



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

This thesis has been submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for a postgraduate degree (e.g. PhD, MPhil, DClinPsychol) at the University of Edinburgh. Please note the following terms and conditions of use:

This work is protected by copyright and other intellectual property rights, which are retained by the thesis author, unless otherwise stated.

A copy can be downloaded for personal non-commercial research or study, without prior permission or charge.

This thesis cannot be reproduced or quoted extensively from without first obtaining permission in writing from the author.

The content must not be changed in any way or sold commercially in any format or medium without the formal permission of the author.

When referring to this work, full bibliographic details including the author, title, awarding institution and date of the thesis must be given.

**Unraveling the Discursive Spaces around *Fanyi*: An
Investigation into Conceptualizations of Translation in
Modern China, 1890s-1920s**

Yumiao Bao

PhD

The University of Edinburgh

2018

Declaration

I hereby declare that this thesis has been composed solely by myself and that it has not been submitted, in whole or in part, in any previous application for a degree. Except where stated otherwise by reference or acknowledgment, the work presented is entirely my own.

29/4/2018

Abstract

In the existing scholarship on Chinese translation history, the shifting conceptualizations of translation from the 1890s to the 1920s have been presented as a teleological evolution from ‘traditional’, target-oriented translation norms to ‘modern’, source-oriented norms. In response to this virtually unchallenged grand narrative, the dissertation presents a more nuanced and complex picture of the changing conceptualizations of translation in China during this period. Using New Historicism to engage with Roland Barthes’s theory of intertextuality and Gérard Genette’s framework of paratextuality, the study builds an integrated theoretical framework for examining how the conceptual relationships between translating, writing, commenting, and editing (among a variety of other textual activities) changed during this period. Adopting Microhistory principles, the dissertation conducts three case studies of marginalized figures—Zhong Junwen (1865-1908), Zhou Shoujuan (1895-1968), and Wu Mi (1894-1978)—from Chinese translation history: by analyzing their translations and/or writings about translation in a range of textual forms such as translation reviews, prefaces, diaries, and *pingdian* commentaries, the dissertation reveals how these cultural actors blurred the boundaries between translating, writing, commenting, and editing within China’s rapidly evolving publishing context and how their conceptualizations of translation were deeply grounded in the traditional Chinese notions of authorship. The results of the three case studies demonstrate how the conceptual boundaries between various textual activities were in flux during these four decades and that the shifts in the conceptualizations of translation were not a simple, linear development from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’. Apart from contributing to a better knowledge of Chinese conceptualizations of translation in a key period of Chinese translation history, the dissertation challenges the validity of adopting the theoretical models of intertextuality and paratextuality as universally applicable frameworks in translation studies.

Key words: Chinese translation history; conceptualization of translation; New Historicism; intertextuality; paratext; Microhistory

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Abstract..... | i |
| Acknowledgement..... | v |
| Chapter I. Introduction..... | 1 |
| 1.1 Prolegomena..... | 1 |
| 1.2 Shifts in practices and perceptions of translation in Chinese translation history .. | 6 |
| 1.2.1 Pre-20 th -century Chinese practices and perceptions of translation | 8 |
| 1.2.1.1 Collaborative translation | 8 |
| 1.2.1.2 Relay translation..... | 10 |
| 1.2.2 The transformational period in Chinese translation history | 12 |
| 1.3 Intellectual Background..... | 18 |
| 1.3.1 Translation history | 18 |
| 1.3.2 The emerging interest in reconceptualizing translation and call for the de- westernization of translation studies | 21 |
| 1.4 Rationale..... | 30 |
| 1.4.1 Previous scholarship on Chinese translation history from the late 19 th to early 20 th centuries | 30 |
| 1.4.2 The ‘May Fourth paradigm’ in Chinese translation historiography..... | 33 |
| 1.4.3 The grand narrative of progression from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ periods of Chinese translation history | 37 |
| 1.5 Dissertation outline..... | 43 |
| Chapter II Theoretical Framework, Methodology, and Research Methods..... | 46 |
| 2.1 Intertextuality and Translation Studies | 49 |
| 2.1.1 The protean concept of intertextuality | 49 |
| 2.1.2 Previous applications of theories of intertextuality in translation studies..... | 51 |
| 2.2 The conceptual framework of paratextuality in translation studies..... | 60 |
| 2.2.1 Genette’s conceptual framework for paratextuality | 60 |
| 2.2.2 Paratextuality in translation studies | 62 |
| 2.3 New Historicism: A social and historical model for intertextual reading..... | 66 |
| 2.4 Triangulating intertextuality, paratextuality, and New Historicism..... | 69 |
| 2.5 Research method: Multiple-case study..... | 78 |
| 2.5.1 Choosing the method of case study..... | 79 |
| 2.5.2 Case study and the issue of generalization in translation studies..... | 80 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| 2.5.3 Remodeling the case study method in light of Microhistory | 83 |
| Chapter III. The Indistinct Identity of the ‘Translator’ in the Heterogeneous Discursive Space around <i>Fanyi</i> in Late Qing (1840-1911) | 91 |
| 3.1 The literary translation wave in late Qing | 93 |
| 3.1.1 The socio-political backdrop..... | 93 |
| 3.1.2 Previous scholarship on Chinese thinking about translation in late Qing..... | 97 |
| 3.2 Conceptualizing translation in ‘non-discussions’ about translation and the periodical press in late Qing | 102 |
| 3.2.1 The medium for ‘non-discussions’ about <i>fanyi</i> and an emerging public discursive space..... | 108 |
| 3.2.2 A generalist view about <i>fanyi</i> | 119 |
| 3.2.3 On the blurred conceptual boundaries between specific textual activities | 128 |
| 3.3 Conclusion | 136 |
| Chapter IV. Conceptualizations of translation in early Republican China (1912-1917): Challenging the linear ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ paradigm..... | 140 |
| 4.1 The ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ in early Republican China | 141 |
| 4.2 Zhou Shoujuan and his <i>Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers</i> | 147 |
| 4.3 Conceptualizations of translation in the forewords to the <i>Collection</i> | 152 |
| 4.3.1 (Self-)Identification as a ‘master of fiction’ instead of a ‘fiction translator’ | 153 |
| 4.3.2 The misfortune of being a master of fiction who translates..... | 157 |
| 4.3.3 Translating as acting | 162 |
| 4.4 The immediate paratexts, from first publications to the <i>Collection</i> iterations ... | 171 |
| 4.5 Lu Xun’s review of the <i>Collection</i> | 180 |
| 4.6 Conclusion: The heterogeneous discursive space around the <i>Collection</i>..... | 185 |
| Chapter V. Cultural continuities within changes in the May Fourth period, 1915-1929 | 188 |
| 5.1 The polemics surrounding <i>fanyi</i> among literary societies in the May Fourth era (1915-1929) | 190 |
| 5.2 The Neo-traditionalists–Wu Mi (1894-1978) and the Xueheng School | 195 |
| 5.2.1 The confluence of old and new, Chinese and Western—Wu’s education..... | 195 |
| 5.2.2 The journal <i>Xueheng</i> (The Critical Review) | 196 |
| 5.3 Wu Mi’s writings on translation | 199 |
| 5.3.1 Conceptualizing translation in relation to imitation and literary creation..... | 201 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| 5.3.2 Wu Mi's discussions of the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation as an intervention in the May-Fourth modernity debate..... | 209 |
| 5.4 Wu's adoption and adaptation of <i>pingdian</i> commentaries in his fiction translations..... | 217 |
| 5.4.1 A brief introduction to <i>pingdian</i> and its history until the 1920s..... | 219 |
| 5.4.2 Wu's adaptation of <i>pingdian</i> practice in fiction translation..... | 227 |
| 5.4.3 Multiple temporalities in Wu's translation practice..... | 238 |
| 5.5 Conclusion: translation, power, and temporality..... | 242 |
| Conclusion..... | 246 |
| 6.1 Recapitulation of the study..... | 246 |
| 6.2 Contributions..... | 248 |
| 6.2.1 Chinese translation history..... | 248 |
| 6.2.2 Theoretical and methodological interventions..... | 252 |
| 6.3 Implications and areas for future research..... | 257 |
| Bibliography..... | 261 |
| Appendix..... | 292 |

Acknowledgement

With the deepest gratitude, I would like to take this opportunity to thank my principal supervisor Dr. Hephzibah Israel for her patient guidance, critical feedback, and insightful advice throughout my PhD program. Sincere thanks also to Dr. Christopher Rosenmeier, my second supervisor, and Dr. Şebnem Susam-Sarajeva, the chair of my annual review committee, for their expert input and valuable feedback.

I want to express my sincere thanks for the opportunity to attend the 2015 Nida School of Translation Studies in the first year of my PhD program. I received invaluable advice and tremendous encouragement from Professor Susan Bassnett, Professor Theo Hermans, Professor Sandra Berman, Professor Edwin Gentzler, Dr. Anna Stowe, and other 2015 NSTS faculty members and associates. Those two intellectually challenging yet supportive weeks in Misano Adriatico, Italy were truly inspirational. I wish to thank Professor Joachim Gentz, Professor Natascha Gentz, Dr. Gregory Adam Scott, Professor Scott Williams, and Mehtap Ozdemir for their kind help when I sought their expert opinion. I also want to thank Dr. Tong Shexiao, the librarian for Chinese Studies and Translation Studies at the University of Edinburgh, who has helped me locate many primary and secondary sources.

I am immensely grateful to Dr. Zvi Septimus for his love, support, and belief in me. I would simply not have been able to complete this thesis without him. My gratitude also goes to Roger Olsen who has been providing immense support for my academic life since my Master Program at Tsinghua University. I am enormously grateful to my parents for their unconditional love and forgiveness. My thanks also go to my dear friends Clara Martínez, Ida Hummel Gabrielsen, Barbara Fernandez-White at the University of Edinburgh, without whom my PhD life in Edinburgh would have been so dull and lonely. Thanks also to my loyal friends from college, Wei Liwei, Zhang Ning, Jin Lu, Xiao Xinyao, and Li Jing for their friendship and company when I was down, confused, and lost.

My final appreciation goes to China Scholarship Council for the three-year funding I received to support my PhD research.

Chapter I. Introduction

1.1 Prolegomena

The existing scholarship on Chinese translation history portrays the shifting conceptualizations of translation in the late 19th and early 20th centuries as a teleological progression from ‘traditional’, target-oriented translation norms to ‘modern’, source-oriented norms. This grand narrative has largely dismissed those ‘traditional’ aspects of Chinese thinking about translation that do not map neatly onto our current, ‘modern’ understandings of translation and treated them as merely outmoded and even unsophisticated. In this dissertation, I challenge this pervasive grand narrative and develop a more nuanced and complex assessment of the shifting Chinese conceptualizations of translation by investigating in detail the changing relationships between translating and other textual activities such as writing, editing, and commenting. My in-depth analysis of these relationships reveals a more intricate pattern of Chinese translation history in this period. Moreover, through the lens of an integrated theoretical framework (see Chapter II), my dissertation probes the blurred conceptual boundaries between translating and other textual activities as an important aspect of Chinese conceptualizations about translation, one that is deeply grounded in the Chinese communal textual and intellectual traditions. My study demonstrates how Chinese translation history, especially Chinese conceptualizations of translation, could be brought into a cross-cultural dialogue that moves beyond the mere application of existing theoretical and methodological approaches to Chinese data and instead

examines Chinese thinking about translation on its own terms in engaging with deeply rooted disciplinary assumptions in translation studies.

This study, therefore, is not simply a historiographical project of collecting, describing, and analyzing primary sources concerning Chinese conceptualizations of translation in the period from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries. My focus on the conceptual relationships between translating, writing, and other types of textual activities has its roots in my interest in engaging with the theoretical discussions about conceptions of translation and translatorship in contemporary translation studies. In contemporary translation studies, especially since the late 1980s, such prominent scholars as Venuti (1992, 1995), Littau (1993, 1997), Arrojo (1997, 1998), and Bassnett (1998a, b) have lamented the second-rate image of the translator as compared to the author and the low status of translation as compared to original writing. These scholars cite Romantic conceptions of authorship and originality as significant causes for the translator's inferior image. Arrojo's (1997) following statement is representative:

In the essentialist opposition which *tradition* has built between reading and writing, and between originality and reproduction, translation has not been merely associated with secondariness and failure. In its long history of marginality and invisibility, particularly in a culture that often equates authorship with property and writing with the conscious interference of a producer, the translator's activity has been related to evil and blasphemy, to indecency and transgression. (21; my emphasis)

These scholars also point out that the theoretical discussion of translation and translators have always been constrained by such notions as 'faithfulness', 'fidelity', and 'equivalence' which affirm and perpetuate the conceptual hierarchy between 'translation' and 'original'.

This strand of translation studies scholars (reviewed in detail in Chapter II) has borrowed conceptions and approaches from poststructuralist theorizations on textuality to reconceptualize the relationships between ‘translation’ and the ‘original’ and between the translator and the ‘original’ author. That is, the poststructuralist thinking on such issues as authorship, literary originality, signification, and binary opposition in literary and critical theory has served as a powerful theoretical weapon for these translation studies scholars to challenge and even overturn the traditional conceptions of translation and translatorship Arrojo identifies above. This reconceptualization has made undeniable contributions to the development of translation studies. For instance, it has drawn more scholarly attention to the agency, subjectivity, and creativity of (literary) translators, broadened the purview of translation studies beyond textual comparison to embrace such issues as culture, power, and ideology, and raised awareness regarding the importance of translation in other academic disciplines.

As a Chinese student of translation studies, I have been intrigued and sometimes disturbed, however, by the way in which this strand of scholarship has attained its theoretical ground. This line of research shows that the conceptual relationship between authorship and translatorship is indeed an illuminating vantage point from which to examine conceptualizations of translation, but the way these translation studies scholars put forward their arguments and present the problem of the inferior status of the translator vis-a-vis the original author is totalizing. What is implied in Arrojo’s statement above, by her use of the word *tradition* (in singular form), is that

this problem is universal but especially serious in the Western context.¹ My question is this: is the essentialist conceptual opposition between translating and original writing really a universal problem which applies equally in all different cultures and in different historical periods? If a cultural tradition did not share assumptions about the relationships between individual (text or talent) and tradition with Western Romantic conceptions of authorship (the author as a God or Genius figure) and originality (*creatio ex nihilo*), then perhaps that culture has developed a different conception of translation which did not posit the translator as inferior to the author. My project, in this respect, is essentially revisionary: it aims to bring more of a Chinese perspective to the issue of conceptualizations of translation in contemporary translation studies by examining Chinese conceptions of translation and translatorship that developed out of Chinese textual and literary traditions rather than accepting uncritically Western translation theory as universally applicable.

The existing scholarship on Chinese literature and history suggests that conceptions of authorship in the Chinese tradition developed differently from Western notions of authorship (e.g. Galik 1980; Huang 1994; Edwards 2001; Saussy 2003; Schwermann and Steineck 2014; Li 2017).² Considering China's long literary history, any generalization regarding its traditional views on text, authorship, and originality risks being superficial and simplistic. Yet Chinese studies scholarship on authorship reveals almost consistently that the Chinese textual tradition "show[ed] a preference

¹ See Littau (1997), p. 82, for a similarly universalizing statement about the inferiority of translation vis-à-vis the original.

² In fact, the contributions to Schwermann and Steineck (2014) show that several cultural traditions in East Asia had communal, genre-bound notions of authorship that were distinctively different from the modern Western conceptions of authorship. For a brief overview of the history of the changing conceptions of authorship in the Western traditions, see Burke (1995), pp. 5-11.

for less ego-centric notions of authorship and a marked tendency to distribute author functions among several individuals” (Steineck and Schwermann 2014, 26). From the fluid circulation of texts in the physical form of loosely-bound bamboo or wooden slips in early China (popular before 220 AD; see Lewis 1999, 54-5) to the blurred lines between writing, reading, commenting, compiling, and editing in Ming-Qing (1368-1911) fiction (see Huang 1994; Rolston 1997), ‘authorship’ in the Chinese textual tradition was never synonymous with ‘authority’, ‘property’, or ‘authorial origination’. Rather, the Chinese tradition upheld a model of authorship that was more elastic and communal, accommodating various textual identities—editor, compiler, commentator, etc.—as integral agencies in the authorship of a text. In such a textual tradition, what position did the translator then occupy in relation to these other textual roles, i.e., writer, commentator, editor, compiler, and reader? How was translatorship conceptualized in relation to the traditional Chinese conceptions of authorship?

In my study, I have been seeking to answer the fundamental question, “What is ‘translation’ for the Chinese?” Since such a broad question is beyond the scope of a single PhD study, I focus on the conceptualizations of translation from the late 19th century to the early 20th century in Chinese translation history. While China has had a three-millennia history of translation and interpreting, as discussed in the following section, the previous scholarship on Chinese translation history suggests that the period spanning the late 19th and early 20th centuries constitutes an important turning point in terms of how the Chinese practice and perceive translation. This period, furthermore, witnessed the beginning of literary translations in Chinese translation

history.³ Therefore, the period from the 1890s to the 1920s, in its scope and significance, is an optimal space for exploring Chinese conceptualizations of translation from the angle of the conceptual relationships between translatorship and authorship as well as literary originality.

1.2 Shifts in practices and perceptions of translation in Chinese translation history

What is translation for the Chinese? Contemporary Chinese, whether laymen or scholars, seem to understand ‘translation’ (or the Chinese words *fanyi* 翻译, *yi* 译) or ‘translator’ (also *fanyi* or *yizhe* 译者) in the same way as their non-Chinese counterparts. It is not difficult to notice “the assumption of bilingual or multilingual abilities” (Hung 2006, 147) and the assumption of direct translation in the definitions of *yi* (and its derivatives) in mainstream, authoritative Chinese-language dictionaries commonly used in contemporary China.⁴ That is, *fanyi* denotes the activity of a bilingual (or multilingual) person rendering a text from one language into another and a ‘translator’ is consistently understood to be “someone who carries out the task of inter-lingual transmission of a message or messages, employing his or her knowledge of the two languages concerned” (ibid.). Moreover, nowadays, the Chinese are also

³ There were some translations of Buddhist and Christian literature into Chinese and translations of Chinese classical works into European languages in the Buddhist translation wave (1st to 9th century) and Jesuit missionary translation wave (16th to 18th century). In general, however, literary translation was not a major component of China’s translation history until the late 19th century.

⁴ Hung (2006) lists in English translation several definitions of *yi* and its derivatives, such as *fanyi* and *yizhe*, in nine mainstream Chinese-language dictionaries (the first was compiled in 121 CE and the latest published in 1997). She suggests that the assumption of bilingualism is implicitly stated in the dictionaries compiled before the 20th century. I do not entirely agree with her interpretation. The concise definitions of *yi* in Classical Chinese in those ancient dictionaries do not specify that only one person is involved in transmitting the words of foreigners. It is only in the dictionaries compiled after the 1930s that there is an explicit emphasis on ‘translation’ as direct translation from language A to language B and on the word ‘translator’ as someone who works with those two languages.

performing translation thus defined as a homogeneous universal category⁵. The mushrooming translation and interpreting programs in Chinese higher institutes all aim to produce professionals for the translation industry in this increasingly globalized world.⁶

As some studies of Chinese translation history indicate, however, the Chinese in the past conceived of and practiced translation in different ways (e.g. Hung 2005b, 2006; St André 2010; Ma 1998). In China's three millennia of translation history, apart from the continuous tradition of *government* translation activities from around 10th century BCE to the present, there were two major *cultural* translation movements: Buddhist sutra translation from the 2nd to the 9th centuries and the translation of Western learning from the late 16th century to the present (Hung 2005b).⁷ The intermittent translation of Western learning up to the early 20th century can be further divided into several waves: Jesuit missionary translation from the 16th to the 18th centuries, Protestant missionary translation in the 19th century, and Chinese-initiated translation of Western social sciences and literary works from the late 19th to the 20th centuries (see e.g. Wang and Fan 1999; Hung 2005b; Chu 2011).⁸ As some studies have revealed, there are many aspects of the Chinese translation tradition that differ markedly from modern-day practices and understandings of translation (e.g. Hung 2005b; St André 2010). Though there is a grand narrative in Chinese translation

⁵ See Tymoczko (2006) for a list of universalizing assumptions about translation underpinning contemporary translation studies.

⁶ As Ping (2015) explains, translator and interpreter training in China nowadays (especially the Master of Translation and Interpreting programs) aspires to learn from international (read Western) experience to meet international standards.

⁷ I adopt Hung's (2005a, b) idea of 'dual translation traditions' in China—i.e. government translation and cultural translation. See Hung (2005b), p. 73, for a chart in English that compares the marked differences between these two types of translation activities.

⁸ The specific divisions and wordings of the waves of cultural translation in Chinese translation history differ according to the different standards used by scholars in the existing scholarship.

historiography that views the practices and discussions of translation before the mid-1910s as ‘antiquated’ and ‘outdated’ (see 1.3.4), scholars such as Hung (2005b) and St André (2010) have shown that the pre-20th-century Chinese translation history constitutes a rich unmined resource from which to draw lessons for engaging with contemporary models of translation theory and practice. They have highlighted two phenomena in Chinese translation history—collaborative translation and relay translation—that challenge the common assumption in contemporary translation studies that translation is universally a solitary, bilingual undertaking directly from the source language to the target language.

1.2.1 Pre-20th-century Chinese practices and perceptions of translation

1.2.1.1 Collaborative translation

Before the 20th century in China, *fanyi* had always been considered historically a collaborative act between monolingual⁹ and bilingual participants in cultural translation activities. Collaborative translation was the standard mode of operation in Buddhist sutra translation, in Western missionary translation, and even in the early translations by Chinese intellectuals of Western literature.

