novel had a reactionary political motivation. For that period saw the upsurge of a revolutionary mass movement against imperialism and feudalism; so Hu Shih and his followers preached reactionary pragmatism and idealism and through their "researches" opposed the spread of Marxism in China.\[331

Since "Publisher's Note" completely denies the researches of "new Redologists" that are actually devoted to the exploration of the author's identity, the relevant historical events and the differences among various versions of Hongloumeng in order to trace back the formation of the novel, the translator is deprived of every possibility to contribute introduction or appendix based on these studies. Thus, the translation is of little significance for the scholarly readers in English-speaking world who are yearning for an "academic translation". Wu Shichang, the first Chinese publishing research results on Hongloumeng in English, once outrageously attacked the "Publisher's Note", condemning its "numerous ridiculous assertions" for the purpose of "exporting revolution".\[341 Hawkes' version, on the contrary, is highly "academic" partly because of academic writings attached to the translation based on the studies of the "new Redologists", such as Zhou Ruchang and Zhao Gang, while Yangs' version not only lacks such writings, but even denies the strenuous efforts of "New Redologists", which definitely could have degenerated its reputation. This may partly explain why the extracts of Yangs' version can hardly be found in histories, introductions and anthologies of Chinese literature in English, which will further influence its literary fame among other professional readers. When the professionals have become the majority of intended audience of Chinese literature since the 1960s, the lack or even denial of academic consideration of Yangs' version is a very important factor causing its unpopularity.

Conclusion
A survey of the anthologization of Hongloumeng in English-speaking world during the 1960s reveals the scholarly readers' dissatisfaction with existing translations and their expectation for complete translation of the novel. The disparity between the existing abridged translations aiming at general readers and the professional readers' thirst for "academic translation" in this historical period is caused by the upsurge of professional readers of Chinese literature in the English-speaking world and the drastic reduction or general readers' interest in
Chinese literature, with the former due to the prosperity of regional studies as the consequence of Cold War, and the latter due to general readers’ shift of interest and appearance of new forms of entertainments more attractive to them.

The anthologization of *Hongloumeng* in the 1960s yields far-reaching influence on the future translation of the novel: First, even though Wang Chi-chen’s version is not so well accepted by general readers as MacHugh-Kuhn’s version, its literary fame remains more persistent in the following three decades due to Liu Wu-chi’s quotation from the version in *An Introduction to Chinese Literature*. Second, the compilers’ attitude represents professional readers’ expectation and greatly influences the future mode for translation and the identity of future translators, giving birth to the “age of total translation” in the 1970s when a large number of complete translations of classical Chinese literature by professionals appeared successively. Lastly, current anthologization of *Hongloumeng* in English histories, introductions and anthologies of Chinese, Asian or even world literature shows the unpopularity of Yang Hsien-yi and Gladys Yang’s translation in English-speaking world, which may be partly explained by the scholarly readers’ expectation reflected in the way of anthologization of the novel in the 1960s.
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