In the early stage (2nd century) of Buddhist sutra translation in China, collaboration existed between a monolingual monk of Central Asian or Indian origin who orally recited the sutra, one or several interpreters (*chuanyan* 传言, *duyu* 度语) who orally translated the sutra into Chinese, and one or several scribes (*bishou* 笔受) who recorded and even edited the translated text (Ma 1998; Hung 2005a). This

⁹ I adopt Hung’s (2005b) working definitions of ‘monolingual’ and ‘bilingual’. That is, they do not reflect the actual number of languages one can speak but refer to his or her competence in the particular languages involved in the translation at issue.

collaborative, multi-stage mode of operation was not merely a practical solution to the problems posed by foreign monks' limited command of Chinese. Rather, it was adopted to uphold "the Buddhist tradition of oral explication of sutras in public, with debate and discussion of the meaning of the sutra as part of the process" (St André 2010, 74). Even when later generations of monks (of either foreign or Chinese origins) were much more proficient in the required languages, this teamwork approach continued and even developed by the 5th century into a normative form called *yichang* 译场 (translation forum). In a translation forum, the translation of a sutra, under a highly revered monk's direction, could be divided into up to eleven roles, and most of these roles were played by several people (Ma 1998, 55-6, 63-5, 78-82; Hung 2011). The translation forums presided over by Kumarajiva (344-413), for instance, were said to have hundreds to thousands of participants. Though many of these participants were audience members, they were allowed to engage in the forum's discussions and debates (Ma 1998, 55-6). In this format, translation was a quintessentially communal activity which challenges the modern individualistic image of the translator.

The Jesuits, who conducted missionary work in China from the late 16th to the 18th centuries, also adopted a teamwork approach to translating both sacred texts and Western science and technology (St André 2010; Pollard 2011). In this case, the Jesuits were the bilingual party, with their Chinese partners being monolingual. As Pollard (2011) points out, the collaboration with eminent Chinese scholar-officials such as Xu Guangqi 徐光启 (1562-1633) and Li Zhizao 李之藻 (1571-1630) was especially important for the Jesuits, who sought to gain a firm footing in China in the early stage of their missionary work. Not only did these Chinese collaborators record, edit, and

polish the translated texts, but they also played a vital role, through their prefaces and postscripts, in the Jesuits' acceptance by the wider community of scholar-officials and the court (Pollard 2011). Their successors in the 19th century, the Protestant missionaries "also continued to use a team approach to their translation" (St André 2010, 76). In fact, this well-established tradition of teamwork translation was continued as the norm until the early 20th century when Chinese intellectuals themselves assumed the responsibility for the translation of Western literature. In translation studies, the story of Lin Shu 林纾 (1852-1924) (who knew no foreign languages) and his assistants translating over 160 works of Western fiction is well known and, as Hung (2005b, 148) points out, often mistakenly considered an exceptional mode of operation. Yet Lin Shu's case, as my above brief review shows, is not unique at all in Chinese translation history.

1.2.1.2 Relay translation

The practice of collaborative, multi-stage translation was closely associated with relay translation in Chinese translation history. Relay translation via one or more intermediate languages had also been a common practice that continued well into the 20th century. In the case of Buddhist sutra translation, "without relay translation", to borrow St André's words (2010), "Buddhism... would never have reached China" (82). By the 5th century, many Buddhist sutras were relay-translated through Central Asian languages. Many of the monks that initiated the Buddhist sutra translation movement in China were from Central Asia and "many of the sutras they brought (written or orally) were in Central Asian languages/scripts" rather than in their original languages (Hung 2005b, 84; see also Ma 1998, 18-22). Later, when sutra translations were based

on original Sanskrit or Pali texts, “the expertise of Buddhists from Central Asia who were trilingual” was still heavily relied upon (St André 2010, 82). Meanwhile, the relay translation of Western works in the social sciences and literature, especially through Japanese, was widely practiced in the late 19th century through to the first decade of the 20th century (Ma 1998, 364-6; Tarumoto 1998, 41-2). The prominent late-Qing reformer-intellectuals such as Liang Qichao 梁启超 (1873-1929) and Kang Youwei 康有为 (1858-1927) even recommended relay translation through Japanese as the most efficient approach for importing Western learning because the Japanese language contained a large number of Chinese characters (Chen 1996, 94-6; Luo 2005).

Examples of the important roles played by relay translation in Chinese translation history are too numerous to cite them all. In fact, indirect translation has been a common phenomenon in the history of translation throughout the world, for it is an expedient way to achieve cross-cultural communication when specialists in the original language are in short supply (St André 2011; Ringmar 2012). “Despite its obvious importance through history”, as Ringmar (2012) puts it, “the notion of relay translation is laden with negative connotations” in the post-Romantic Western tradition (142). What is relatively unique about relay translation in Chinese translation history is that it had not been deemed as a makeshift but rather as a reliable and efficient means of communication until around the 1920s.¹⁰

Especially in imperial China’s three-millennia history of government translation, indirect or relay translation had been privileged in mainstream cultural discourse (Hung 2005a, 74; see also Hung 2005b, 24-7). The earliest extant record of relay

¹⁰ See Qin (2009), pp. 263-4, for a brief discussion on how, in the May Fourth period, some intellectuals argued that relay translation was not preferable to direction translation.

translation—*chongyi* 重译¹¹—dates to the 2nd century BCE. It is recorded in the *Shangshu dazhuan* 尚书大传 (Amplification of the Book of History) that the kingdom of Yuechang 越裳 sent an envoy together with three interpreting-functionaries “who interpreted in relay to present the rare gift of a white pheasant” to the Duke of Zhou (as quoted in Cheung 2006, 47; Cheung’s translation). The accounts of this and similar instances of relay translations in diplomatic settings can be found repeatedly in imperial China’s historical records right up to the early 20th century “as a symbol of government prestige and cultural dominance” (Hung 2005b, 75; see also Wang 2010). That is, as Hung (2005a, b) has pointed out, the large number of intermediate languages involved in relay translation highlighted the far-reaching civilizing influence of the Chinese emperor’s benevolent rule that attracted remote countries to overcome insurmountable language barriers to pay tribute. The fact that the Chinese took so much pride in this method of translation suggests a conception of translation distinctively different from the modern-day (read post-Romantic Western) understanding of translation which views mediation negatively as moving further away from the original.

1.2.2 The transformational period in Chinese translation history

Then where is the turning point in Chinese conceptualizations of translation? How did the Chinese arrive at their current understandings and practices of *fanyi* as a seemingly universal category? In other words, with such a long history of relay

¹¹ In the historical records, there are variants of the term *chongyi* such as *sanyi* 三译 (literally ‘three translators’) and *jiuyi* 九译 (literally ‘nine translators’) that emphasize the large number of intermediate languages (Hung 2005a, 24; 2005b, 74; see also Wang 2010). *Chongyi* is the traditional Chinese term for ‘relay translation’, especially common in imperial China’s official historical records. However, in contemporary Chinese translation studies terminology, *chongyi* usually means ‘retranslation’ while *chuanyi* 传译 or *zhuanyi* 转译 are the common terms for ‘relay translation’ (Zhou 2013).

translations and collaborative translation, how did *fanyi* become for the Chinese a solitary, bilingual undertaking directly from a single source language to a target language? Hung (2005b), in her analytical survey of Chinese translation history from the 1st century BCE to the early 20th century, traces “the wholesale changes in translation practice as well as public perception of translation” to the period from the late 19th century to the early 20th century (95), the very period which is the focus of this study.

The historical period from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries in China was truly eventful. During this period, the Qing dynasty, China’s last imperial dynasty, fell and the Republic of China was founded in 1912. The deteriorating Qing Empire and the young Republic witnessed Western and Japanese encroachments and China’s military defeats, civil unrests and student movements, reforms and revolutions, warlord factionalism and imperial restorations (see each case study for a more detailed summary of the relevant historical background). Amongst all these historical events, the series of humiliating military defeats by the expanding Western and Japanese powers from the late 1840s to the 1890s,¹² according to scholarly consensus, forced the Chinese to awaken from a centuries-old mind-set of cultural superiority (e.g. Shi 1990; Pollard 1998a; Hung 2005b). The resultant “national shame...spurred the Chinese search for means of reform and modernization” in all major aspects of society during the period from the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Hung 2005b, 94).

During this period, even the Chinese language itself was the object of dramatic transformation. Reform-minded Chinese intellectuals considered language reform as

¹² These wars are the First Opium War (1839-1842) against the British, the Second Opium War (1856-1860) against the British and the French, and the First Sino-Japanese War (1894-1895).

integral, if not fundamental, to the undertaking of the wide-ranging reforms they thought necessary for national salvation (see e.g. Chen 1999; Kaske 2008). For over two millennia before the 20th century, *wenyan* 文言 (classical Chinese) had been the official written language in China. This form of Chinese was the standard for use in politics, administration, literature, and historiography and was only mastered by a small fraction of the Chinese population—the literati. Apart from classical Chinese, another written medium of the Chinese language, *baihua* 白话 (literally “plain, unadorned speech”, vernacular Chinese), was used to serve such “low-culture functions” as the writing of plays, folk stories, and personal diaries since the late Tang Dynasty (618-907CE) (Chen 1999, 69). While classical Chinese was superior to vernacular Chinese in status, it was at the same time “almost completely divorced from the contemporary speech of its users” in a vast country containing extreme dialectal diversity (ibid., 67). However, since the final years of the 19th century, various groups of reformist Chinese intellectuals sought to colloquialize and democratize the Chinese language in an attempt to promulgate their ideas among the Chinese masses and thus, through increased literacy, mobilize and empower them for the implementation of socio-political reforms. In response to this top-down movement, the Chinese language and its writing system underwent changes at an unprecedented speed. The effort of language reform was pushed to a peak in the late 1910s and 1920s when Hu Shi 胡适 (1891-1962) and his like-minded colleagues initiated the *baihuawen yundong* 白话文运动 (Vernacular Movement), which advocated the replacement of classical Chinese with a modern vernacular as the national language for all areas of use (ibid., 72-82).

Overall, during the late 19th century and early 20th century, various strands of Chinese intellectuals experimented with different strategies for altering both written and spoken Chinese in an attempt to bring them into closer unity. As a result of these initiatives, the linguistic situation in China during this period had become, as Chen (1999) characterizes it, “multi-glossic” (76). That is, new varieties of vernacular Chinese emerged as traditional classical Chinese and traditional vernacular Chinese were “being adapted to suit contemporary needs” (ibid.). As for literature, in both original writing and translations, traditional as well as these evolving forms of Chinese language coexisted. At the same time, the translation of foreign literature itself played an important role in the transformation of the Chinese language, especially in the formation of the vernacular Chinese as the standard modern Chinese language (see e.g. Wang 2002; Li 2012; Miyajima 2014).

Within these rapidly changing social and linguistic situations, a series of changes in China’s translation norms also occurred. Elite and educated Chinese started to realize that there was an urgent need to expand the introduction and translation of Western learning beyond the simply material aspects of Western civilization such as technology, economics, and the natural sciences. Therefore, starting in the late 1890s, educated Chinese began to take the initiative to translate Western literature (usually via Japanese), especially fiction, as a vehicle for educating the wider public and saving the nation (see e.g. Pollard 1998a; Hung 2005a, b). Consequently, there was an unprecedented wave of literary translation activities in terms of translation output, the number of Chinese translators, and the readership of translations (Tarumoto 1998).

From this period on, China's translation history started to become entwined, in large measure, with its literary history.

Chinese initiatives in literary translation were further widened in the early 20th century, when Chinese students who had studied abroad in Europe, America, and Japan returned to China with knowledge which they tried to introduce to various disciplines, sectors, and public debates in their mother country (Qin 2009).¹³ The May Fourth Movement and New Culture Movement, both inspired by new ideas from outside China, have long been treated in the existing historiography as the most significant and influential events in Chinese history in the early 20th century. The New Culture Movement (late 1910s to 1920s) was an intellectual, cultural, and literary movement that questioned the relevance and validity of the Confucian tradition and called for the establishment of a new Chinese culture and a new Chinese literature based on Western standards and values.¹⁴ The May Fourth Movement in its narrowest sense refers to the anti-imperialist student protest against the Chinese government on May 4th, 1919 in Beijing.¹⁵ In a broader sense, it is loosely synonymous with the New Culture Movement, which is commonly considered as constituting the literary and cultural aspects of the May Fourth Movement.¹⁶

¹³ For a study of the experience and historical roles of American-educated Chinese students in the early 20th century see Ye (2001).

¹⁴ In the People's Republic of China (PRC)'s historiography, the year 1915, in which the magazine *Xin qingnian* 新青年 (New Youth) was founded, heralded the beginning of the New Culture Movement. See Kuo (2017) for an analysis of the discursive constructions of the New Culture Movement in modern Chinese history.

¹⁵ See various scholars' definitions of the May Fourth Movement in, e.g. Chow et al., (2008) and Doleželová-Velingerová, Král, and Sanders (2001). For a brief overview of the changing narrative regarding the May Fourth Movement in Chinese historiography and how the year 1919 became the great watershed in the historical consciousness of the People's Republic of China, see Sun (2008), pp. 272-6.

¹⁶ See Chow (1967), pp. 1-6, for a discussion of the controversies over the scope of the term *May Fourth Movement*—especially its relationship with the New Culture Movement—and the time span of the 'May Fourth period'.

From the late 1910s to the 1920s—now commonly referred to as the *May Fourth period*—a new generation of cultural actors was not only deeply engaged in translating and introducing foreign literature and Western literary theory to China but also vigorously debating translation issues. In those tumultuous years, translation became an integral part of the weaponry these cultural actors used to advance what they believed was the ‘modernization’ of Chinese literature, culture, and society.

Overall, these four decades constitute a decisive period in the assimilation and integration of China’s translation sphere into the global modern experience. Hung’s (2005b) aforementioned incisive survey of Chinese translation history only briefly lists the major changes in the norms of translation in China during this period without delving further into the shifting practices and perceptions of translation. Moreover, though there have been many studies on the history of translation in this period, little attention has been paid to the issue of the shift in conceptualizations of translation (see 1.3). In this study, therefore, I examine how Chinese cultural actors conceptualized translation between the 1890s and the 1920s, especially the shifts in their attitude towards translation.

I use the term *cultural actors* to refer to individuals who were actively engaged in various cultural and social roles such as translator, writer, editor, commentator, critic, activist, and teacher. Through their engagement in diverse textual, cultural, and social activities, these cultural actors exerted a significant influence on the public discursive spaces, if not the ‘public sphere’ in the Habermasian sense.¹⁷ The formation

¹⁷ It is beyond the scope of this study to engage with the application of Jürgen Habermas’s concept of the ‘public sphere’ in the study of the late-Qing and early-Republican period in China. See e.g. Rowe (1990) and Huang (1993) for discussions of the controversies over this issue in Chinese studies.

of the public discursive spaces was enabled by the emergence and development of a modern press and the proliferation of periodicals, literary groups, and other arenas for public discussion and participation. By viewing historical individuals in this period as ‘cultural actors’ rather than specifically and exclusively as ‘translators’, ‘critics’ or ‘scholars’, I can acknowledge their involvement in different activities outside of the sphere of translation practice and approach their conceptualizations of translation through the lens of the relationships between translating, writing, and commenting as part of a range of textual activities.

1.3 Intellectual Background

To situate my research in translation studies, I discuss three important areas of development in the discipline: the study of translation history, the emerging interest in reconceptualizing translation, and the call for de-Westernizing translation studies.

1.3.1 Translation history

In the past three decades, there has been increasing interest in the history of translation both in translation studies and such adjacent disciplines as comparative literature and postcolonial studies. More and more translation studies scholars have been arguing for the acknowledgment of the historical study of translation as a sub-discipline of translation studies (e.g. Pym 1998; Lambert 1993; D’hulst 2001; Bastin and Bandia 2006a; O’Sullivan 2012a). Since James S. Holmes’s (1972/1988) seminal model for the discipline of translation studies did not consider or include the study of translation history, this is a welcome sign of further development in the discipline.

The development of the paradigm of descriptivism¹⁸ in translation studies since the 1970s has played an important role in drawing scholarly attention to the study of translation history. Emerging in reaction to the prescriptive, evaluative study of translation based on comparing individual source and target texts, descriptive translation studies views translation as “a cultural construct bound to specific communities, times, and locations” (Hermans 2012, 3). This paradigm shift has led to “the historicizing of translation concepts and practices” and an increasing amount of historical research about translations (ibid.). Many specific approaches within this new descriptive paradigm—for example, Even-Zohar’s (1978, 1990) polysystem theory, Toury’s (1995, 2000) concept of translation norms, and Lefevere’s (1992) theory of rewriting—have provided useful tools for the study of translations in their historical, social, and cultural contexts.

Translation history, according to D’hulst (2010), is the historical study of various aspects of translation that include past translation theories and criticism, translation practices (product, process, and function), translation institutions, and translator training. D’hulst (2001) suggests that scholars answer the following basic questions when researching translation history: Who? What? Where? With whose help? Why? How? When? Who benefits? Meanwhile, Pym (1998) emphasizes the importance of studying translators. He views “translation history as a unified area for the humanistic study of human translators and their social actions, both within and beyond their material translations” (ibid., 4). Moreover, as a sub-discipline, translation history is

¹⁸ Though descriptive translation studies is most famously associated with Gideon Toury and his book *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*, other descriptive approaches that emerged in the 1970s and 1980s constitute a descriptive paradigm. This paradigm of descriptivism “was once a limited, distinct paradigm defined by its opposition to prescriptive studies and evaluation criticism” but now, as Hermans (2012) puts it, “has become a mainstream direction in translation research” (4).

not merely the collection, analysis, and (narrative) presentation of historical findings about translation, but should also include reflections on epistemological and methodological problems—periodization, categorization, metalanguage, etc.—in the study of translation history (D’huilst 2010; Gürçağlar 2013; Bastin and Bandia 2006b).

Previous scholars have pointed out the importance of studying translation history from different perspectives. On the one hand, the study of translation *history* is important for the establishment and further development of the discipline of translation studies. The construction of a history of translation “will help to legitimize translation as an independent discipline, capable of defining itself, of sustaining a discourse *sui generis*” (Delisle and Woodsworth 2012, xx). More specifically, insights into history can “facilitat[e] translation practice and enhance knowledge in translation studies” (Bandia 2014, 114), help policy making related to language, culture, and translation (Pym 1998, 16), and “prevent[s] the scholar from blind adherence to one single theory” (D’huilst 2001, 22). On the other hand, the study of *translation* history contributes to historical knowledge of literary, cultural, social, religious, and political issues of the time and place under study (Rundle 2012, 2014). Since translation practice played a major role in various realms of human history, as Long (2007) has summarized it, “translation history can describe changes in literary trends, account for the regeneration of a culture, trace changes in politics or ideology and explain the expansion and transfer of thought and knowledge in a particular era” and to initiate comparative studies across cultures or through time (63). This potential of translation history to contribute to a broader range of knowledge has drawn scholars from adjacent

disciplines to engage with translation studies while nurturing interdisciplinary dialogue and collaboration.

To fully realize the significant roles of historical research on translation as delineated above, however, it is important to have more critical reflection on translation historiography, i.e. the writing of translation history. Since Pym's (1998) seminal *Method in Translation History*, there has been important growth in methodological and theoretical reflections on translation history (e.g. Hermans 2002; Cheung 2003, 2012; Venuti 2005; Bastin and Bandia 2006a; Wakabayashi 2007, 2013, 2016; O'Sullivan 2012b). Drawing on historiographic discussions and debates in the field of history, some translation historians have started to discuss the narrative nature of history, the positionality of the historian, periodization, and grand narratives in the writing of translation histories. However, methodological thinking in translation history is still at a preliminary stage. There are still many unexplored or underexplored terrains and shortcomings at the methodological level that "have prevented translation history from reaching its full disciplinary status" (Bastin and Bandia 2006b, 1). This statement is true of the study of Chinese translation history as well (see 1.4).

1.3.2 The emerging interest in reconceptualizing translation and call for the de-westernization of translation studies

To explain the importance of studying conceptualizations of translation in Chinese translation history, I draw attention to the recently emerging interest in reconceptualizing translation and de-westernizing translation studies. These developments are, to a large extent, closely interrelated.

Since the 1950s, there have been various approaches to the study of translation, e.g. the linguistic approach, the functionalist approach, descriptive translation studies, the cultural approach, the Deconstructionist approach, and the postcolonial approach. With these different strands of translation theory emerging in contemporary translation studies, however, the definition of ‘translation’ itself has become less certain and more equivocal. That is, with more aspects of translation products and processes being explored using these different approaches, ‘translation’—the discipline’s object of study—is itself constantly being negotiated and contested. Tymoczko (2007) views this seemingly paradoxical phenomenon as the “definitional impulse inherent in translation research and theorizing” (57). She argues that all the disparate approaches to translation studies can be interpreted as a concerted effort at trying to define translation from different yet complementary angles. In this sense, the different strands of scholarship in contemporary translation studies are not oppositional, but contribute collectively to a better understanding of translation with increasingly conceptual openness and inclusiveness.

Descriptive translation studies and the influence of poststructuralism have given direct impetus to this definitional impulse in translation studies. As mentioned earlier, the development of descriptivism in translation studies has provided important theoretical frameworks and methodological tools—especially the concept of norms developed by Toury (1995, 2000)—to study what constitutes ‘translation’ within a certain culture in a specific historical period. In this way, descriptive approaches allow for the widening of the scope of inquiry and the opening up of the definition of translation for further investigation.

The borrowings and appropriations of poststructuralist theorizations on text(tuality), as mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, have also enabled many scholars located in the Western academia to radically challenge the conventional thinking about translation in Western translation studies (e.g. Venuti 1992; Littau 1993, 1997; Arrojo 1997; Bassnett 1998). As discussed in more detail in Chapter II, poststructuralist ideas about text, language, meaning, and the subject (i.e., author and reader) prove to be useful theoretical weapons for reconceptualizing the traditional ‘author/translator’ and ‘original/translation’ relationships which have long paralyzed the discussions on translation in the Western tradition. This strand of definitional rethinking has enabled, as Gentzler (2004) puts it, “a radical redrawing of the questions upon which translation theory is founded” (145).

The intrinsic definitional impulse has played an important role in the development of the discipline and “brought greater self-reflexivity to translation studies” (Tymoczko 2007, 51). The explicit rethinking of the definition of translation, however, is still limited. Most translation scholars have simply been working on certain presupposed conceptions of translation within their own approaches to the study of translation. As Tymoczko suggests, “the task of defining translation is not finished” (ibid., 53).

The task of defining translation is still vital for translation studies not only because “in any academic field definition is an essential element” (ibid., 51), but also because the discipline of translation studies has been predominantly based on Western conceptualizations, practices, and histories of translation (Kothari and Wakabayashi 2009; Hung and Wakabayashi 2005b). Even the Western European words for

‘translation’—*translation*, *traduction*, etc.—commonly used in the international scholarship on translation studies, as Tymoczko (2010) reveals, are saturated with Western history, and specifically Christian religious practices. Therefore, by merely using the words *translation/translate* to describe their local translational activities, there is always the risk that scholars located outside the Anglo-European academic context might unconsciously reinforce the dominant Western conceptualizations of translation and possibly lose sight of different modes of thinking about translation in their own cultures. Despite Western scholars’ critical efforts to broaden the concept of translation for the discipline, such an expansion has been so far largely imbedded in Western intellectual traditions and preoccupied with Western histories. For instance, the poststructuralist rethinking of translation mentioned earlier has also been primarily concerned with Western translation traditions in particular and Western intellectual history in general. What is more problematic is that these concerns and paradigms, often based on biblical idioms and metaphors for translation, are universalized and applied to all cultures.

Before continuing further, it is necessary for me to explain my use of the problematic term *West(ern)* and my position on the idea of ‘the West’. The category of ‘West(ern)’—especially when used in contrast to and together with that of ‘non-West(ern)’ or ‘East(ern)’—has received considerable criticism in translation studies and other disciplines (e.g. Susam-Sarajeva 2002; Boyden 2011; Flynn 2011). Such simple dichotomies efface the multiplicity and hybridity within both what is designated as the *West* and what is designated as the *non-West* or the *East*. Susam-Sarajeva (2002) instead proposes the use of the terms *central* and *peripheral*, which,

according to her, allow for more conceptual flexibility and complexity. Tymoczko (2007), however, argues that Susam-Sarajeva's terms are still problematic, for they reify power asymmetries. Regardless of the dispute about terminology, these two scholars are both concerned with the power differentials within the discipline of translation studies. While acknowledging these terms "represent[s] fuzzy and artificial constructions" (Kothari and Wakabayashi 2009, 3), I still use such problematic terms as *Western* and *non-Western* in my research, for the solution to the terminological problems is well beyond the scope of the present study. More importantly, in contrast to Ricci (2013) who takes such categories as meaningless, I think these terms are 'meaningful' (cf. Bonnett 2004). They are meaningful not only in the sense that they tend to stimulate deliberation and further debate, but also because they are useful for discussing issues related to power differentials, cultural negotiation, identity formation, etc. In the period I study, as briefly mentioned in 1.2.2, the incessant European and Japanese invasions jolted the Chinese to redefine their own identity as well as their relations to the Other. Ideas of 'the West', based upon imagining, misunderstanding, and even purposeful appropriation, were central to the public discourses in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Therefore, it is all the more important for me to use the term *West(ern)* in this study and distinguish my position from those held by the historical figures I discuss.

In reaction to the universalization of Western conceptualizations of translation and the Eurocentrism of translation studies in general, Tymoczko (2006, 2007, 2010) has been arguing that the definitional impulse should be further enlarged to examine more *non-Western* concepts, practices, and histories of translation. She calls for more

contributions from non-Western translation studies scholars. Elaborating on the theoretical implications of the conceptual metaphors behind Arabic, Nigerian, Chinese, Malay, and Tagalog words for 'translation', Tymoczko (2010) calls into question the discipline's narrow conceptual basis. She invites people to think "what the field of translation studies would look like if it had been constituted around local concepts of translation from domains beyond the West" (ibid., 116).

Contributions from non-Western cultures have been emerging in the recent two decades, constituting what Tymoczko (2007) proclaims as the 'international turn' in translation studies (e.g. Hung and Wakabayashi 2005a; Cheung 2006; Hermans 2006; Wakabayashi and Kothari 2009; Ricci and Putten 2011). Through exploring various non-Western conceptions, practices, and theorizations of translation, these studies examine local translation cultures without forcing them into Western molds. They reveal long-neglected translation traditions that are not only markedly different from mainstream Western traditions but also exhibit vast regional differences from each other.¹⁹ Their discussions about, for instance, the oral tradition, multilingualism, and different religious beliefs in non-Western cultures help unsettle the conventional (read Western) understandings of what constitutes 'translation', what a translator is, and other fundamental issues in translation studies (see articles in Hung and Wakabayashi 2005; Hermans 2006; Wakabayashi and Kothari 2009).

On the whole, however, this 'international turn' in translation studies is a fairly new area of development; many cultural traditions still remain unexplored or

¹⁹ Most scholars focus on their own cultures, but Wakabayashi (2005, 2007, 2013) has conducted comparative studies among different Asian translation traditions and reflected on methodological and theoretical issues regarding comparative translation historiography.

underexplored and many issues are as yet unaddressed. There seems to be, as Wakabayashi (2014) observes, “an apparent ‘semi-silence’ on the part of some non-Western scholars (at least in the literature available in *European* languages) in relation to the field’s neglect of non-mainstream traditions” (102; original italics).

Martha Cheung is one of the few Chinese scholars who has directly addressed the issue of conceptualization of translation in Chinese translation history and has engaged with the international turn. Cheung (2005, 2006, 2011, 2012) published a series of studies in this respect, mainly from the perspective of the Chinese discourse on translation and Chinese terms for ‘translation’. Her project of *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation* presents to translation studies in English a history of the Chinese thinking on translation from the 5th century to the 19th century.²⁰ Cheung also actively engaged in methodological reflections and innovations. In 2011, she proposed a conceptual framework for what she envisioned as an internationally cooperative project of investigating local, historical concepts of translation. Meanwhile, she proposed a ‘pushing-hands’ approach to translation history in 2012 that challenges the prevalent dichotomous thinking in existing translation research and beyond. Though Cheung has passed away, her ‘pushing-hands’ approach has encouraged more critical

²⁰ Cheung’s original plan for the second volume was to cover the period from the 13th century to the demise of the Qing dynasty in 1911. She had only finished the first volume, however, before she passed away in 2013. Robert Neather carried forward the editing of the second volume, but the final result covers a relatively shorter time-frame.

thinking on the study of translation history.²¹ As discussed in Chapter II, I adopt in this study the methodological principles of Microhistory which, as Cheung (2012) indicates in passing, shares with her ‘pushing-hands’ approach in “moving from dichotomous thinking to dialogic engagement” (167).

Eva Hung (2006) approaches the issue of Chinese conceptualizations of translation from a different angle—i.e. the translators and the actual nature of their work. Focusing on the collaborative mode of translation in pre-20th-century Chinese translation history, her work reveals the discrepancies between what translators actually *did* in Chinese history and the common contemporary (mis)representations of their translation activities in Chinese translation studies. Hung (2006) points out that the discrepancies, to a large extent, have resulted from contemporary Chinese scholars’ uncritical acceptance and internalization of a seemingly universal understanding of translation and the role of the translator. Her work highlights the importance of closely examining historical translation practices with valid approaches and self-reflexivity to improve our understanding of Chinese translation history.

Both Hung’s and Cheung’s researches are ground-breaking and thought-provoking. They map a large and under-explored yet potentially illuminating area in

²¹ Pushing-hands (*tuishou* 推手) is a non-violent form of Chinese martial art that, practiced by two people, “teaches the body not to react to force with force...but to yield to force in order to neutralize it and redirect it” (Cheung 2012, 161). Cheung borrows from the fundamental principles of this martial art practice—“attentiveness to the incoming force”, “continuous dialogic engagement”, and “reacting to force not with force but by displacing it and redirecting it, or even borrowing it to gain leverage over the other”—to shed light on the mediated nature of knowledge in historical research (ibid.). I would argue, as Wakabayashi (2016) also suggests, Cheung’s pushing-hands approach is more illuminating at an epistemological level which “helps open up a way to reconciling seemingly different approaches” to translation history rather than offering a specific methodological framework for conducting translation history (165). A group of scholars in the volume edited by Robinson (2016) has attempted to critically engage with, flesh out, and apply Cheung’s ‘pushing-hands’ approach to the study of translation history and theoretical reflections.

Chinese translation history. Also, by writing and publishing in English, their work has reached scholars beyond China and inspired cross-cultural dialogues with respect to the enterprise of enlarging the understanding of translation in a global context.²² Following Hung and Cheung, my current study of the conceptualizations of translation in China from the 1890s to the 1920s responds to the emerging interest in reconceptualization of translation and the call for the de-Westernization of translation studies.

Granted, the growing interest in moving beyond the discipline's Eurocentrism runs the risk of becoming a new version of Orientalism or even imperialism of "the resource-hungry West" (Trivedi 2006, 102), reifying and reinforcing the power differentials between the 'West' and the 'non-West'.²³ However, I agree with Wakabayashi (2014), among other scholars who call for the de-Westernization of translation studies, that "culture-specific practices and notions of translation merit study" for they could help "extend and deepen our understanding of translation-related thinking and praxis" in an international context (102). An important way to avoid the pitfalls of Neo-Orientalism, as discussed above, is to engage in conceptual, methodological, and theoretical reflections when investigating local translation histories. With the recent rapid development of translation studies in China, Chinese scholars have emerged as a growing international voice on matters regarding the Chinese translation tradition. Yet its rich history of translation practices, discussions,

²² One instance of such intellectual interchange is the engagement back and forth between Tymoczko (2007, 2010) and Cheung (2005, 2011).

²³ See Boyden (2011) for his criticism of the use of the concept 'Eurocentrism' for self-legitimization and the "overextension of identity claims" (174) in the recent interest in 'non-Western' discourses on translation on the part of 'Western' scholars. See Chesterman (2013) for his criticism of what he calls 'the genetic fallacy' in the de-Westernizing arguments in translation studies.

and conceptions is yet to be explored with apposite approaches. That is, instead of simply being “used conveniently to prove certain existing or future theory” (Hung 2006, 158), Chinese translation history could and should be studied in ways that can effectively contribute to international translation scholarship. In the following section, I review the relevant scholarship on Chinese translation history to present the rationale for my project.

1.4 Rationale

As reviewed here, the historical period under study, spanning the end of the Qing dynasty (1644-1911) and the first half of Republican China (1912-1949), has in recent decades received considerable scholarly attention in translation studies. However, there is still a lack of focus specifically on the conceptualizations of translation in this historical period and there remains a pervasive, persistent ‘May Fourth paradigm’ that greatly hampers critical examination of the shifting conceptualizations of translation during this period.

1.4.1 Previous scholarship on Chinese translation history from the late 19th to early 20th centuries

China’s translation history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries has provided translation studies scholars with fertile ground for investigating a variety of issues, especially with respect to the crucial role of translation in shaping the course of history or effecting cultural and social changes. Especially with the introduction of Western translation studies theories, frameworks, and methods, there has been a considerable amount of scholarly work on both translation practices and discussions about

translation in these four decades (e.g. Pollard 1998b; Qin 2009; X. Wang 2006; Zhao 2007; Zhang 2006; Liao 2010).

In terms of translation practice, previous scholars have investigated various aspects of the translation realities in this period. They have tried to answer the basic questions: “Who translated what, how, where, when, for whom and with what effect?” and they have also provided analyses and interpretations of the translation realities within certain theoretical frameworks. Especially on the doctoral level, polysystem theory and norms theory constitute the most commonly used dual theoretical frameworks for describing and investigating this part of Chinese translation history. Altogether, these previous studies on translation practices have contributed to a better knowledge of such issues as the translation norms, the status of translation in the then Chinese polysystem, and the translators’ roles in the larger social, cultural, and political contexts.

In particular, with the help of the concept of norms as patterned behavior, previous studies have been able to describe the dominant views—as well as the changes in the dominant views—of translation in China from late Qing through to the first part of the Republican era (e.g. Kwan 2008; Hu 2007b; Liao 2010). This body of scholarship thus contributes to the knowledge of the conceptualizations of translation in China at that time. However, as Crisafulli (2002) points out, “the assumption that corpora may be representative of translation behaviour is highly problematic”, and, in the kind of historical investigations undertaken within the norms theoretical framework, the focus has been mainly on the sociological aspects rather than the individual translators (32). That is, as Crisafulli further explains, “scholars ...tend to subsume all the translator’s

interventions—even those that occur in single target texts—under the concept of norm-governed or patterned behaviour” and offer explanations based on the collective social forces behind those norms (ibid., 34). Though not focused on historical conceptualizations of translation, Crisafulli nonetheless identifies the problem of studying conceptualizations of translation merely through the lens of norms. As discussed later, the adoption of norms theory, to a certain extent, has perpetuated the May Fourth paradigm in the existing Chinese translation historiography that I seek to challenge in this dissertation.

In terms of the discourse on translation, there have also been continuous efforts since the 1980s to anthologize and study Chinese translation theory (*lilun* 理论), many of which include writings on translation from the late-Qing and early-Republican period (e.g. Luo 1984; Chen 1996; Wang 2003; Chan 2004; Wang 2004). These anthologists and historians have their own understandings of what Chinese translation ‘theory (*lilun*)’ is and their own narrative frames. On one end of the spectrum, Chan (2004) seems to subscribe to a modern/Western idea of ‘theory’ that emphasizes systematic reasoning. He does not see much theoretical significance in most of the fragmentary remarks on translation from the early 20th century. Explicit, systematic discussions on translation, of course, constitute the most accessible body of primary sources about historical conceptualizations of translation. However, the focus on such “direct discourse on translation”, to use Cheung’s (2006) phrase, excludes other primary sources that could be informative about Chinese thinking about translation. On the other end, Luo’s, Chen’s, Wang Hongyin’s, and Wang Bingqin’s understandings of ‘theory’—denoted in their works by the words *lilun* or *sixiang* 思想

(thought)—are more inclusive. The concepts of *lilun* and *sixiang* in the Chinese tradition embrace impressionistic and non-systematic remarks, which allow them to include a broader range of primary sources. In such efforts to reconstruct a long, continuous Chinese tradition of thinking on translation, however, these scholars all retrospectively impose a nationalistic perspective on their reconstruction of a Chinese tradition of translation theory (see also 3.1.2).

In sum, the existing scholarship has established a foundation for understanding how translation was understood and practiced at that time, yet, as the brief review above indicates, many methodological issues remain to be addressed in studying the historical conceptualizations of translation in the Chinese context. In the following, I critically engage with the ‘May Fourth paradigm’ in particular and the prevalent grand narrative it has helped to construct in previous scholarship.

1.4.2 The ‘May Fourth paradigm’ in Chinese translation historiography

One central methodological problem in the existing scholarship on Chinese translation history from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries is the establishment of a ‘May Fourth paradigm’.²⁴ In this study, I address two main manifestations of this problem: one is related to periodization, and the other is the exclusive association of the ‘modern’ with the New Culture Movement in constructing the narrative of the translation history during the May Fourth period (1919-1929).

In the existing literature, there has been a conceptual divide between the ‘May Fourth period’ and the period(s) before it—either ‘late Qing’ (*qingmo* 清末) or ‘late

²⁴ In Chinese studies, there has also been a ‘May Fourth paradigm’ which has been challenged over the past three decades (e.g. Link 1981; Wang 1997; Chow et al. 2008).

Qing and early Republic of China' (*qingmo minchu* 清末民初). Prior studies usually focus on either of these two sub-periods as a distinctive stage in Chinese translation history, with more emphasis on the differences and changes than the inherent associations or continuities. The 'late-Qing period' usually refers to the period extending from the last decade of the 19th century to the demise of the Qing dynasty in 1911, while the 'late-Qing and early-Republican period' also includes the several years of the Republican era which came before the May Fourth period. In other words, these two terms have been employed to denote roughly the same era right before—and, more importantly, in contrast to—the celebrated May Fourth period. Another common set of phrases which serves almost the same periodization function in Chinese-language scholarship is *jindai* 近代 versus *xiandai* 现代.²⁵ *Xiandai* is the standard Chinese term for translating 'modern'; *jindai* is often accordingly translated into English as 'early modern', capturing the sense of 'proto-modern' if not merely 'traditional'.²⁶ It is obvious from the employment of these two sets of terms for periodization that the beginning of the May Fourth period is considered as constituting a watershed that separates two sub-periods in modern Chinese history. Moreover, the first five or six years of Republican China seem almost negligible in Chinese translation historiography, mostly taken as a continuation of the previous late-Qing period in terms of translation practice and conceptualization.

²⁵ See Oksenberg (1993) for a brief review on how ideology has affected the periodization and conceptualization of modern Chinese history on the Chinese mainland.

²⁶ In fact, *jindai* and *xiandai*, together with *dangdai* 当代 (contemporary), are common terms to designate different periods in Chinese history on the Chinese mainland. According to the official definitions in *Xiandai hanyu cidian* 现代汉语词典 (Contemporary Chinese Dictionary), *jindai* covers the period from 1840 to 1919; *xiandai* refers to the period from after 1919 to 1949, before the People's Republic of China (PRC) was founded; *dangdai* refers to the PRC era, from 1949 to the present. The specific scope of each concept, however, varies from case to case depending on each scholar's own understanding.

Granted, these two sub-periods do present rather distinct characteristics on various levels. During those four decades, there was an apparent shift in both the common modes of operation in translation practice and the public discussions about translation. To offer a simplistic generalization of the two sub-periods based on existing scholarship (e.g. Chan 2001; Xie and Zha 2004; Kwan 2008; Qin 2009; Liao 2010; Zhao 2013): The first two decades, i.e., the late-Qing and early Republican periods, are characterized by target-text oriented translation norms, common practices of collaborative translation and relay translation through Japanese, as well as little theoretical interest in translation. The latter two decades, however, witnessed the rise of source-text oriented norms, a new generation of translators with competence in foreign languages, and fierce debates about translation. A limited focus on each sub-period by itself, it should be acknowledged, does allow for more detailed and in-depth analysis within a manageable scope.

However, the changes we are discussing did not occur neatly or all at once; the shifts did not have clear-cut lines of demarcation. By dividing those four decades into two largely isolated sub-periods, the previous scholarship collectively creates a grand narrative that presumes the existence of a shift from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ practices and conceptualizations of translation without taking a closer and more critical look at the shift itself. Such a construction of history, which neatly divides two distinct periods, runs the risk of exaggerating differences and changes while obscuring the equally significant ‘inheritance within rupture,’²⁷ as well as the heterogeneity of voices and the complexity of history.

²⁷ I here borrow the phrase from the title of Luo Zhitian’s (2015) book (in English translation) on the cultural and intellectual fields in modern China.

Another manifestation of the May Fourth paradigm is the indisputably dominant status that the existing scholarship has attached to the New Culture Movement in the construction of modern Chinese translation history. That is, while the May Fourth period has been considered as the modern era of Chinese translation history, in terms of both translation practice and translation theory, most scholars associate this modernity only with the New Culture Movement and its advocates. Other cultural actors who were active in this period but who did not participate in or even opposed the New Culture Movement—and their ideas and practices of translation—have been mostly marginalized in the narrative construction of this ‘modern’ period of Chinese translation history. This is largely due to the canonization of the New Culture Movement, as mentioned earlier, in the official historiography in People’s Republic of China (PRC) in general. Such an ideologically slanted view of ‘translational modernity’—what makes translation practice and theory ‘modern’—in Chinese history presents an extremely narrow and homogeneous picture of the Chinese conceptualizations of translation during this period.

In sum, the influence of the May Fourth paradigm on Chinese translation historiography has created a situation where scholars tend to put more emphasis on conspicuous changes and distinctive stages of translation activities in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Based on my research, I have developed a different narrative for this part of Chinese translation history. It is different in the sense of being a more nuanced description and interpretation of how different cultural actors, both the effector and the effected of historical changes, understood *fanyi* (as either the process, the product, or the agent who produces the product).

1.4.3 The grand narrative of progression from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ periods of Chinese translation history

The May Fourth paradigm also underlies the construction of the existing grand narrative about Chinese translation history from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries. This grand narrative not only presents the May Fourth period as the modern stage in contrast to the previous two decades but also constructs a teleological progression from the early ‘traditional’ period (i.e. the late-Qing and early-Republican period) to the ‘modern’ period (i.e. the May Fourth period). It is teleological because this transformational period has often been presented in a narrative which presumes that the traditional practices and perceptions of translation were destined to be influenced and replaced by the new practices and ideas of translation during the May Fourth period. Though this grand narrative is pervasive in the existing scholarship, scholars have rarely explicitly laid out and justified the criteria for measuring the ‘modernity’ of practices or conceptions of translation. Rather, the standards for making this judgment are implied in the way the existing scholarship has constructed the history of translation from the late 19th to early 20th centuries. In what follows, I try to draw out what these implied criteria are.

The construction of the dichotomy between ‘modern’ versus ‘traditional’ periods of Chinese translation history can be traced to the early stage of the New Culture Movement. At the turn of the century, young advocates of the New Culture Movement—what I call New Culturalists, also known as May Fourth intellectuals—started off by levelling scathing criticism at other cultural actors who espoused different views and by conducting self-canonizing rewritings of Chinese literary

history (see e.g. Zhixi 1919; Fu 1919; Zheng 1924; Hu 1920/1953).²⁸ They lashed out at the literary practices of such prominent cultural actors as Lin Shu and what they labelled the ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ and consigned them to the undesirable realm of ‘*jiu* 旧’ (old, traditional, out-dated). The main problems with the translation practices of these ‘traditional’ cultural actors, according to these New Culturalists, included the low literary quality of the original texts they had chosen to translate, unfaithfulness of their translations to the original texts (especially the practices of heavy rewriting and bowdlerization), and their use of classical Chinese for translation (see e.g. Zhixi 1919; Fu 1919; Zheng 1924; Hu 1920/1953). Eventually, the New Culturalists gained the upper hand in the discursive spaces and were later canonized in PRC historiography. Their views of how the translation practices in the May Fourth period were ‘new’ as compared to those in the previous decades were handed down and have dominated the scholarship until this day (e.g. Chen 1929; Shi 1990; Guo 2000; Qin 2009; Zhao 2013).

In terms of the discourse on translation, it is a common view in the existing scholarship that “it is in the May Fourth Period that one sees translation theory entering a distinctly modern phase” (Chan 2001, 196). Chan suggests that what makes translation theory in this period ‘modern’ is the fact that the fierce debates over translation issues were closely entangled with the May Fourth project to “modernize the nation on the political, cultural and linguistic levels” (ibid., 198). In other words, according to Chan, the ‘modernity’ of Chinese translation theory is subsumed under

²⁸ See, for instance, Chen (2008) and the first four contributions to *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China’s May Fourth Project*, edited by Doleželová-Velingerová, Král, and Sanders (2001), for discussions on how the May-Fourth intellectuals asserted their hegemonic power and became canonized in modern Chinese history.

or symptomatic of the larger narrative of modernity provided by the May Fourth/New Culture Movement. Such an understanding of translational modernity is simplistic. Another main criterion for assessing the ‘modernity’ of the discourse on translation seems to be the degree of systematic reasoning, especially among Chinese scholars who subscribe to such a Western notion of ‘theory’.²⁹ That is, the more systematic the discussion on translation is, the more ‘modern’ it is. Though the discourse on translation during the May Fourth period might still fall short of the contemporary Western standards of ‘theory’, it was much more direct, systematic, and hence ‘modern’ than the fragmentary, sporadic discussions on translation found in prefaces and postscripts from the late-Qing and early-Republican period. Scholars who adopt Western ideas of ‘theory’ tend to dismiss many of the discussions about translation from the late-Qing and early-Republican period as primary sources for modern Chinese translation theory.

The Chinese modernity issue is incontrovertibly complex and multi-faceted. In Chinese studies, for example, there has been a concerted effort since the 1980s to challenge the pivotal position of the May Fourth/New Culture Movement in defining Chinese literary modernity (see e.g. Link 1981; L. Liu 1995; Wang 1997; Doleželová-Velingerová, Král, and Sanders 2001; Chow et al. 2008a). In the literature, as summarized by Chow et al. (2008b), there are two main strategies for decentering ‘May Fourth’ in the historiography of modern China: one is the turn to studying marginalized cultural actors and the other is to critically examine the May Fourth

²⁹ Since the 1980s, as Sun (2012) observes, there has been a “growing disenchantment with traditional Chinese translation theory, which came to be seen as insufficiently theoretical and unduly fragmentary” (36). As noted by Cheung (2003), *lilun* 理论, the standard Chinese word to translate ‘theory’, is a loan word, with a complicated history, that “did not come into currency until some time in the late Qing and early Republican era” (392).

legacy (1-7). Applying these strategies, Chinese studies scholarship has started to “conceptualize modernity as a multifaceted enterprise that transcended the polarity of tradition and the ‘new’” (ibid., 4).

Moreover, Chinese studies scholars in the recent two decades have shown an emerging interest in the issue of translation which has helped to broaden the scholarly exploration of Chinese modernity (e.g. Liu 1995; Chen 2003; Hanan 2004; Hill 2013). There has also been a growing cross-disciplinary dialogue between Chinese studies and translation studies (e.g. Pollard 1998b; St. André and Peng 2012; Peng and Rabut 2014). As Lydia Liu (1999) points out, “[t]he problem of translation has become increasingly central to critical reflections on modernity” (1). By analyzing how Chinese literary figures translated Western fiction and internalized its narrative structures and techniques in their own original writing, scholars have been able to generate a more nuanced and dynamic view of the formation of modern Chinese literature (e.g. J. Chen 2002; P. Chen 2003, 2005). Meanwhile, ‘translation’ has also been used as a trope to rethink interlingual and cross-cultural encounters, negotiations, and exchanges.³⁰ For instance, Liu’s (1995) seminal work, *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937*, treats translation as part of a broad range of what she calls *translingual practices* in China’s “contact/collision with European languages and literatures” in the first part of 20th century (xvi). Though not focused on analyzing actual translated texts, Liu uses the concept of translation to open up new avenues for rethinking the issue of Chinese agency in the mediated process of forming and canonizing Chinese literary modernity

³⁰ See Chapter 4 and Chapter 5 in Guldin (2016) for a review of the different metaphorical uses of the concept of translation in other disciplines such as psychoanalysis, postcolonial theory, literature, and sociology.

beyond the conventional ‘dominance/resistance’ model.³¹ Whether treated as actual textual activities or tropes for the processes of transformation, transaction, or negotiation, the issue of translation serves, in this Chinese studies scholarship, as a useful and fresh perspective for studying and reconsidering Chinese modernity in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Yet these two approaches are not applicable in my field of inquiry, for I seek to find out how the Chinese conceptualized translation in this historical period.

In recent years, Chinese translation studies has also turned its attention to marginalized cultural actors and their translation activities in studying Chinese translation history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (e.g. Li and Deng 2004; Wang 2008; Xiu 2014; Bai 2017). As I review in more detail in each case study, the study of marginalized cultural actors in the previous scholarship is still at the stage of describing and analyzing their long-neglected translation activities. These emerging studies, overall, complement the general picture of Chinese translation history that still centers on the May Fourth/New Culture Movement. In these studies, however, the grand narrative of ‘tradition’ versus ‘modernity’ in Chinese translation historiography mostly remains unchallenged.

Therefore, this study aims to address this scholarly gap in Chinese translation studies. The identification of the May Forth paradigm allows me to design my case studies in such a way as to challenge the teleological, linear grand narrative about

³¹ See Robinson (2017) for a critical analysis of Liu’s—as well as Naoki Sakai’s and Jon Solomon’s—approaches to translation. Robinson groups them together under the rubric *Critical Translation Studies*. In fact, Robinson comments that these scholars seem to have bypassed the scholarship in contemporary translation studies in the recent two decades while translation studies scholars either know very little about these scholars’ discussions of translation or have been mostly at a loss how to engage with them (ibid., ix-xi).

Chinese translation history in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (see 1.5). The May Fourth paradigm and the grand narrative it helps to construct have constituted a lens for understanding and analyzing the history of translation and especially the transitions in the conceptualizations of translation in this period. Embedding the narrative of translation events in a predetermined, progressive history, such a frame leads to a preemptive epistemological closure pertaining to the shifts in Chinese conceptualizations of translation. Therefore, by critically interrogating and scrutinizing the May Fourth paradigm and the dichotomy of ‘old/traditional’ versus ‘new/modern’, my study provides fresh insights into and a better knowledge of the changing conceptualizations of translation in the historical period under study.

I also challenge the existing grand narrative in the study of Chinese translation history to address the issue of self-representation of Chinese culture in the international field of translation studies. Only with a better knowledge of the conceptualizations of translation in the Chinese context can we start to engage in meaningful cross-cultural dialogue and “help recalibrate the discourse on translation” which has been so far established on Eurocentric conceptions, practices, and histories of translation (Wakabayashi 2014, 102). Therefore, by expanding our understanding of local forms of knowledge about translation in a transitional period in Chinese history, this study aims to provoke a rethinking and widening of the nature and definition of translation and contribute to the internationalization of translation studies.

1.5 Dissertation outline

In Chapter II, I discuss my theoretical framework and methodology. I propose to use New Historicism to engage with both Barthes's theory of intertextuality and Genette's framework of paratextuality in order to apply them more effectively in the Chinese context. In the second half of Chapter II, I discuss the multiple-case study method I adopt to conduct an intertextual reading of the various textual materials under investigation and how I borrow from Microhistory to modify the case study method commonly used in translation studies. I conduct three case studies in this thesis, not only to capture a diversity of views of translation in disparate forms of textual materials but also to challenge the aforementioned teleological grand narrative.

Chapters III, IV, and V each focus on one of the three case studies. Each case study covers a different span of time from the 1890s to the 1920s. The first case study focuses on what I call 'non-discussions' about translation in the emerging public discursive space in late Qing (1890-1911). More specifically, I examine a translation review that does not focus on any translational aspects of the reviewed translations. This review was written by a lesser-known late-Qing cultural actor, Zhong Junwen 钟俊文 (1865-1908), and published in the periodical that he himself ran. Based on an intertextual reading of this review and other contemporaneous non-discussions on translation, I highlight and explore the cultural logic underlying the blurred lines between writing, translating, editing, and compiling in the conceptualizations of translation in this period.

In Chapter IV, I move on to the first few years of Republican China (1912-1918). In this case study, I focus on the various layers of paratextual materials accompanying

Zhou Shoujuan's 周瘦鹃 (1895-1968) 1917 translation anthology. These writings comprise a multifaceted discursive space: on the one hand, Zhou Shoujuan and the contributors to the prefaces in this anthology have been commonly classified as belonging to the 'Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies School', which was relegated by the New Culturalists to the realm of 'old' Chinese literature; on the other, the 'official' review of the anthology was drafted by one of the most prominent new Culturalists—Lu Xun 鲁迅 (1881-1936)—in the name of the then Ministry of Education. I juxtapose my analysis of these different paratexts to show that there were different ideas and attitudes regarding translation during that period. Also, by being the first study to trace the prehistory of the translations included in the anthology, this case study questions the previous scholarship's construction of Zhou's changing conception of translation based on the May Fourth paradigm. The heterogeneity of the discursive space surrounding this publication challenges the existing linear grand narrative about the transformation from 'traditional' to 'modern' conceptualizations of translation in China from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries.

In Chapter V, I examine the cultural continuities that persisted within the changes in practices and perceptions of translation during the May Fourth period (1915-1929). This case study focuses on Wu Mi's 吴宓 (1894-1978) writings about and practices of translation in the journal *Xueheng* 学衡 (Critical Review, 1922-1933). Wu was a leading member of the Xueheng School which openly opposed the New Culture Movement and hence has been long excluded from the canon of modern Chinese literature and intellectual history. I not only examine how Wu conceptualized translation in relation to imitation and literary creation in his writings on translation,

but also look at his use of *pingdian* commentaries—a traditional Chinese commentary practice that challenges the distinction between text and paratext—in his fiction translations. In my analysis, I show that the seeming differences between Wu's and New Culturalists' understandings of translation lie in the polemical nature of their discussion and their different visions of Chinese modernity.

In the Conclusion, I will revisit this study's line of inquiry, assess its main contributions and implications, and propose areas for further research.

Chapter II Theoretical Framework, Methodology, and Research Methods

In this study, as explained in the Introduction, I assess the shifting Chinese conceptions of translation from the angle of the conceptual relationships between translatorship and authorship. The concept of intertextuality, the basic idea of which is the relational nature of texts and textual meaning, provides an important theoretical framework for reorienting the thinking about translation and translatorship. In particular, Roland Barthes's (1977a, b, 1981) version of the concept of intertextuality helps break down the essentialist conceptual boundaries between such textual activities as writing, reading, and translating. That is, Barthes's development of the notion of intertextuality deconstructs the illusion of literary originality as *creatio ex nihilo* and highlights the derivative nature of all types of textual production. Such a framework allows me a new avenue for recognizing and discussing the translator's position in relation to other textual roles such as writer, commentator, editor, and reader in the context of the collective, collaborative Chinese textual tradition.

In the existing scholarship on Chinese translation history from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries, as reviewed in Chapter I, the concept of translation norms (as patterned translation behaviors within a particular sociocultural situation) has helped to probe the dominant conceptions of translation in a culture at a particular time. However, within the framework of norms theory, scholars mainly focus on the translated texts themselves and semi-theoretical or critical statements about translation as main sources for (re)constructing the translation norms within that particular

sociocultural situation.¹ Such a focus has excluded many forms of textual traces from the past that are also informative about how translation might have been conceptualized. The notion of paratext, proposed by Gérard Genette, offers another important perspective from which to investigate historical conceptualizations of translation by drawing attention to those (verbal and non-verbal) textual materials that surround, frame, and present a published text. These paratextual materials—book titles, prefaces, notes, dedications, illustrations, etc.—mediate between the world of the text and the world in which it is consumed, and hence offer important insights into the production and reception of the text as well as the mediation and agency of the translator and other agents involved in the production. In historical translation research, as Tahir-Gürçağlar (2010) points out, the study of paratexts that accompany and present translated texts help “provide the researcher with information pertaining to the translation strategies and the concept of translation operational in the specific work” (115). Taking Tahir-Gürçağlar’s and other like-minded translation studies scholars’ lead, I include in my investigation a broad range of paratextual materials—prefaces, interlinear comments, titles, emphatic punctuation—that physically surround translated texts. This allows me to reveal those aspects of the conceptualizations of translation ignored or undertheorized in previous studies that mainly focus on the analysis of past translated texts or past translation theories. Where I move beyond Genette and Tahir-Gürçağlar is in the non-hierarchical manner in which I view the relationship between paratext and text.

¹ In fact, Toury (2000) takes translated texts as the “*primary* products of norm-regulated behaviour” and hence “immediate representations” of norm-regulated behavior while taking normative pronouncements to be “*by-products* of the existence and activity of norms” (207; original italics).

As I will explain more fully below, neither Barthes's theory of intertextuality nor Genette's theory of paratextuality, as they have been adopted in translation studies, are readily applicable by themselves for a historical investigation into Chinese conceptualizations of translation. New Historicism provides a historically and socially grounded framework for me to engage with both Barthes's concept of intertextuality and Genette's framework of paratextuality in a non-hierarchical manner. New Historicism, itself theoretically dependent on the concept of intertextuality, argues that various types of textual artifacts interact with each other discursively and should be viewed as having equal discursive status. I extend this non-hierarchical notion to the relationship between text and paratext. In this way, I can effectively describe and assess translated literature, non-literary texts, and different textual materials surrounding the translated literature—prefaces, reviews, commentaries, etc.—as different yet equal modes of discursive practice that can inform us about Chinese conceptualizations of translation.

In the following sections, I first provide a more detailed introduction to the concept of intertextuality (2.1), Genette's theory of paratextuality (2.2), and New Historicism (2.3) before explaining how I engage with this assortment of theories to understand and analyze the conceptualizations of translation in late Qing and early Republican China. Then, in 2.4, I borrow from the methodological principles of Microhistory to argue for my use of the multiple-case study method.

2.1 Intertextuality and Translation Studies

2.1.1 The protean concept of intertextuality

There are few words that are so widely disseminated and belong so naturally to the modern critical vocabulary as the term *intertextuality*. First coined by Julia Kristeva (1968) to introduce Mikhail Bakhtin's work to French critical circles, the word *intertextuality* (*intertextualité* in French) has been variously defined and appropriated in a broad range of contemporary disciplines, including literary criticism, culture studies, and text linguistics. When Kristeva coined this word, she did not clearly define what she meant by *intertextuality*; rather, she used the term in an appositional manner to gloss Bakhtin's theory of dialogism. The resulting ambiguity has offered critics and scholars a fertile source for theoretical productivity and flexibility in the later development and usage of the term *intertextuality*. As a result, the word has developed divergent meanings in different disciplines. Every theorist, in his or her efforts to appropriate and expound this concept, has exploited this flexibility and extended its range of meanings to overflowing. For instance, *intertextuality* can be utilized either to attack authorial intention and authority in a poststructuralist manner (Barthes 1977b) or to look for interpretive certainty in literature and literary systems in a structuralist scheme (Genette 1997a; Riffaterre 1990). *Intertextuality* can also refer to a text's relation to the abstract discursive space of a culture (in its poststructuralist versions) or the specific, definite relations of a work to particular prior texts (in its structuralist versions). The relational nature of texts for some scholars, such as Harold Bloom (1997), only exists within the literary context. But for others—for instance, Kristeva (1980)—an intertextual relationship also exists between literary

texts and cultural, social texts. In this sense, *intertextuality* has truly come to mean “nothing more than whatever each particular critic wishes it to mean” (Allen 2000, 2).² What unites or underlies all the different versions of the concept of intertextuality is the recognition of and emphasis on the relational nature of texts—the kernel of meaning conveyed by the term *intertextuality*.

Despite its wide dissemination in academic discourse, the concept of intertextuality has also incurred certain criticism concerning its semantic opacity and later divergence. *Intertextuality* has for some become a “terminological Babylon” that exemplifies such problems as “fondness for fashionable theories, and unnecessary renaming of known phenomena” in academia (Juvan 2008, 6). For Irwin (2004), the term *intertextuality* has been overused, so its meaning has become vague and abstract and its viability thus weak. Such criticisms are legitimate, and they apply directly to the fervent yet chaotic borrowings of various theorizations of intertextuality in Chinese translation studies (see 2.2.3).

Though also troubled by the conceptual equivocality of the term *intertextuality* in translation studies, I nonetheless think the concept of intertextuality—the relational nature of texts—is useful for discussing the issue of text(uality) in Chinese translation history. In particular, the Barthesian notion of intertextuality provides a basic conceptual model for discussing the reader-author relationship in the Chinese textual tradition. The way in which I adapt Barthes’s theorization of intertextuality is different from the existing ways in which the concept of intertextuality has been traditionally

² For more comprehensive literature reviews on the various theorizations on the concept of intertextuality, see Worton and Still (1990), Graham Allen (2000), Mary Orr (2003), and Marko Juvan (2008) in English, and Luo Xuanmin (2006) in Chinese.

applied in translation studies. In the following, I provide an overview of the three main approaches to intertextuality in translation studies.

2.1.2 Previous applications of theories of intertextuality in translation studies

Translation studies scholars have adopted various versions of the concept of intertextuality since the 1980s to serve their respective theoretical goals. I have classified Western scholarship on translation and intertextuality into three strands, based on the particular understandings of the concept of intertextuality and the ways in which scholars have integrated it within their theoretical agendas.

The first approach to intertextuality in translation studies uses poststructuralist theorizations on intertextuality to argue for a reevaluation of the importance of literary translators and translation based on a reversal of the conceptual relation between the translation and the original. The most frequently invoked poststructuralist theorists of intertextuality are Roland Barthes (1975, 1977a, b, 1981), Jacques Derrida (1982, 1985, 1987), and Michel Foucault (1980).³

Barthes's version of intertextuality, crystallized in his phrase "the death of the Author" (1977b), serves as important theoretical ammunition for challenging the traditional conceptions of translation in (Western) translation studies. According to Barthes (1977b), the Author-god, who is conventionally conceived of as the ultimate authority regarding the meaning of the text, in fact does not have the ability to freely express his own feelings, state of mind, or intentions—to control the univocal meaning

³ Though Kristeva is widely acknowledged as the inventor of the term *intertextuality*, her ideas are rarely invoked directly or in detail in translation studies. For a discussion on the delegation and marginalization of Kristeva's contribution to the concept of intertextuality in the academia see Mary Orr (2003).

of the text. Instead, the meaning of a text is derived from previous and surrounding texts—i.e. “the various languages or signifying practices of a culture” (Culler 1981, 103). Via such a concept of intertextuality, Barthes disillusioned the reader about the idea of literary originality. Reading is no longer the search for some stable or ultimate meaning intended by the Author, but becomes something playful and erotic. Since translating consists of reading and (re)writing, translation studies scholars argue that the translator is no longer cramped by the task of uncovering the authorial meaning of the original text and transferring it intact into another language (e.g. Littau 1993, 1997; Bassnett 1998a, b). Hence, Barthes’s version of intertextuality enables this strand of scholars to argue for the creativity and subjectivity of the literary translator and to improve his/her status vis-à-vis the ‘original’ author.

This group of scholars also frequently draws on Derrida’s theorizations. Derrida’s most important contribution to the development of the concept of intertextuality is his idea of ‘*différance*’. He interprets and builds upon Saussure’s proposition that language is a relational system of differences and argues that meaning is caught up in an infinite chain of signification, always *differing* and *deferring* (Derrida 1982, 1987). In this light, there is no stable, definite, or ultimate meaning to be located in a simple one-to-one correspondence between the signifier and the signified. Hence, for translation studies scholars, there is no sense in talking about meaning recovery, equivalence, or faithfulness (Arrojo 1997; Littau 1997). Scholars have also built upon Derrida’s (and Paul de Man’s) re-readings of Walter Benjamin’s “The Task of the Translator” to reassess the importance of translation and the translator (e.g. Venuti 1992). Benjamin holds that the original depends on translation for its afterlife, while

Derrida (1985) goes even further by arguing that the so-called ‘original’ requires translation for it is, by definition, incomplete from the outset. According to either view, therefore, the conventional original-translation relation is reversed—translation is either the survival of the ‘original’ or already present within the ‘original’ at its point of ‘origin’.

Foucault’s theory, for some scholars within this first group, opens up another avenue for challenging the conventional social construction of translation with respect to original writing. Foucault (1980) argues that the ‘author’ in Western tradition is a historically, socially, and ideologically constructed concept which functions as a certain regulatory principle to prevent or, at least, reduce the possibility of meaning proliferation. Analogously, Littau (1993) argues that the inferiorization of translation and translatorship is “nothing other than the attempt to reduce its potential for multitudes” (64), for translation exactly brings about uncontrollable differences and the proliferation of meaning (see also Arrojo 1997; Littau 1997).⁴

In summary, the above-mentioned poststructuralist thinkers have deconstructed the ideas of literary originality, univocity of meaning, unity of language, binary opposition, and ultimately the logocentrism of the Western metaphysical tradition. These poststructuralist ideas about text, language, meaning, and the subject are all embraced by the semantic range of the term *intertextuality* as they define it. With the help of these poststructuralist ideas, this strand of translation studies scholars has challenged conventional Western conceptions of translation and translatorship.

⁴ Though not explicitly invoking Foucault, Venuti (2009) discusses the possibility of exploiting the proliferation of meaning in translation, arguing that a theoretically self-conscious translator can and should intentionally “inscribe an interrogative interpretation by constructing intertextual relations that are pertinent to the form and theme of the foreign text” (168).

In sharp contrast, there is a second major strand of scholars who view intertextuality as a specific textual relationship in translation practice. Linguistically and practically oriented, this group of translation studies scholars mainly focus on how to deal with (or how translators have been dealing with) intertextual references in translation practice (e.g. Hatim and Mason 1990; Neubert and Shreve 1992; Al-Taher 2008; Moreton 2010; Schäffner 2012). They mostly borrow from more concrete approaches to intertextuality, such as de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) development of intertextuality as one of the seven standards of textuality and Fairclough's (1992) contribution to intertextuality in critical discourse analysis. These scholars downplay the poststructuralist theorists' reflections on intertextuality and translation as too abstract and elusive to work with. Hatim and Mason (1990), for instance, accept Kristeva's and Barthes's theorizations on intertextuality only in the sense that they acknowledge these poststructuralist thinkers' contribution to a more dynamic, culturally and ideologically sophisticated notion of signification which helps translation studies move beyond the naive, value-neutral notions of meaning and translation (121, 124-5). They build upon this implication of intertextuality to take into consideration the socio-cultural, political, and ideological factors at play in translation practice.

Generally, in this second strand, the scholars bring the concept of intertextuality into their equivalence-based conceptual framework to enlarge its purview. For instance, building upon de Beaugrande and Dressler's (1981) work in text linguistics, Neubert and Shreve (1992) understand and describe intertextuality as a text's relationship with other texts in either the source-language culture or the target-language culture. They

are particularly interested in a target-text intertextuality⁵ which imposes constraints on achieving an adequate translation (117-23). Most of these scholars attempt to offer advice for handling intertextual relations in translation practice (see Hatim and Mason 1990; Neubert and Shreve 1992; Mur Dueñas 2005; Al-Taher 2008; Moreton 2010). Their common advice includes: 1) erudition—to build a good knowledge of both source-language and target-language cultures; 2) awareness of intertextuality, especially the motivation behind the use of each intertextual reference and its functional importance in the source text; 3) specific strategies to maintain *equivalence* to source-text intertextuality. This adherence to the notion of equivalence (though finer in definition) is exactly what distinguishes the second approach from the first approach to intertextuality in translation studies.

The third approach to intertextuality, developed by Theo Hermans (2003, 2007a, b), is different from both of the previous two approaches. Though it also critically engages with the concept of equivalence, the conceptual relationship between the source text and the target text is not radically reversed by invoking poststructuralist theories of intertextuality. For Hermans, the concept of intertextuality replaces that of equivalence and possesses much stronger explanatory power.

Hermans (2003, 2007a, b) sets the concept of intertextuality against that of equivalence in this way: Equivalence is not an intrinsic semantic feature of the relation between the source text and the target text. Rather, it is an imposed illusion “through an external, institutional, perlocutionary speech act” (Hermans 2007a, 24). Then he argues that (total) equivalence is impossible in translation, for the moment the

⁵ Neubert and Shreve’s target-text intertextuality is somewhat similar to Hermans’s translation-specific intertextuality (see below), though each is situated within distinctive theoretical projects.

translation possesses equal value, status, and authority with the original, it ceases to be a translation. To sensibly and profitably talk about translation, therefore, one needs to move on from the paradoxically invalid notion of equivalence and treat a translation as only one possible realization of the source text. That is, not only does a translation engage with existing translations of the same target text, but it in itself also implies the possibility of other renderings. Such a conception “opens up an intertextual dimension specific to the domain of translation” with the original text out of sight (Hermans 2007b, 60). This self-referentiality of translation is part of what Hermans terms *translation-specific intertextuality* (or *intratranslational intertextuality*).

Hermans’s concept of translation-specific intertextuality is developed on the basis of Gérard Genette’s (1997a) version of intertextuality—in Genette’s terminology, ‘transtextuality’ (see also 2.2.1). From Genette’s theory of the sign-system of literature, Hermans adapts the concepts of specific intertextuality, metatextuality, and architextuality to the study of translated literature.⁶ According to Hermans, both specific intertextuality (the presence of one text in another) and metatextuality (commentary upon a text) are at work when a translation alludes in a critical manner to previous translations of the same source text. Hermans’s term *generic intertextuality*, which Genette calls *architextuality*, denotes the relationship between a particular translation and the entire generic tradition of translations of this type. Hermans (2007b) instead uses the term *architextuality* to designate a translation’s relation to the social conception of legitimate, proper translation within a given culture at a specific time

⁶ Hermans did not bring up this term in “Equivalence, Intertextuality and Translation” (2003), though he already put forward the concept of metatextuality in both this essay and “Translation, Irritation and Resonance” (2007b). He started to openly refer to Genette’s term *metatextuality* (the wording of it is *a metatextual aspect*) in *Conference of the Tongues* published in 2007. For a brief explanation of Genette’s various concepts, see 2.2.1.

(61). Thus, when adapting Genette's theory to the study of translation, Hermans separates the category of generic intertextuality into two levels—one concerns the translation of a particular genre and the other concerns translation as a genre. In so doing, he treats the translation as a text in its own right and translated literature as a sub-system in a given culture's literary system. He fixes his critical attention solely on the target language reality—e.g. translators, translations, the system of translation in the target society, and the intertextual dynamics between these on multiple levels. It is in this sense that the concept of intertextuality, for Hermans, opens up a vast new area of investigation into translations which avoids engaging with the old pattern of comparing a translated text with its original.

These three ways of appropriating the concept of intertextuality in contemporary Western translation theory have all proven useful for their respective theoretical and methodological goals. The first approach has highlighted the (literary) translators' creativity, subjectivity, and originality and encouraged more self-reflexive efforts in Western translation studies with respect to its understanding of such fundamental issues as text, language, meaning, and the nature of translation itself. The second approach draws more attention to the problematics of cross-cultural communication as well as the translator's role in enabling and complicating this communication in translation practice. Hermans's approach to intertextuality helps broaden the discussion about translation beyond a simple linear conception of translation in relation to the original.

Chinese translation studies scholars have imported the protean concept of intertextuality (*huwenxing* 互文性 in Chinese translation) since the early 1990s.

Though there have been a large number of studies about intertextuality and translation in China,⁷ as Luo Xuanmin (2006) has noted, Chinese scholars and research students have not contributed many new insights to the discourse on intertextuality. Scanning through this vast body of literature, it is not difficult to discern that most of these studies are at best superficial: they mainly introduce the concept of intertextuality and apply its theories, frameworks, and research models as proposed by Western scholars to Chinese data, such as texts translated into or from Chinese, Chinese translational phenomena, and Chinese translation history. In general, Chinese translation studies scholars have been using the concept of intertextuality uncritically without clearly differentiating among the various approaches to the concept of intertextuality in translation studies or reflecting upon its validity in the Chinese context. The aforementioned first and second strands in Western translation studies scholarship are frequently adopted in Chinese scholarship, while the third approach is rarely identified or adopted. Moreover, except for Qin Wenhua's (2006) book-length translation and exposition of the poststructuralist translation theory as has been developed in the West, few studies that adopt the first approach to the concept of intertextuality strictly follow the poststructuralist thinking throughout in their analysis of the Chinese materials.

It is the first strand of translation studies scholars that are relevant to my intervention in the discourse on intertextuality in the field of translation studies. As stated at the beginning of this chapter, I find Barthes's theory of intertextuality helpful for probing the conceptual relationship between translatorship and authorship in China in the historical period under study. While the first strand of translation studies

⁷ According to my searches in December 2014 on CNKI, the most comprehensive academic database in China, there were at least over 800 studies, including journal articles and postgraduate theses, which discuss and utilize the concept of intertextuality.

scholars mentioned above uses Barthes's theory as a sort of call-to-arms for the elevation of the status of the translator, I am interested in using his theory, rather, to gain a better understanding of the status of the translator within the Chinese tradition of authorship itself (see 2.4, below). As Steineck and Schwermann (2014) note, Barthes's proclamation of the death of the Author "was not the end, but rather the beginning of a theoretical discussion that has served to differentiate and clarify our notions of authorship"; and the conception of authorship Barthes effectively deconstructs is "a product of a specific cultural discourse...firmly embedded in European classical modernity" (1). Therefore, Barthes's radical declaration of the death of the Author in fact has highlighted the cultural and historical specificities of notions of authorship. With the issue of authorship opened to further investigation, then, the concept of translation (or translatorship) in its historical and cultural specificities can also be examined in relation to notions of authorship.

While I focus my engagement with the first strand of scholars mentioned above, all three approaches to intertextuality in translation studies focus on intertextual relationships that exist either between (specific elements of) separate texts or between a text and a larger corpus—e.g. genre, literary tradition, or the discursive space of a culture. My study, however, extends the inquiry to a largely overlooked dimension of 'intertextuality'—the intertextual relationship between text and paratext. It is therefore to the subject of paratextuality that I now turn.

2.2 The conceptual framework of paratextuality in translation studies

2.2.1 Genette's conceptual framework for paratextuality

Genette (1997b), in *Paratexts: Threshold of Interpretation*, has systematically studied a heterogeneous group of textual elements that “constitutes a zone between text and off-text” which guide or control the reception of the text as a work or more often as a book (2). He terms this heterogeneous group of textual elements—titles, dedications, prefaces, notes, authorial correspondence, author’s diaries, publicity announcements, etc.—*paratexts*. For Genette, the paratextuality of these textual materials lies not only in their spatiality but more importantly in their functionality. That is, the paratextual elements surround and extend the text in order to package and present it in the particular way that the author (and/or the publisher) intends or authorizes it. In Genette’s own words, the paratexts serve “a better reception for the text and a more pertinent reading of it”; hence, they form “a zone not only of transition but of *transaction*” (ibid., 2; original italics).

In order to systematically investigate the transactional nature of paratexts, Genette identifies various paratextual sub-categories according to different criteria—spatial, temporal, functional, etc. For instance, he categorizes paratext into ‘peritext’ and ‘epitext’ on the basis of spatiality, with ‘peritext’ covering those paratextual materials that are located within the book and ‘epitext’ covering those outside the book. Genette also subdivides the category of paratext into authorial, publisher’s, and allographic (i.e., authorized third-party) paratexts, according to the producer’s identity.

It is important, as Macksey (1997) points out, to view Genette's work on paratextuality as an integral part of his "general poetics of transtextuality" (xviii). The concept of transtextuality is, to borrow from Allen's (2000) description, Genette's brand of "intertextuality from the viewpoint of structural poetics" (98). In Genette's work on structuralist poetics, *transtextuality* is the overarching term describing the relational nature of texts in general, i.e., "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts" (Genette 1997a, 1). Genette further divides it into five sub-categories: intertextuality, paratextuality, metatextuality, hypertextuality, and architextuality. In Genette's model of transtextuality, intertextuality becomes redefined as a limited category which refers to "a relationship of copresence between or among several texts" and focuses on "the actual presence of one text within another" (ibid., 1-2). Metatextuality refers to the intertextual relationship that is of a commentary nature, while hypertextuality refers to the manner in which a text is intentionally related to specific prior texts (what Genette calls the *hypotexts*) through parody, pastiche, travesty, or caricature. Architextuality refers mostly to a text's relationship to genre or other taxonomic conventions. Viewed within Genette's poetics of transtextuality, therefore, paratextuality is the kind of intertextual—or to use Genette's terminology, transtextual—relationship that connects the textual world to the real world and the production of the text to its reception and consumption in the study of how a specific text produces its meaning out of an "entire set of general or transcendent categories" (ibid., 1).

2.2.2 Paratextuality in translation studies

Genette's elaborate typology of paratextuality not only attracts attention to the study of various materials previously understudied and undertheorized but also provides translation studies scholars with a clear-cut, expedient conceptual framework for analyzing these textual materials. In translation studies, there has been a growing interest, since the late 1990s, in studying the paratexts of translations (e.g. Kovala 1996; Watts 2000; Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002; Pellatt 2013; Deane-Cox 2014). When discussing the utility of the paratext concept for translation studies—especially for historical translation studies—Tahir-Gürçağlar (2010) points out that a focus on the paratexts that accompany translations offers important “clues regarding the visibility of the translator, the target readership, the aim of the translation or the concept of translation favoured by the specific culture and/or publisher” (113-4; see also Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002). The study of translation paratexts has become an indispensable part of research that, Tahir-Gürçağlar (2010) argues, can complement the findings from studies that only focus on translated texts or extratextual material related to the translated texts.

However, Genette's framework for paratextuality has not gone without criticism and modifications in its applications in translation studies. One of the major critiques of Genette's paratextual framework is his treatment of the conceptual relationships between paratext and translation. Genette (1997b) does not discuss translation within his framework but only suggests in the conclusion to *Paratexts* that he takes translation—especially translations “revised or checked by the author” and self-translations—as paratexts of the original (405). Tahir-Gürçağlar (2002) argues that

such a conception of translation as paratext not only reifies the conceptual hierarchy between the source text and the target text but also restricts the broadening of the concept of translation. Her critique of Genette from the perspective of translation studies is mostly valid. However, as Deane-Cox (2014) points out, Tahir-Gürçağlar misses some of the nuances in Genette's position. That is, Genette's proposition regarding the paratextual nature of translation "is predicated specifically on a correspondence between authorized or self-translation and paratext" (ibid., 28). Under this specific condition that Genette demarcates, a translation has to be aligned with authorial intentions and thus is of some undeniable paratextual relevance to the original text. For her research on the issue of retranslation, Deane-Cox (2014) instead engages with Genette on the more concrete point that "the translator is bereft of any clear-cut position within the paratextual model" with only the distinction between author's, publisher's, and allographic paratexts (29). She suggests adding a subcategory called "translatorial paratext" to properly "plac[e] stronger analysis on the tangible and mediative paratextual presence of the translator" (Deane-Cox 2014, 29). This effort of giving the translator a precise position within the paratextual framework, however, (as I discuss shortly) does not help to break down the conceptual hierarchy between the translator and the original author and might result in premature theoretical closure.

Despite these existing critical engagements with Genette's framework of paratextuality from the perspective of translation studies, this revised conceptual framework of paratextuality is still limited and problematic, especially in terms of its applicability to different textual materials and textual traditions. The problem I focus

on is the preoccupation with ‘authorial intention’ underlying the insistence on clear-cut demarcations between text, paratext, and extratext on the one hand and between authorial, translatorial, publisher’s, and allographic paratexts on the other.

Genette’s original model of paratextuality was constructed on a conceptual hierarchy among different textual materials on the basis of their closeness to authorial intentions or responsibility. Though Genette (1997b) acknowledges the ambiguities of the concept of paratext—i.e., the impossibility of drawing “any hard and fast boundary on either the inward side (turned toward the text) or the outward side (turned toward the world’s discourse about the text)”—he nonetheless strives for neat conceptual distinctions in his analysis (2).⁸ On the one hand, according to Genette, the paratext is separated from the text because its entire *raison d’être* is to serve the text as “something other than itself” (ibid., 12). On the other hand, the paratext is distinguished from the *hors-texte* (off-text, non-text, or extratext) which literally means ‘outside-the-text’.⁹ The *hors-texte* is distinguished from the paratext because it is not related to the text in terms of authorial intentions or responsibility. Therefore, it is clear that Genette takes the relevance of the author’s purposes and authorization as the ultimate foundation for distinguishing between text, paratext, and *hors-texte*. The prefixes ‘para-’ and ‘hors-’

⁸ In a footnote, Genette quotes from Hillis Miller’s discussion on the prefix ‘para-’ to describe the conceptual ambiguity of ‘paratext’: “‘Para’ is a double antithetical prefix signifying at once proximity and distance, similarity and difference, interiority and exteriority, ... something simultaneously this side of a boundary line, threshold, or margin, and also beyond it, equivalent in status and also secondary or subsidiary, submissive, as of quest to host, slave to master. A thing in ‘para,’ moreover, is not only simultaneously on both sides of the boundary line between inside and out. It is also the boundary itself, the screen which is a permeable membrane connecting inside and outside. It confuses them with one another, allowing the outside in, making the inside out, dividing them and joining them” (as quoted in Genette 1997b, 1).

⁹ The translator of Genette’s (1988) “The Proustian Paratexte”, Amy G. McIntosh, renders it as ‘non-text’, while the translator of Genette’s *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, Jane E. Lewin, opts for the term ‘off-text’. In translation studies, the term *extratext* (or *extratextual material*) is usually used to refer to the kind of *hors-texte* that discourses on the translation(s) in question.

straightforwardly demonstrate this conceptual hierarchy. Genette has insisted, in both *Palimpsests* (1997a) and *Paratexts* (1997b), on understanding the prefix ‘para-’ in relation to such words as *parafiscal* and *paramilitary*, especially “in the ambiguous, even hypocritical sense” (Genette 1997a, 429). The ‘hypocrisy’ meant by Genette can only refer to the sense of “pretending to have the qualities of something (i.e., fiscal matters, military force, or text) but in fact not really having them” implied by the prefix ‘para-’. In this sense, Genette is highlighting a deficiency in a somewhat derogatory way. As for the concept of *hors-texte*, even regardless of the negative connotations of the prefixes in its different English renditions (‘non-’, ‘off-’), the prefix ‘hors-’ in French refers to something that is outside and thus simply *not the text*.

Though, as mentioned earlier, translation studies scholars have criticized the conceptual hierarchy between translation and the original text implied in Genette’s original model, the current conceptualization of paratext in translation studies still operates on a hierarchical structure. Most scholars, in their application of Genette’s concept of paratext, clearly distinguish the paratext from the translated text, maintaining that the former—together with extratextual materials—“does not form part of the actual translated text itself” (Tahir-Gürçağlar 2002, 44). Deane-Cox (2014) further insists that

a clear line must be drawn between paratextual material, which is closely linked to the text having stemmed from the translator, author, publisher and/or authorized third party, and extratextual sources of information on (re)translation such as reviews which are often, and erroneously, discussed in Translation Studies under the heading of the former. (29-30)

Granted, clear-cut boundaries can help ensure conceptual clarity and rigor in research. Paradoxically, with the clear separation of the paratext from the text and the focus on

the translatorial paratext as the domain of the translator's voice and mediative presence, the translator becomes mainly associated with the domain of the paratext, hence one degree removed from the authorship of the (translated) text. In this way, the dichotomy between text and paratext implies a dichotomy between the original author and the translator. Precise sub-categorization discourages, if not precludes, further exploration into the complicated relationships between text and paratext, the multiple text-related roles played by historical individuals, and their conceptual implications with regard to such issues as authorship and translatorship.

In order to challenge the conceptual hierarchy in Genette's framework of paratextuality as it has been commonly applied in translation studies, I turn to the critical school of New Historicism, which itself is a negotiation and extension of the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality.

2.3 New Historicism: A social and historical model for intertextual reading

New Historicism is a school of literary criticism—and a “new interpretive practice” (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000, 1)—that first emerged in the field of Renaissance literary studies in America in the late 1970s. This interpretative practice is “based on *parallel* reading of literary and non-literary texts, usually of the same historical period” (Barry 2009, 166; original italics). This non-hierarchical treatment of literary and non-literary texts may be New Historicism's most distinctive characteristic.

In the West's long tradition of literary criticism, there has always been an essentialist distinction between the literary foreground and the historical, social, and

political background. Prior to the late 1930s, in fact, Anglophone literary studies had been dominated by a historicism that believed literature could only be understood on the basis of a firm grasp and understanding of the historical, biographical, and sociological context in which a literary work was produced. In the practice of this paradigm, the literary text was treated merely as the record or reflection of its context. New Criticism turned this paradigm on its head. In reaction against traditional historicism, such New Critics as John Crowe Ransom (1937, 1941) and Allen Tate (1940) conferred on the literary text an autonomous, self-referential status detached from its biographical, historical origins or social effects. Such a reading practice completely severed literature from its social and historical contexts.

New Historicism developed as a direct reaction to New Criticism that dominated especially American literary criticism from the 1930s to the 1960s “by pulling historical considerations to the center stage of literary analysis” again (Veese 1989, xi). What makes New Historicism ‘new’ as compared to the older practice of historicism prior to the 1930s is that all textual traces of the past are read “with the attention traditionally conferred only on literary texts” (Greenblatt 1990, 14). That is, literature—and art in general—is to be treated as just “one practice among many by which a culture organizes its production of meaning and values and structures itself” (Boyarin 1995, 12).

Since in New Historicism non-literary texts “are not subordinated as contexts” for the interpretation of the literary text, Barry (2009) suggests that they should rather be called “co-texts” which are “expressions of the same historical ‘moments’” as literary texts (167). I would instead call all the different types of texts under study in New

Historicism as ‘intertexts’ and refer to New Historicism, just as Boyarin (1995) does, as a “special form of intertextual reading” (12). The practice of New Historicism is intertextual not only in the sense that it blurs the boundaries between the literary text and its context, but also because it views culture as a broader spatial and temporal continuum which itself constitutes an expanded concept of text. Therefore, New Historicism rejects a unidirectional view of the relationship between different discursive spheres. New Historicists do not seek simply to find out how literary texts draw from or reflect legal, political, medical, or social discourses of the same age. Rather, New Historicists explore how these various discursive spheres interact with and distinguish themselves from each other. In other words, New Historicists are interested in the ‘intertextual’ relationships between a cultural milieu’s various discourses and in “locating inventive energies more deeply interfused within” this extended notion of cultural continuum (Gallagher and Greenblatt 2000, 12). For this reason, Greenblatt prefers to term his critical interpretative practice ‘Cultural Poetics’ rather than ‘New Historicism’ (see Greenblatt 1987).

I am aware that New Historicism, since its inception, has been critically received and sometimes even vehemently attacked from various fronts. It has been criticized, for example, for being simply a new form of “Marxist criticism” (Pechter 1987, 292) or a new form of traditional hermeneutics (Veenstra 1995), for its “disregard for the integrity of the literary text” (Vicker 1993, 267), for lacking theoretical and methodological rigor and relying only on the New Historicist’s interpretive skills (e.g. White 1989; Liu 1989), or for its pessimistic, universalizing conception of power

(Cohen 1990; LaCapra 1989).¹⁰ As Parvini (2017) summarizes it, “[d]epending on the critique, new historicism was not historical enough, not literary enough and not political enough to serve” (117). However, the scathing attacks mounted at New Historicism, mostly in the 1980s and the 1990s, as Veesper (1989) points out, came mostly from conventional scholars’ defence of academic “guild loyalties and turf” and policing of the “quasi-monastic order” (ix). In fact, New Historicism “has weathered the storm” of criticism and become, in the 21st century, an established practice assimilated into the orthodoxies of literary studies (Parvini 2017, 117).¹¹ Though New Historicism might seem to many an outmoded approach in *literary studies*, I nevertheless find it useful for this study, especially for rethinking the issues of ‘intertextuality’ and ‘paratextuality’ in the study of various forms of textual material in *translation historiography*.

2.4 Triangulating intertextuality, paratextuality, and New Historicism

The Barthesian notion of intertextuality provides me with a theoretical basis for describing and analyzing the relationship between translation and writing (among other textual activities) without a presumed conceptual hierarchy that prizes (original) writing over other derivative textual activities. Barthes does not treat individual texts as isolated, unified entities that correspond to determinate meanings controlled by their

¹⁰ See Parvini (2017), pp. 115-32, for a review of the main strains of criticism New Historicism has received since the 1980s. See also contributions to Veesper (1989) for critiques of and engagements with New Historicism from various perspectives.

¹¹ As Parvini’s (2017) shows, though there are still objections to New Historicism in Shakespeare studies in the 2000s and early 2010s, these critiques have become milder in tone, serving, to a large extent, to set the critics’ own approaches against New Historicism as a new orthodoxy in the field (117-26).

authors. According to Barthes (1977a), the text, especially in its reading, is woven with “anonymous, untraceable, and yet *already read*” citations and thus intertextual (160; original italics). Barthes contrasts ‘text’ with ‘work’, arguing that a work is a concrete, finished object that can be held in hand and consumed while “the text is held in language” and can be “experienced only in an activity of production” (ibid., 157). Hence, in contrast to the ‘work’, the text does not have closure let alone an ‘inside’ or ‘outside’ to which the author, reader, and critic can be allocated separately (Barthes 1975). In this way, Barthes’s theory of intertextuality blurs the boundaries between such textual activities as writing, reading, and criticism. As Allen (2000) points out, Barthes’s theory of intertextuality “demands a wholesale ‘relativization of the relations of writer, reader, and observer (critic)’” (70). Since the meaning of the text does not originate from the Author-god but from the inevitable *already-read* during the process of reading, the reader is liberated from the authorial intention of the Author-god and is instead able to draw *jouissance* from the play of intertextuality. When the Author-god is dethroned, reading, for Barthes (1981), becomes in itself both ‘textual analysis’ and (re-)writing. That is, the textual activities of reading, writing, and criticism within the intertextual field can no longer be strictly distinguished from each other according to their different relations to the author’s ‘original’ intention.

While Barthes’s theory of intertextuality appears to break down the conceptual hierarchy between author and reader, it does so only to a limited extent. At face value, for Barthes, writing and reading are not distinguishable activities but operate together in the formation of a text. Yet, in his effort to dismantle the traditional Author-centered conceptual hierarchy, Barthes constructs a new hierarchy centered on the Reader. That

is, according to Barthes, once the Author is dead, the Reader inherits his privileged position. This maneuver, as mentioned in 2.1.2, has enabled some translation studies scholars to advocate, in the Western context, for the elevation of the translator's status in relation to the original author.¹² In contrast, for the Chinese context that I examine, Barthes's theory of intertextuality provides useful critical tools for understanding and describing how traditional Chinese conceptualizations of authorship, and by extension translatorship, differ from those of the West. As we will shortly see, traditional Chinese notions of authorship are far afield from the Western Romantic conception of the Author-God that Barthes challenges, and Barthes's theory of intertextuality can therefore be used as a starting point from which to articulate precisely what those notions are. He has also given us an understanding of the interrelatedness of all texts, which is an important idea as it relates to the Chinese textual tradition. However, Barthes's privileging of the reader should give us pause. It is here that the similarities between Barthes's conception of authorship and the traditional Chinese one ends; and it is here that Barthes's notion of intertextuality as it relates to authorship can be used as a foil through which to more clearly define the traditional Chinese one.

As mentioned in 2.1.2, there has been an enthusiastic reaction to the concept of intertextuality and a wholesale borrowing of theorizations of intertextuality among Chinese scholars. The affinity Chinese scholars have with the concept of intertextuality can be said to be deeply rooted in the Chinese textual tradition. One significant underlying cause for the ready acceptance of the concept of intertextuality

¹² Not all scholars who borrow from poststructuralist theorizations on intertextuality proceed in this way. For instance, Arrojo (1997) contends that it is theoretically incoherent if one uses the birth of the Barthesian reader at the cost of the death of the Author to empower the translator (23). According to her, this is nothing but replacing one authority by another—the Author-god is taken off the pedestal and the reader/translator succeeds to the throne.

among Chinese academics might be the fact that, as Wang Jing (1992) puts it, “the phenomenon of ‘intertextuality’ has long been embedded within the Chinese tradition of textuality in its broadest sense” (3). Therefore, to some extent, the word *intertextuality* provides contemporary Chinese scholars with a belated term to denote the abundant practices of textual interconnectedness that have long been an essential part of the Chinese textual tradition and the textual experience of perhaps every literate Chinese person.¹³

Although scholars appear to have varying views of how to define the phenomenon of intertextuality in the Chinese context, they all emphasize the role that ‘tradition’ itself plays in Chinese textual production. On the one hand, Gentz (2009), mentioning quotes and allusions, highlights the cultural function of specific intertextual referentiality in the Chinese tradition:

[s]tarting with the obligatory quotes from the classics, from philosophers such as Confucius and Laozi, from poems and from mass of proverbs from the corpus of ancient literature, the incorporation of quotes is one of the central features of Chinese literary products and is used to place them into the cultural memory of given texts. (82)

On the other hand, Wang (1992) argues that intertextuality in this tradition is less about the relationship of one text to another than it is about the construction of “a classical paradigm [that] has provided traditional Chinese literature with a stable context to which later writers constantly refer and return” (3). However, both scholars would

¹³ J. Q. Liu’s (2017) study of the literary production of love stories in early 20th-century China, recently published in the Brill ‘Chinese Studies’ series, is an example. In her study, she examines “the intricate *process* of literary adaptation and appropriation” in early 20th-century Chinese love fiction by treating ‘translation’ and ‘intertextuality’ as two interrelated modes of textual production (ibid., 3; original italics). Liu adopts what she calls “the Western notion of intertextuality”, which—according to her—acknowledges “the fact that every text exists in relation to and, in a sense, is created out of other texts” (ibid., 14). For Liu, “phenomena which match the Western notion of intertextuality”—quotations and allusions in literary works—abound in the Chinese literary tradition (ibid.).

agree that the Chinese textual tradition is always directed inward toward a classical textual center. To borrow from Wang's (1992) formulation, the practice of intertextual referentiality in the Chinese tradition serves as a "centripetal and *retroactive*" force that consolidates the tradition (3; original italics).¹⁴ In this way, both scholars point out that intertextuality in the Chinese tradition differs from Barthes's notion of intertextuality in a very important way. What distinguishes traditional Chinese notions of intertextuality from poststructuralist ones lies in the positionality of the subject vis-à-vis the intertextual frame of reference. Traditional Chinese writing and reading practices were always self-consciously intertextual. Therefore, while the Barthesian reader/critic participating in the intertextual frame is always situated in the present, the Chinese intertextual frame is always oriented toward the past.

As scholarship in Chinese studies has shown, the valorization of tradition and collectivity in the Chinese intellectual tradition has fundamentally shaped its textual history and notions related to text. On the one hand, the individual has always been understood collectively, situated within the boundaries of higher social units—nation, clan, family, etc. (Galik 1980). It follows that there was no such notion of an author as

¹⁴ Wang (1992), in her poststructuralist rereading of the stone lore in Chinese classic novels, seems to lament this traditional notion of intertextual relations in the Chinese cultural tradition. For Wang (1992), "[s]uch a highly structured view of intertextuality...coexists with the concept of a constrained and tamed 'textual essence', which characterizes the Confucian Canon" (3). In this Confucian literary tradition, intertextual relationship could only be narrowly conceived as the relationship between a text and the tradition in a "root-seeking", "homogenizing", and "confluent" manner (*ibid.*, 282). She also seems to indicate that the poststructuralist concept of intertextuality could have been formulated by traditional Chinese literary critics if the Confucian orthodoxy had not dominated the Chinese thought tradition, for she argues that the earliest meaning of the Chinese term for 'text'—*wen* 文 (also meaning 'pattern', 'writing', 'literature', 'civilization', etc.)—shares common connotations with the poststructuralist term *text* (*ibid.*, 280-1). Gentz (2009), in his textbook on rethinking key Western cultural studies theories and concepts in their applications in the Chinese context, seems to question Wang's application of the poststructuralist concept of intertextuality to the reading of traditional Chinese literature. However, restricted by the form of the textbook, Gentz only provides a list of questions that ask the students to thoroughly analyze Wang's usage of the notion of intertextuality in her re-reading of classical Chinese literature (83-4).

an individual fulfilling all the author-functions—origination, responsibility, and interpretation—“prior to [China’s] integration into the cultural discourse of European classical modernity” (Steineck and Schwermann 2014, 19). Rather, these author-functions were often distributed among several individuals. On the other hand, the accumulation of the cultural past did not create an unbearable burden for Chinese literati; they did not need to resort to a cult of originality and denial of their relations to tradition to compete for cultural relevance (cf. Bloom 1997). The traditional Chinese understanding of literary creativity is “not creating something out of nothing...but deepening one’s self-awareness to the extent that its quality is comparable to that of the ancients” (Tu 1976, 14). “[I]nteraction with the past,” as Murck (1976) puts it, “is one of the distinctive modes of intellectual and imaginative endeavor in traditional Chinese culture” (xi). An author’s value or achievement is not measured in terms of how much he or she has invented afresh but in relation to his or her position vis-à-vis tradition. It is in such a textual and intellectual tradition that the age-old Chinese practices of intertextual references have been deeply rooted. Therefore, though Barthes’s notion of intertextuality captures how relative and fluid the roles are between writer, reader, and critic, it does not sufficiently account for how Chinese writers, commentators, compilers, editors, and readers conceived of the nature of their participation in the production of texts. It is the argument of this dissertation that Chinese conceptualizations of translation during the period that I examine must be viewed in light of this understanding of authorship.

The prioritization of the reader in Barthes’s theory of intertextuality leads to another limitation in its wholesale application to the study of Chinese

conceptualizations of translation, for Barthes's theory of intertextuality itself fails to sufficiently acknowledge the historicity and social situatedness of the text. Since Barthes is interested in a purely textual moment of liberation, the in-the-moment *jouissance* the reader can obtain when reading a text, Barthesian intertextuality opens the text to more textuality instead of to history. As Dentith (1995) argues, Barthes's notion of intertextuality celebrates "a version of liberation which takes you out of the historical process altogether" (98).

A New Historicist approach can help negotiate between Barthes's abstract, ideal concept of (inter-)text and the study of actual, concrete textual traces of the past in practice, for it addresses both "the historicity of texts and the textuality of history" (Montrose 1989, 20). On the one hand, the New Historicists accept the theoretical implications of the poststructuralist theory of textuality, i.e., that the meaning of a text cannot be stabilized because there is no simple one-to-one correspondence between a signifier and a transcendental signified. Hence the New Historicists do not believe that a single determinate meaning for a literary work can be recovered. On the other hand, as Montrose (1989) puts it, the New Historicists emphasize that "writing and reading are always historically and socially determinate events, performed *in* the world and *upon* the world by gendered individuals and collective human agents" (23; original italics). According to Barry (2009), it is the influence of Deconstructionism, especially "Derrida's view that there is nothing outside the text", that leads New Historicists to read cultures as texts (169).¹⁵ However, Gallagher and Greenblatt (2000) counter that

¹⁵ Derrida's original phrase—*il n'y a pas de hors-texte*—is perhaps more accurately translated as 'there is no outside-text' or, as Derrida (1988) later explained it, "there is nothing outside context" (136). However, this phrase has been commonly misunderstood as "there is nothing outside the text" and as a slogan for the deconstructionist view of pan-textualism.

the New Historicist notion of cultures as texts is different from Deconstructionism's 'pan-textualism' for the latter is ahistorical and still privileges the literary text (17). In New Historicist readings, on the contrary, not only are cultures viewed as texts, but texts are also analyzed "as a discourse produced and appropriated within history and within a history of other productions and appropriations" (Montrose 1989, 22). That is, the intertextual space New Historicists investigate is not constituted by the kind of "anonymous, untraceable and yet *already read*" citations for poststructuralists like Barthes (1977b, 160), but in the space of the "interplay of culture-specific discursive practices" that leave concrete textual traces (Montrose 1989, 22). It is in bringing the concept of intertextuality back into its historical and cultural context that New Historicism breaks with poststructuralism.

At the same time, New Historicism is a form of intertextual reading that attempts to tear down both the hierarchy between literary and non-literary texts in the study of literature and the boundaries between literary studies and other disciplines such as history and anthropology. In this sense, New Historicism pushes for a more thoroughly non-hierarchical view of intertextuality than Barthes's. Whereas Barthes simply flips the conceptual hierarchy in favour of the reader, New Historicism seeks to flatten this hierarchy in its reading of the various textual traces of a culture.¹⁶ Following the line of argument of New Historicism, I propose that this latter concept of intertextuality

¹⁶ Of course, New Historicism cannot completely escape Barthes's pitfall because, in a sense, the New Historicist now becomes this privileged reader who rewrites history as text in the act of reading. As Hayden White (1978) has convincingly demonstrated, historians do not present disconnected historical data but rather find meaning in the historical data by organizing it in a narrative structure. After White, it is difficult to ignore the role of historian as a Reader writing history. Nonetheless, the New Historicist engages in this activity self-consciously and acknowledges his or her socio-historical positionality (see Montrose 1989, 23). Clifford Geertz's (1988) description of the anthropologist's attempt to understand a culture utterly foreign to him or her and the limitations he or she faces in trying to do so can be used as an analogy for describing the project of New Historicism: "What is remote close up is, at a remove, near" (48).

can help refine Genette's framework of paratextuality. As I discussed in 2.2, the framework of paratextuality is established on a conceptual hierarchy among different textual materials that centers on the author's intention. New Historicism gives equal discursive status to literary and non-literary texts in literary studies, and I extend this view to my reading of such concrete textual forms as text, paratext, and extratext as they relate to the production and consumption of translations. That is, in this expanded conceptual framework, these textual materials can all be viewed as 'intertexts'¹⁷ since they relate to each other and interact discursively with each other. The various textual materials that surround and accompany the translated texts—prefaces, marginal notes, punctuation marks, reviews, etc.—are also part and parcel of the cultural production of translations in the same historical period. At least potentially, translated texts and various types of textual materials surrounding translations are equally informative about how translation is being conceptualized, whether explicitly stated or implied. Moreover, as discussed earlier, since in the Chinese textual tradition there was no essentialist conceptual hierarchy between writer, editor, and commentator, viewing these various textual and paratextual materials as equal better acknowledges the interlocking relationships between these different textual roles in the communal tradition of textual production.

In sum, the New Historicist approach to text complements both the Barthesian theory of intertextuality and Genette's framework of paratextuality in their applications to the study of historical Chinese conceptualizations of translation. That

¹⁷ The term *intertext* has also appeared in previous scholarship on intertextuality in different senses. On the abstract end, Barthes (1981) uses this term to refer to "a general field of anonymous formulae whose origin can scarcely ever be located; of unconscious or automatic quotations, given without quotation marks" (39). On the more concrete end, an intertext is a specific text (element) present within another text (Genette 1997a).

is, translated literature, ‘original’ writings, non-literary texts, and different textual materials accompanying the translated literature—reviews, prefaces, commentaries, etc.—can all be read, on equal terms, as different modes of meaning production in China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. These different discursive materials are all historically and socially specific intertexts where we can examine how translation was performed and perceived in that transitional period of Chinese translation history. In my case studies, I not only focus on different textual materials—such as reviews, prefaces, and commentaries—to look for what was said about the relationships between translating and other types of textual activities. I further examine, in Chapter V, how various (para)textual forms interact with the translated text as integral components in the Chinese literary production process.

2.5 Research method: Multiple-case study

As discussed in Chapter I, an important aspect of translation history is the critical methodological reflection on the writing of translation history. I have also pointed out that the concept of norms, though instrumental in previous studies on Chinese translation history, tends to prioritize the socio-cultural aspects at the expense of the individual human element. To a certain extent, the norms approach has aggravated the grand narrative established on the May Fourth paradigm.

In this study, therefore, I adopt a different approach to the study of Chinese translation history. Instead of looking at norms of translation as the regularities of translation behavior and the underlying dominant views of translation in the long term,

I keep a more local focus on individual cases to construct from them a microhistory of conceptualizations of translation in China during the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

2.5.1 Choosing the method of case study

I adopt a multiple-case study approach in order to capture the complexities of the shifting conceptualizations of translation in China from the 1890s to the 1920s. In *Method in Translation History*, Pym (1998) argues that the best historiography combines and relates past theories and discussions about translation with past translation practices and calls for the humanization of translation history (10). By adopting the case study method, I can include both writings on translation and translation practices in my investigation. Moreover, both past practices and theories of translation only present themselves to the historian in the form of *textual* traces of the past. As argued earlier, these various textual traces—whether previously designated as textual, paratextual, extratextual, or metatextual—are all intertexts that are equally informative regarding historical conceptualizations of translation. The case study method—with its intensive, open-ended investigation into small-scale units of analysis within their respective contexts—enables extensive analysis of various intertextual materials and how they relate to each other discursively. It also allows contextualization in relation to the pertinent historical actors that helps to restore the human dimension of these textual traces.

A ‘case’ in translation studies, as Susam-Sarajeva (2009) defines it, is “a unit of translation or interpreting-related activity, product, person, etc. in real life, which can only be studied or understood in the context in which it is embedded” (40). For Susam-Sarajeva (2001), studying multiple cases can help reach more rigorous conclusions

than single-case studies. She stresses that studying more than one unit of analysis merely on the basis of a principle of similarity does not qualify as a multiple-case study. In multiple-case study research, she maintains, “every case should serve a specific purpose within the overall scope of inquiry” so that the examination of both the similarities and differences between these units of analysis can yield more fruitful results (Susam-Sarajeva 2009, 50; see also Susam-Sarajeva 2001). Taking this into account, I have selected three diverse case types for analysis, with each case centering on a relatively different cultural sphere (see 1. 5).

In the following, I will address the issue of case selection and answer the question as to how the study of merely three cases can allow me to offer an interpretation of the shifting conceptualizations of translation in China over a relatively long period of four decades.

2.5.2 Case study and the issue of generalization in translation studies

Case study is one of the most common research methods in translation studies. As Susam-Sarajeva (2009) points out, however, there is a general lack of theoretical and methodological discussion of the utility and relevance of this research method.¹⁸ Drawing on social science research, she is one of the first translation studies scholars to reflect critically on the definitions, characteristics, and design of case study research (see Susam-Sarajeva 2001, 2009).

¹⁸ See also Saldanha and O’Brian (2013), Chapter 6, for a practice-oriented discussion about how to conduct case studies in translation research which covers case design, data collection, data analysis, and other practical suggestions.

One of the main methodological issues that plagues the case study method is its generalizability, i.e., whether case studies can serve as a suitable and valid basis for generalization. Susam-Sarajeva (2009) has reviewed the debate on this issue in the social sciences. She classifies the various responses into three main approaches (44-53). Some scholars subscribe to the conventional notion of generalization in a statistical sense but at the same time propose to “take into account the heterogeneity of the target population” by choosing multiple typical cases on the basis of theoretically informed decisions (ibid., 52). A second strand of scholars, opposed to the conventional understanding of generalizability, argue for ‘thick description’ in the context of unique features. Generalization is conceptualized by some in this strand as ‘transferability’, i.e. generalizability onto other cases. The third strand of social scientists believe that generalization is still possible but should be realized through analytic induction and logical inference. For these scholars, “[t]he main objective of case study research should therefore be generalizing *into theory*, not generalizing over onto other case studies” (ibid., 49; original italics). Through this review, Susam-Sarajeva has highlighted the complexity of the issue of generalization in the case study method and “emphasized the importance of theoretically informed choices and of systematic selection of cases” (ibid., 54). Without indicating her preference, she seems to suggest that either approach is valid as long as one has sufficiently justified the choice against its competing alternatives. However, I find none of these approaches helpful for my historical research.

Though proponents of the case study method in the social sciences seek to address the issue of generalization by modifying or challenging the traditional notion of

generalizability in different ways, they seem unable to completely break away from the concerns with scientific rigor in the social sciences. That is, the social scientists' defence of the validity of the case study method betrays a deep anxiety about the applicability or even predictability of the results of case study research. Moreover, representativeness and uniqueness are still the two main criteria for case selection in the social sciences. One either chooses a case or multiple cases representative of a larger group—the 'whole'—that is to be understood through the case study or an exceptional case that is unusual and statistically infrequent. The underlying conception of the relationship between the 'case' and the 'whole' is mainly unidirectional and still covertly follows a quantitative, statistical principle that either serves to prove or disprove a preconceived generalization.¹⁹

I want to address the issue of generalization in case study research from an alternative perspective. I propose that the concept of the 'exceptional normal' or 'normal exception' in Microhistory, first proposed by Edoardo Grendi (1977), can break down this typical/exceptional binary. This concept, in fact, epitomizes the methodological concerns and characteristics of Microhistory. Therefore, in the following section, I will explain the methodological implications of the concept of 'exceptional normal' in particular and how using Microhistory for the case study method can help capture the complexities and nuances in the shifting conceptualizations of translation in China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

¹⁹ Peltonen (2001), though not specifically discussing the case study method, has complained that the common conceptualizations of the micro-macro link in the social sciences in terms of "exceptionality (famous persons and important events)" and "typicality (individuals or events that represent a larger group)" do not generate new information (356).

2.5.3 Remodeling the case study method in light of Microhistory

In the late 1970s, a group of Italian historians (including Carlo Ginzburg, Giovanni Levi, Edoardo Grendi, and Carlo Poni) developed a historiographical practice called *microstoria*, or, in English, Microhistory.²⁰ In this historiographical practice, these Microhistorians conducted intensive research on small-scale cases—usually persons, communities, events, etc.—and often, in the words of Szijártó (2013), “give a completely different picture of the past from the investigations about nations, states, or social groupings, stretching over decades, centuries, or whatever *longue durée*” (5). The emergence of Microhistory was closely associated with the “dissatisfaction...with the macroscopic and quantitative model that dominated the international historiographical scene between the mid-1950s and mid-1970s” (Ginzburg 1993, 17). Though, or in spite of, “acknowledging the limits of knowledge and reason”, Microhistorians still strive to refine research tools that can illuminate, organize, and explain past worlds (Levi 2001, 99).

As the Italian Microhistorian Giovanni Levi (2001, 2012) has repeatedly pointed out, Microhistory is not a unified theory but operates with varied and eclectic theoretical references. Its reception and development in Germany, France, the Anglo-Saxon world, etc. have also exhibited different characteristics as compared to Italian *microstoria* (Szijártó 2013). Nonetheless, all the works under the ‘Microhistory’ rubric share some common features.

²⁰ See Ginzburg (1993), “Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about it”, for a discussion about the different usages of the word *microhistory* prior to the emergence of the Italian school of *microstoria* as well as other intellectual and historiographical approaches that share affinities with the Italian *microstoria*.

It is not difficult to assume from the term *Microhistory* that the most distinctive characteristic of this historiographical practice is its ‘microscopic’ focus. That is, Microhistory focuses on the qualitative analysis of documentary materials of concrete small-scale units of research. In *The Cheese and the Worms* (1992), for example, Ginzburg uses local Inquisition records to conduct a detailed investigation into the beliefs and world-views of a 16th-century miller from the small Italian village of Montereale. Meanwhile, Levi (1988) zeros in on a 17th-century parish priest in another small Italian village called Santena. To those who oppose Microhistory, such as Franco Venturi, the study of such microscopic units, usually villages and villagers, is trivial and meaningless for it does not help us to know “the origins of those ideas which shape our lives” (as quoted in Levi 2001, 100). However, Microhistorians do not aim to produce trivial, local histories or biographies of relatively unimportant people. Rather, they believe that microscopic observation “will reveal factors previously unobserved” or help to expose completely new meanings for historical phenomena only previously examined on the macro-level (Levi 2001, 101). “[I]t is on this reduced scale, and probably only on this scale,” according to Roger Chartier, “that we can understand, without deterministic reduction, the relationships between systems of beliefs, of values and representations on the one hand, and social affiliations on the other” (as quoted in Ginzburg 1993, 22).

Though many studies in the name of Microhistory tend to focus on “the excluded, the little people, the far-off” in terms of the subject matter, Levi has more than once emphasized that what characterizes the ‘micro-’ aspect of Microhistory is not so much its subject matter as its mode of discussion and methodological concerns (Levi 2012,

125; see also Levi 2001). Italian Microhistorians, Levi (2012) argues, do not investigate peripheral individuals, communities, or small-scale events simply for the sake of studying them or fueled by a postmodern mistrust of the possibility of knowing the truth of the past. Rather, what they are concerned with is how to “reach generalizations without filtering out individuals and situations” on the one hand and, on the other, “describe situations and persons without falling into typologies and examples and in turn, without forgoing an understanding of general problems” (Levi 2012, 124). The focus on small-scale cases, in other words, provides Microhistorians with a strategic point of entry for realizing simultaneously generalization and preservation of specificity.

Therefore, Microhistory is not merely microscopic, but in fact an integration of and interaction between the microscopic and the macroscopic. Yet this aspect of multiscope investigation has been mostly neglected in previous applications of Microhistory in translation studies. So far, only Adamo (2006) and Munday (2014) have explicitly applied Microhistory in translation studies. Adamo (2006) especially focuses on Microhistory’s emphasis on the marginal and the neglected, for she maintains this aspect of Microhistory can help counteract the dominant trend in research on translation history that focuses on “what can be called ‘canonized,’ visible topics, issues, subjects, and events” (87). Munday (2014) borrows from Microhistory to argue for the importance of focusing on (pretextual and) extratextual sources such as post-hoc interviews, archives, manuscripts, and translator papers in history research of “sometimes little-known or forgotten translators” (64). What is most illuminating

of Microhistory for historical translation studies, according to Munday (2014), is also its microscopic focus on the daily lives and choices of marginalized people.

I argue that Microhistory's multiscopic investigative approach has the most important implications for translation historiography. The reduction of scale in Microhistory is a kind of experiment that emphasizes the *change* of scale rather than maintaining the small-scale of the analysis (see Levi 2001).²¹ As Levi (2001) admits, the change of scale towards the micro-level was "the only experimental direction possible to take" because in the 1970s macroscopic historiographical approaches dominated the field of social history (111). Ginzburg (1993) gives an excellent description of this multiscopic characteristic of Microhistory by comparing it to the cinematographic technique of close-up: though termed *Microhistory*, this historiographical approach is

a constant back and forth between micro- and macrohistory, between close-ups and extreme long-shots, so as to continually thrust back into discussion the comprehensive vision of the historical process through apparent exceptions and cases of brief duration. (27)²²

In such constant shifting of scope and scale, the specificities and particularities of the real events and persons can be reconstructed while at the same time the grand narratives can be closely re-examined, "correcting their simplifications and modifying their perspectives and assumptions" (Levi 2012, 129-30). This allows what Levi (2012) calls the "recovery of complexity" and problematization of the historical narrative in

²¹ See also Szíjártó (2013), pp. 19-20, for a review on the further development of this idea in the reception of Microhistory in France.

²² As already noted by O'Sullivan (2012a) and Wakabayashi (2016), this description reminds one of Martha Cheung's (2012) vision of the "pushing-hands approach" to research on translation history. Cheung herself in her article mentioned in passing that there are affinities between her approach and Microhistory. See Wakabayashi (2016) for a discussion of the similarities and differences between Cheung's pushing-hands approach, Microhistory, Macrohistory, and *Histoire Croisée*.

comparison to the simplistically schematic, linear, and coherent interpretations found in macrohistorical studies.

The concept of the ‘exceptional normal’ neatly captures Microhistory’s methodological features and its implications for case selection. A case used in a historical study does not have to be viewed as *either* exceptional *or* typical. ‘Exceptionality’ or ‘typicality’ are not intrinsic, *a priori* qualities of a case, but depend on the perspective(s) from which the researcher views the case, the contexts in which the researcher situates it, and the pre-existing narrative frameworks. A seemingly ‘exceptional’ behavior from a modern perspective was in fact the ‘norm’ in premodern societies (Ginzburg and Poni 1991, 7-8); or, a seemingly exceptional case in one segment of society can be ‘normal’ in another segment. For Microhistorians, the significance and relevance of an apparently ‘exceptional’ case does not lie in its uniqueness but in its richer potential of providing “clues to or traces of a hidden reality” (ibid., 8). As McComiskey (2016) puts it, “[t]he point of Microhistory is not to narrate the normal or describe the exceptional but to interpret their relationship, shedding light on the normal and lending more than anecdotal significance to the exceptional” (19). This change of perspective, scope, and context is what distinguishes the concept of the ‘exceptional normal’ from that of ‘exceptionality’ or ‘typicality’, for the constant boundary-crossing reveals new findings and deeper meanings. It is in this sense, as Szíjártó (2013) has noted, this oxymoronic concept provides a third category for addressing the relationship between the micro and macro levels (see also Peltonen 2001).

In this project, I adopt the method of case study in light of the methodological concerns of Microhistory. It might seem, from the description of the three cases in Chapter I, that all of them focus on some previously marginalized figures or groups. I have not chosen these Chinese cultural actors simply because they have all been marginalized in the Chinese translation historiography and are thus exceptions to the grand narrative. Rather, they could be viewed as either exceptional or typical depending on the different social (or narrative) settings in which they are contextualized.

In delimiting each case, the main criterion for data selection among the extensive primary sources I have consulted and collected is the relevance to my focus on the conceptual relationships among translation, writing, commenting, and other textual activities.²³ Apart from choosing primary sources that contain discussions about this issue, I also pay special attention in my data selection to ‘paratextual’ materials—which in my study include what are commonly considered ‘extratexts’—that surround translated texts. In the first case, apart from Zhong Junwen’s review of the two Chinese translations of *Joan Haste*, the journal in which the review was published, and the reviewed translations, I have also included in my analysis Zhou’s biography as well as prefaces, postscripts, and forwards in contemporaneous publications that shed direct light on the conceptual distinction between translating and writing. In the second case study, I mainly examine the paratextual materials linked to the *Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers*, which include the three prefaces, the immediate paratexts accompanying each anthologized translation, and a

²³ I conducted archival research at Tsinghua University, Peking University, National Library of China, and Harvard University.

contemporaneous official review of this publication. In the last case study, I mainly focus on two of Wu Mi's essays that contain his direct discussions about the relationships between translating and original writing on the one hand and, on the other, two fiction translations in which he adapts a traditional Chinese commentary practice that blurs the lines between 'text' and 'paratext' and those between writing, commenting, and editing. Apart from these materials that were all published in the journal *Xueheng*, I also include Wu's other contemporaneous essays, diaries, and degree thesis as supporting materials.

In each case study, therefore, I closely examine a small selection of primary sources. The reduced scale of investigation allows me to recover many of the complexities and nuances in conceptualizations of translation in this historical period to problematize the current teleological, linear metanarrative that depicts a shift from 'traditional' to 'modern' conceptions of translation. By concentrating on three cases, I can, on the one hand, focus on how individual cultural actors perceived and performed translation "in the context of their particularity" (Levi 2012, 125). Their writings about and/or practices of translation are not treated as passive, inevitable reflections or embodiments of the translation norms of the age. Rather, they are examined in concrete circumstances in relation to the individual's social background, education, literary persuasion, institutional and political affiliations, etc. On the other hand, by constantly shifting between close-ups and long shots in the case studies, I can also investigate how these individuals negotiated with the larger social conditions and structures when they discussed—or did not discuss—or performed translation.

To sum up, the multiple-case study method provides the flexibility to examine both past writings about translation and practices of translation as well as the relationships or even contradictions between them. Conducted in line with the methodology of Microhistory, the meticulous study of individual cases within their particular, complex contexts allows for the restoration of a human dimension to the study of past textual traces concerning translation. The change of scale also enables the close reading of previously unobserved details in historical documents “which upset and throw into disarray the superficial aspect of the documentation” (Ginzburg and Poni 1991, 8) and challenges the simplifications of the prevailing grand narrative which inadequately accounts for the shifts in attitudes to translation in China from the 1890s to the 1920s.

Within the theoretical framework that I have delineated in this chapter, I investigate in the following three case studies the shifting conceptualizations of translation in the historical period at issue by examining the various statements on and practices of translation. I particularly focus on how the boundaries between translating, writing, and commenting, among other textual activities, were blurred in these various discursive practices and how this conceptual blurring persisted and changed over four decades.

Chapter III. The Indistinct Identity of the ‘Translator’ in the Heterogeneous Discursive Space around *Fanyi* in Late Qing (1840-1911)

In late Qing, after China experienced a series of crushing defeats in wars against Western powers and Japan, many educated Chinese started to translate and introduce Western learning, especially fiction, in response to the ensuing social and national crises. In this wave of translations, as revealed by the substantial body of existing research on late-Qing translation history, translators abridged, expanded, rewrote, and domesticated the original texts at their disposal to bring Western fiction to Chinese readers (e.g. Pollard 1998b; Kwan 2008; Chen 2005, 34-43). Such liberal, target-culture oriented norms of translation, according to previous studies, were overdetermined by the immediate political and social situations, indigenous Chinese literary traditions, and the cultural and social ideologies that still dominated a tumultuous Chinese society in transition (e.g. Wong 2005; Zhang 2006; X.Wang 2006).

Previous studies have mostly viewed late-Qing target-culture oriented translation norms as traditional, “backward”, and even “abnormal” compared to the source-text oriented translation norms of the May Fourth period (Kwan 2008, 356).¹ Kwan (2008) even argues that the reason late-Qing translators could freely manipulate the original texts lies in the “misplaced authority” enjoyed by the translator (rather than the original author) as well as the indistinct identity of the translator in late Qing (ibid.). Wang Hongyin (2003) expresses a similarly pejorative view when commenting on the blurred lines between translation and writing in Yan Fu’s 严复 (1854-1921) translation

¹ In this thesis, regarding the quotes of Chinese primary and secondary sources in English translation, unless otherwise noted, all translations are mine.

theory—‘*xin* 信 (faithfulness, trustworthiness), *da* 达 (expressiveness, comprehensibility), *ya* 雅 (elegance)’. He argues that such a lack of a formal distinction between a theory of translation and a theory of writing is a “defect in expression” if not a “limitation in cognition” (ibid., 108). Though usually stated in passing, such value judgements in the existing scholarship reveal how ‘modern’ or currently dominant conceptions of translation are still influencing research on late-Qing translation history. Instead of evaluating attitudes toward translation in late Qing based on a contemporary or an ahistorical conception of translation, I examine in this chapter how this generation of Chinese literati-translators *themselves* perceived what they were doing with texts and what the blurred lines between translation and other textual activities meant for them.

My point of entry for this investigation is a relatively obscure late-Qing man of letters, Zhong Junwen 钟俊文 (1865-1908), known as Yinbansheng 寅半生 in his writings. The fact that he is still known today, though mostly among scholars of late-Qing fiction and translation, is largely due to his criticism of the famous Lin Shu’s 林纾 (1852-1924) translations. In fact, Yang Lianfen (2003) uses Zhong as an example of the marginalized group of late-Qing literati who held a non-utilitarian view of literature in contrast to such prominent figures as Liang Qichao 梁启超 (1873-1929) and Yan Fu who dominated the late-Qing socio-political discursive space. Such a contrast between dominant and marginalized literati might even have existed in late Qing, yet this disparity between the dominant and the marginalized has been intensified through historiographical filtration and scholarly narrativization. I challenge such a neat dichotomy in my analysis of the case of Zhong Junwen.

As I show in this chapter, though relatively marginalized, Zhong was able to establish for himself a space for self-expression in the late-Qing discursive space by making extensive use, as reader, writer, critic, and publisher, of the new medium of the periodical press. Zhong's review of two Chinese translations of Rider Haggard's (1856-1925) *Joan Haste* is a 'clue' that allows us, living over one century later, to access a concrete case of a conception of '(fiction) translation' that blurs the boundaries between translating, writing, compiling, and editing.

3.1 The literary translation wave in late Qing

3.1.1 The socio-political backdrop

Previous scholarship has thoroughly examined the social, political, and historical circumstances of the period from 1840 to 1911 and how a heightened sense of urgency motivated educated Chinese to engage in translational activities. According to scholarly consensus, the beginning of the late-Qing literary translation wave was a response to socio-political exigencies. Lawrence Wang-Chi Wong (2005) neatly summarizes the political motivations driving this surge in translation activity:

...the fact that the Chinese were willing to translate Western literature marks a milestone in their attitude towards the outside world. Given their strong faith and great pride in their own cultural and literary heritage, a large-scale literary translation movement within such a short time would have been inconceivable without political pressure. (127)

The "political pressure", as briefly explained below, includes both external aggression and internal turmoil in the last seven decades of the Qing dynasty. Only after a series of attempts to solve the social and political crises was literary translation adopted by educated Chinese elites as a means for saving and modernizing the country.

The Qing government's humiliating defeats in wars against Western powers from the 1840s to the 1860s and the unequal treaties signed as the result of those wars generated a general sense of national crisis among the ruling class, the scholar-gentry, and the general public. The Chinese literary and administrative elites—"the stewards of Chinese ethics and culture" in late imperial China (Denton 1996, 65)—responded to the urgency of national salvation most swiftly and forcefully.² As early as the First Opium War (1839-1842) against the British navy, some Chinese scholar-officials such as Lin Zexu 林则徐 (1785-1850) and Wei Yuan 魏源 (1794-1857) were arguing for the importance of understanding the superior skills of the West, or what they referred to as 'yi 夷' (barbarians).³ Lin and Wei initiated the compilations and translations of works on global geography, international law, Western politics, and Western history (see Xiong 1994, 220-84; Ma 1998, 328-31).

The imperial court, however, was busy coping with large-scale civil unrest such as the Taiping Rebellion (1851-1871). The Qing court did not make an official attempt to learn about the Western powers' superior skills until its military defeat by the British and the French in the Second Opium War (1856-1860). Beginning in 1861, a fraction of the ruling elite adapted to the changing circumstances and launched *Yangwu yundong* 洋务运动 (literally, foreign affairs movement, also known as the Self-

² See Esherick and Rankin (1990) for a collection of studies on Chinese local elites and the mechanisms of their cultural and social functions in China from the 14th to the 20th centuries.

³ The Chinese term for 'the West' changed, in a loosely chronological sense, from *yi* 夷 (barbarian) to *xiyang* 西洋 (literally 'western ocean') and then to *xifang* 西方 (literally 'western direction or side') in modern China. The geopolitical space these terms refer to respectively and the connotations of these words are of course different. See Fang (2001) for a study of the different Chinese terms to refer to the 'foreign' in 19th-century China.

Strengthening Movement).⁴ They urged the court to adopt Western military technology, armaments, applied sciences, and diplomatic practices in order to strengthen the Qing court's governance. The adoption of Western technology inevitably entailed the training of technical, diplomatic, and translation personnel, the sending of Chinese students abroad, and the establishment of official institutions to organize foreign-language teaching, translation projects, and translator training (see Xiong 1994, 301-49, 493-550; Xie and Zha 2004, 40-4; Wong 2005).⁵ In this sense, the official initiatives of learning from the West also established the conditions, especially human resources, for the booming development in translation activities that eventually proliferated outside official government circles.

Meanwhile, the Self-Strengthening Movement, which lasted for over three decades, failed to fulfil its primary and stated goal of building a modern Chinese military force and guarding against further foreign invasions. In 1895, the Qing navy suffered a crushing and humiliating defeat by Japan, which had long been considered by the Chinese as a mere tributary state. This loss of the first Sino-Japanese War gravely deepened the sense of crisis among the Chinese elite. Some of them realized that the scope of Western learning should be enlarged beyond mere technological knowhow. Reform-minded cultural actors such as Kang Youwei 康有为 (1858-1927) and Liang Qichao 梁启超 (1873-1929) tried to convince the Qing court of the need to undertake sweeping social and institutional reforms based on Western and Japanese

⁴ The fraction of the ruling elite which supported and pushed the Self-Strengthening Movement included Prince Yi Xin 奕訢 (1833-1898) and such high-ranking officials as Zeng Guofan 曾国藩 (1811-1872), Li Hongzhang 李鸿章 (1823-1901), and Zhang Zhidong 张之洞 (1837-1909).

⁵ Such institutions include, just to name a few, *Tongwen guan* 同文馆 (School of Combined Learning) set up in Beijing in 1862, *Guang fangyan guan* 广方言馆 (School for the Diffusion of Languages) set up in Shanghai in 1863, and the *Chuangzheng xuetao* 船政学堂 (Academy of Naval Administration) founded in Fuzhou in 1869.

models (see e.g. Chang 1980; Cai, Zhang, and Wang 2001). Their efforts—*Wuxu bianfa* 戊戌变法 (Reform of 1898)—were thwarted, however, by the Empress Dowager’s *coup d’état* with support from the conservative factions at the Qing court.⁶

The failure of this Reform led the reformists to turn their attention to the public as “the main target audience of advocacy for reform” (Wang 1998, 49). This crucial shift in focus was manifested in the reformists’ various engagements in the new-style periodical press and utilization of the genre *xiaoshuo* 小说 (fiction), which allowed them to reach a wider reading public. Liang Qichao, seeing the educational and political potential in Western political fiction, advocated the translation and publication of fiction (Xie and Zha 2004, 45-9; Chen 1996, 109-17; Wong 1998b). Liang’s and other reformists’ active advocacy also helped to elevate the status of *xiaoshuo*, which had long been officially scorned and considered unworthy of pursuit for literati within China’s literary polysystems (Wong 1998b; Hung 1998). When the reformists’ political fiction, with its strong and dry didacticism, quickly waned in popularity, translations and ‘original’ Chinese writings of detective stories, adventure stories, and other types of entertaining fictional tales held considerable appeal for Chinese readers (Wong 1998b, 120-1). Then both fiction and translation became important, worthwhile, and even profitable endeavours for educated Chinese. And that is how the first wave of literary translation came about in Chinese translation history.

⁶ *Wuxu* is the term for the 35th year within a sexagenary cycle in the traditional ‘heavenly stems and earthly branches’ of the Chinese lunar calendar. This reform is commonly referred to as *Bairi weixin* 百日维新 or, in English, Hundred Day’s Reform, which emphasizes retrospectively the reform’s results.

3.1.2 Previous scholarship on Chinese thinking about translation in late Qing

The rich scholarship on the late-Qing translation wave has been centered mostly on translation practice while neglecting Chinese thinking about translation. Moreover, the existing small body of research on translation theory in late Qing focuses on only a select group of prominent figures and their discussions about translation. Overall, I would argue, the issue of conceptualizations of translation in late Qing has not received the attention it deserves in the previous scholarship.

The increased scholarly interest in late-Qing translation history in recent decades is closely associated with the development of descriptive translation studies and especially norms theory and polysystem theory within the discipline of translation studies. Many aspects of translation activities in late Qing, such as the manipulation of texts and the Sinicization of narratives in translation, provide fascinating data for scholars investigating the social dimensions of translating and translation's relations to power and ideology (e.g. Cheung 1998; Hung 1998a, b; X. Wang 2006). To borrow Sun Yifeng's (2012) observation of the influence of various theories—e.g. polysystem theory, norms theory, and the cultural approach—on Chinese translation studies, “[n]umerous case studies were provided, sometimes to a tedious extent, to illustrate the ‘relevance’ of the concept of ideology to translation practice in China” (38). This statement applies nicely to the existing scholarship on late-Qing translation history.

I acknowledge, however, that studies of late-Qing translated texts, translation processes, and translators' behaviors sometimes do touch upon the translators' views and understandings of translation. Especially in studies that focus on the late-Qing translators' subjectivity, ethics, and responses to norms, scholars have examined how

certain aspects of the Chinese literary, intellectual, and translation traditions as well as the immediate socio-political contexts impinged on translators' decision-making processes (e.g. X. Liu 2006; X. Wang 2006; Yang 2006; Zhang 2006; Hu 2007b). By probing late-Qing translators' interaction with these external social, cultural, and political factors in the translation process, these studies illuminate how translators understood 'translation' in that period. In this type of norm-based research, however, the explanations of late-Qing translators' behavior and their underlying conceptions of translation tend to "focus on the sociological (the power of institutions, the collective or social forces behind norms)" (Crisafulli 2002, 35). In other words, in this type of research, translators are viewed as being somewhat passively "in the grip of overpowering norms" and their understandings of translation become merely unidirectional manifestations of those constructed late-Qing norms of translation (ibid., 32). Focused on a generally common, representative conception of translation, therefore, these norm-based studies downplay the individual agency of late-Qing cultural actors and the dynamic dimensions of how they, as both translators and readers, actively conceptualized translation.

Meanwhile, there are studies that specifically focus on the late-Qing discourse on translation in an effort to explore and revitalize traditional Chinese translation theory. The several historiographical projects about Chinese translation theory or thought mentioned in Chapter I all include and examine certain writings about translation that were produced in late Qing (Luo 1984; Chen 1992; Wang 2003; Chan 2004; Wang 2004). In these studies, the representations of the late-Qing discourse on translation, however, tend to be superficial and limited for two different reasons. On the one hand,

Chan (2004) finds late-Qing discussions on translation lacking in theoretical sophistication. He therefore includes only one piece of writing on translation from late Qing, i.e., Yan Fu's '*xin, da, ya*' principle of translation, in his English-language anthology of 20th-century Chinese translation theory.⁷ On the other hand, the Chinese-language anthologies and histories include more discussions about translation produced in late Qing in order to construct a seemingly long, continuous Chinese tradition of thinking on translation (e.g. Luo 1984; Chen 1992).⁸ Yet these studies still include only a small number of eminent historical figures from this period, chosen and read with the scholars' strong nationalistic sentiments.

In these Chinese-language anthologies and histories, Liang Qichao, Lin Shu, and Yan Fu, among several other well-known intellectuals, translators, and writers, are considered the most important and representative thinkers on translation in late Qing. To take Luo's (1984) influential anthology as an example, its '*jindai* 近代' (early modern China) section includes only one piece of writing each from Ma Jianzhong 马建忠 (1845-1900), Su Manshu 苏曼殊 (1884-1918), and Wang Guowei 王国维 (1877-1927), three from Liang Qichao, five from Yan Fu, and nineteen from Lin Shu. Later scholars' efforts in mapping the field of modern Chinese translation theory do not deviate much from Luo's model. The bulk and themes of early modern Chinese thinking on translation, with more or fewer historical figures included, stay roughly

⁷ Though Chan does not think Yan deserves the central position he has enjoyed in the history of Chinese translation theory (see Chan 2001, 199), he still includes Yan's writing on '*xin, da, ya*' in the anthology because it has been invoked, responded to, elaborated and criticized by generations of Chinese translators and scholars in the 20th century (Chan 2004, 67). See Wong (2004) for a contextualized analysis of '*xin, da, ya*' as Yan Fu's strategy for addressing the particular translation problems in late-Qing China.

⁸ See Bai (2009) for a study on Luo's compilation of this anthology. Examining the historical, political and academic backgrounds for the compilation of this anthology, Bai argues that Luo's anthology was intended "to pump up a confidence, if not a pride, in China's own translation theories, which are rooted in its own cultural tradition" (426).

the same. As Chen (1996) states explicitly, this early modern period in Chinese history was an age of “national salvation and enlightenment”, and therefore early modern Chinese translation theory was conditioned and constrained by this theme of the age (201). When the early modern Chinese discourse on translation is read accordingly, with stress on these broader characteristics of the time, its most prominent and salient feature is thus the pragmatic understanding of translation which it represents (see Chen 1996, 201-04). Such scholarship, therefore, has constructed a monophonic and limited discursive space regarding translation in late Qing, which highlights a utilitarian understanding of translation within an overall context of national salvation, public enlightenment, and modernization.

Apart from the general lack of scholarly interest in Chinese thinking on translation in late Qing, the ways in which textual materials have been treated in the previous scholarship also prevent a better understanding of the conceptualizations of translation in this period. In the existing studies on translation practice, translated texts are usually the focus of analysis for constructing translation norms and examining translators’ subjectivity. Meanwhile, segments of writings from late-Qing literati that contain remarks on translation—usually in various paratextual forms that accompany the translated texts—are often quoted or examined to contextualize the translation phenomena under study or to serve as explicit evidence of the norms that governed translation of the day. For instance, Zhang Yan (2006), in her study on translators’ responses to the translation norms in late Qing and early Republican China, even separates, in a simplistic fashion, the editorial materials of periodicals from translators’ prefaces and postscripts. She studies the former to reveal the norms—more specifically,

‘translation guidelines’—that governed translation while examining the latter to see how translators responded to such norms. What she fails to realize is that it was principally the same group of Chinese literati who ‘set’ the translation guidelines in the editorial pieces of periodicals and who contributed translations to these periodicals.

In contrast, the type of scholarship that anthologizes and analyzes Chinese translation theory often prioritizes and isolates paratextual materials from the translated texts they surround. In a recent study on Lin Shu and his collaborators, Hill (2013) criticizes the common practice of extracting textual segments from the paratextual writings surrounding translations and forcing them into such molds as ‘theory’ and ‘thought’ (17-8). Though Hill’s criticism serves to set his research apart from previous studies that ignore translations in the field of Chinese literary and intellectual history, he also alerts us to the problematics of separating paratextual writings (as prized ‘original’ utterance) from the translated texts proper (as non-original utterance) in translation historiography (*ibid.*).⁹ That is, when these paratextual writings are separated as prized ‘original’ utterances, the fact that they were part of the production of the translations they accompany is often ignored. In extracting pieces of prefaces and postscripts to translations as pure theorizations of translation, it is easy to take these paratextual utterances at face value and to be distracted by their noble and elevated rhetoric. For instance, Wang (2004) argues, on the mere basis of Lin Shu’s paratextual writings, that part of Lin’s translation theory is “to stay faithful to the original’s ideas without adding one’s own opinions” (86). Such an interpretation of Lin’s attitudes towards translation is simplistic and

⁹ Hill’s approach is to treat translations also as mental labor in the account of late-Qing and early-Republican literary and intellectual history.

contradicts much of the existing scholarship which reveals Lin's manipulative, complex treatment of the 'original' that veers from or directly opposes the overt claims Lin makes in his paratexts (e.g. Cheung 1998; Wong 1998a).

Hill's (2013) critique of the previous studies' focus on paratextual materials, however, goes a bit too far when he argues, by quoting Genette, that "no one is required to read a preface" or other types of paratext (18). I disagree with Hill on this point. As I have argued in Chapter II, paratexts are important primary sources for the understanding of historical conceptualizations of translation. For purposes of this study, I treat the paratexts and other types of textual material in this case study all as 'intertexts' and as having equal importance. Moreover, in my reading of various types of textual material, I not only focus on the content of *what* is said in discussions about translation but also tease out *how* it is said and what is *not* said. One practical reason for the aforementioned lack of scholarly interest in late-Qing translators' thinking about translation might be that there were simply not many writings with direct, systematic reflections on translation. The lack of overt theorization on translation, however, does not equate to an unenlightened, unsophisticated phase in Chinese translation history unworthy of investigation but rather reveals the particular conceptualizations of translation at that time.

3.2 Conceptualizing translation in 'non-discussions' about translation and the periodical press in late Qing

Compared to the May-Fourth intellectuals, late-Qing cultural actors did not devote much intellectual energy to producing direct statements on translation. On the one hand, there were not many inward reflections on the nature of translation,

translation strategies, or translation criteria. On the other, the brief discussions about the social functions of (fiction) translation were often in fact only discussions of the social functions of (translated) fiction. That is, the ‘translation’ element of translated fiction was overshadowed by the ‘fiction’ element in the late-Qing discursive space. For instance, when cultural actors discussed the importance of translating Western fiction for public enlightenment, social progress, or national salvation, they were primarily concerned with the social function of *fiction* rather than translation. I call this kind of discussions of published fiction translations common in late Qing ‘non-discussions’ about translation. They are closely linked to translated fiction, but rarely focus on the translational aspects of the translated fiction.

Let me explain a bit more about these ‘non-discussions’ about translation in paratextual materials accompanying translation.¹⁰ In late Qing, fiction translations were either serialized in periodicals or published in book form. In fact, “the normal practice then was for new works of fiction to appear in periodicals before being published in book form” (Tarumoto 1998, 37). In either form, the translation proper was always surrounded by various paratextual materials, including: prefaces, postscripts, *pingdian* commentaries (see Chapter V), which spatially sit the closest to the translated text; accreditation of translation on title pages and tables of content; reviews and advertisements that appeared in other journals or newspapers. These paratexts could be produced by the translators, the editors, or some other literati not involved in the production of the particular translation.

¹⁰ As explained in detail in Chapter Two, Genette’s (1997) distinction between ‘paratext’ and ‘extratext’ does not apply in this study, because his hierarchical subcategorization operates on a preoccupation with ‘authorial intention’.

After surveying many of the above mentioned types of paratextual materials in late Qing, Hu (2007b) and Liao (2014) conclude that the late-Qing discourse of translation criticism gave primary emphasis to the sociopolitical functions of translation, advocated the translation method of ‘*dazhi* 达旨’ (giving the gist), and only focused on the elegance of the language (‘*yibi* 译笔’ or more generally ‘*wenbi* 文笔’) of the translated text without comparing it to the original text. Liao (2014) argues that these characteristics of late-Qing translation criticism show that, for late-Qing translators and critics, “the boundaries between translation and creation were blurred or even dissolved” (108; see also Hu 2007b, 206). In other words, translated texts were often treated as if they were ‘original’ works within the intertextual matrix of the Chinese literary system in late Qing. As is well-known in the field of Chinese translation history, neither translators nor editors in late Qing were concerned with providing publication information—not even the original title or the author—of the foreign text.¹¹ To take *Xiaoshuo shibao* 小说时报 (Fiction Times)¹² as an example, it was not until the 11th issue (1911) that the journal started to require all submissions of translated fiction to include information about the original text’s title, publisher, and author as well as the name of the translator (XSSBS 1911). And it took several more issues before the journal gradually included such basic information. An advertisement for the journal *Xin xiaoshuo* 新小说 (New Fiction) in the 14th issue of *Xinmin congbao* 新民丛报 (New Citizen) neatly captures this inclusive attitude towards translated fiction. It declares that both the ‘authored’ (著 *zhu*) and the ‘translated’ (*yi*) works

¹¹ The lack of publication information of the source text makes it difficult for later scholars to identify the nature—either translation, rewriting, relay translation, or pseudo-translation, etc.—of the Chinese text at hand.

¹² This journal was founded by Di Baoxian 狄葆贤 (1873-1941) in 1909 and continued until 1917. Its chief editors were Chen Jinghan 陈景韩 (1878-1965) and Bao Tianxiao 包天笑 (1876-1973).

published in that new periodical were selected and organized carefully “so as not to tarnish the reputation of *Chinese* literature” (XXSBS 1902; my emphasis).

Perhaps because many of these paratextual materials surrounding late-Qing fiction translations do not focus on translational issues, they have often been used as primary sources for extracting Chinese literary thought or fiction theory in contemporary scholarship on Chinese literature (e.g. Chen and Xia 1989; Denton 1996). It has been common practice to separate these paratextual materials from the translated texts they were originally associated with and to treat them as original statements about fiction or literature. Hence, since the focus of the literary scholars is on the embryonic modern Chinese literary theory contained in these utterances, as Hill (2013) argues and I mentioned earlier, the effect is that the importance of translation as intellectual work has been obscured. In contemporary translation studies scholarship, however, these paratextual materials are often taken as evidence for the translators’ strong subjectivity in the late-Qing context (e.g. Wong 2004; X. Wang 2006; X. Liu 2006; Pan 2012). Especially in prefaces, postscripts, and commentaries, the late-Qing translator’s voice was very audible, which has been considered an important aspect of the late-Qing translator’s ‘visibility’¹³.

I want to point out, however, that the paratextual materials surrounding late-Qing fiction translations is not a simple case of the translator’s (in)visibility. The different ways in which Chinese literary scholarship and translation studies scholarship tend to handle basically the same corpus of primary sources are both largely justified. The contradiction between their different foci, however, reveals a more complex aspect of

¹³ I here refer to Venuti’s (1995) seminal concept of the translator’s invisibility.

these paratextual materials. The problem lies in the specific identity—the ‘translator’. That is, in late Qing, the cultural actor who wrote paratexts for his/her own translation was *visible* not as a ‘translator’ but, as I show in detail in 3.2.2, as a generalist Confucian scholar whose social status and authority were derived from the “expertise in the knowledge and presentation of Confucian classics, history, and literature—areas of knowledge that were closely related and technically undifferentiated” (Xu 2001, 4). Translation was only one of the activities Confucian scholars undertook at that time. The so-called ‘invisibility’ belongs to the identity ‘translator’ itself but not to the person who performed the translation activity that we specifically distinguish as ‘translation’ nowadays.

In the following, I focus on one case of this type of ‘non-discussion’ about translation from a late-Qing periodical to explain this phenomenon further. It is a piece of writing which would nowadays be categorized as a ‘translation review’. Titled “*Du Jiayin xiaozhuan liang yiben shuhou* 读迦因小传两译本书后¹⁴” (After reading two translations of *Joan Haste*), this review was written by Zhong Junwen regarding two Chinese translations of Rider Haggard’s *Joan Haste* and published in the 11th issue of the periodical *Youxi shiji* 游戏世界 (World of Game) in 1907 (for a discussion of the concept of *youxi*, see 3.2.1).¹⁵

The first translation at issue, *Jiayin xiaozhuan* 迦因小传, was undertaken by Panxizi 蟠溪子 and Tianxiaosheng 天笑生 and serialized in the periodical *Lixue yibian*

¹⁴ *Shuhou* 书后, which literally means ‘after the book’ is a genre similar to a postscript or an afterword. It usually contains discussion and review of the ‘book’ it is appended to or about.

¹⁵ This journal, founded by Zhong Junwen himself in Hangzhou in 1906, is different from another periodical with the same name published in the early Republican era (1921-1923).

励学译编 (Collection of Translations for Encouraging Learning) from 1901 to 1902.¹⁶ Their translation was soon published in book form by *Wenming shuju* 文明书局 (Wenming Book Company) in 1903. This translation is incomplete: it does not render the first half of the novel, but starts from the 21st chapter of the original text (40 chapters in total). In his preface, Panxizi informs the reader that he is unable to locate the first half of the original novel.¹⁷ Apart from omitting the novel's first half, Panxizi and Tianxiaosheng also extensively sanitized and rewrote many elements of the plot in their translation of the second half, including the parts about the heroine Joan's passionate love for Henry and her resulting premarital pregnancy (see Guo 2009, 96-8; Liu 2010; Liu 2017, 57-66).

The other translation is a relatively full rendition of *Joan Haste*, *Jiayin xiaozhuan* 迦茵小传, provided by Lin Shu and his major collaborator Wei Yi 魏易 (1880-1930) in 1905.¹⁸ It was published in book form by *Shangwu yinshuguan* 商务印书馆 (Commercial Press). As Lin ([1905]1913) himself explains in his preface to this “unabridged version” (*zuben* 足本), he finds it a pity that the first half of such a great novel is untranslated and, unable to identify who Panxizi was, he could not send the original text to Panxizi but had to take on the task of translating the entire novel himself (1-2). Though there are also extensive textual manipulations in Lin and Wei's version,

¹⁶ Panxizi has been unanimously identified in the previous scholarship as the penname of Yang Zilin 杨紫麟, but there is no bibliographical information about this person. Tianxiaosheng was one of Bao Tianxiao's pennames. *Lixue yibian* was one of the earliest Chinese translation periodicals, founded by Bao Tianxiao in April 1901 in Suzhou.

¹⁷ See Shen (2006) and Liu (2010) for discussions of the contrasting views on the truthfulness of Panxizi's claim, i.e. whether Panxizi and Tianxiaosheng intentionally omitted the first half to sanitize the plot or indeed were unable to acquire the first half of the novel.

¹⁸ In Lin and Wei's version, the Chinese character for 'yin' is a homophone of that in Panxizi and Tianxiaosheng's version.

it does include the plot elements about Joan's unwed pregnancy.¹⁹ The publication of this unabridged version created a great sensation at the time, with three reprints in 1906 alone, but it also incurred criticism, mostly concerning its damage to the social morals of late-Qing China (Shen 2006, 70).

Zhong's review of these two Chinese versions of *Joan Haste* has often been cited in previous scholarship as an example of such moral criticism. In his review, Zhong does not focus on any translational aspects of the translations under discussion. Instead, he praises Panxizi's bowdlerization of the text while faulting Lin's more 'faithful' rendering for retaining the indecent aspects of the plot, especially those concerning Joan's premarital pregnancy.²⁰ In my analysis, I am not interested in how Zhong's review represents late-Qing Chinese literati's conservative mores. Rather, I focus on showing how his arguments unfold in a way that reveals a certain conceptual ambiguity between the categories of translating, writing, compiling, and editing. To give an in-depth description of this case within its historical context, first I discuss the periodical *Youxi shijie* within the context of the development of the periodical press in late Qing.

3.2.1 The medium for 'non-discussions' about *fanyi* and an emerging public discursive space

Zhong, an ordinary educated man in late Qing, made his voice heard publicly through the medium of periodicals. His review of the two translations of *Joan Haste*

¹⁹ See H. Liu and Q. Liu (2008) and Guo (2009), pp. 83-106, for comparisons of Lin and Wei's translation with the original text, especially the mistranslations, additions, omissions, and rewritings in their translation.

²⁰ In his review, Zhong himself only mentions Panxizi as the translator of the earlier translation and Lin Shu as the translator of the later version. In my following discussion of Zhong's review, therefore, I follow the way in which Zhong identified the translators of the two translations.

was first published in the periodical *Youxi shijie*, founded and edited by Zhong himself. Then it was reprinted in the 7th issue (1907) of a more popular periodical, *Yueyue xiaoshuo* 月月小说 (All-Story Monthly)²¹, as part of the column “*Shuo xiaoshuo* 说小说 (On fiction)”.

The development of the periodical press in late Qing became an important channel for educated Chinese to express their opinions and reach a much wider readership than the traditional small circle of literati friends. Zhong’s journal *Youxi shijie* carved out a share of space in that polyphonic, rumbustious late-Qing discursive space.

The last four decades of the Qing dynasty, especially the final ten years, witnessed the rise of the periodical press in China.²² Newspapers and magazines of all sorts—political, literary, commercial, scientific, propagandistic, or miscellaneous—were starting to boom. “By the last decade of the Qing, there were more than 170 presses, catering to a potential audience of two to four million readers” (Wang 1997, 2). Previous scholarship has already discussed how the development of the periodical press provided a new public realm—what I call public ‘discursive space’—for educated Chinese to publicize their political agendas, to voice their own views on various public matters, and to mold public opinion (e.g. Judge 1996; Gimpel 2001; Vittinghoff 2001). Political presses such as *Shibao* 时报 (The Eastern Times) constituted what Judge (1996) calls a “middle realm” where late-Qing reformist intellectuals “negotiat[ed] between the dynasty ‘above’ and the common people

²¹ *Yueyue xiaoshuo* has been commonly considered as one of ‘four major late-Qing fiction periodicals’ (*wanqing sida xiaoshuo qikan* 晚清四大小说期刊). It was founded in October 1906 in Shanghai and continued until January 1909.

²² For a comprehensive, descriptive English-language study of the periodical press in late Qing, see Britton (1966), which owes much to Ge Gongzhen’s (1927) pioneer study.

‘below’” (1). Even before the reform-minded publicists utilized the modern press as a weapon, as Vittinghoff (2001) shows, various groups in the late-Qing society were involved in and made use of this public arena. Even the alleged opponents of the new press—the conservative officials—competed for “legitimate public articulation” in the emerging new press (Vittinghoff 2001, 394). With the promotion of the social and political functions of *xiaoshuo*, literary journals and literary supplements to periodicals also served as an important “medium for discussion and for the dissemination and publication of ideas and opinions” (Gimpel 2001, 6). Many *xiaoshuo* periodicals, apart from providing popular entertainment, also served as sites where educated Chinese communicated their thinking about various public matters to a wide readership. In short, the various Chinese-language newspapers and magazines in late Qing constituted a heterogeneous public discursive space that offered the educated Chinese of the day an outlet for self-expression.

It should be noted that this public discursive space was not only constituted by such major comprehensive newspapers as *Shibao*, *Shenbao* 申报 (Shanghai News), *Shiwu bao* 时务报 (China Progress), and *Xinmin congbao* or leading fiction magazines such as *Xin xiaoshuo*, *Xiuxiang xiaoshuo* 绣像小说 (Illustrated Fiction), *Yueyue xiaoshuo*, and *Xiaoshuo lin* 小说林 (Forest of Fiction). Apart from these well-studied, representative periodicals, there were a considerable number of lesser-known periodicals in late Qing that competed for a share of the discursive space. Many periodicals in circulation during this period have faded since into oblivion. *Youxi shijie* was not a major periodical, but it has luckily (for our purposes) survived the travails of history and is still known today, though mostly to scholars in the field of late-Qing

fiction. With 18 issues in all, it was not, by late-Qing standards, a short-lived journal.²³ Considering that the periodical discontinued when Zhong passed away, it perhaps could have otherwise had a longer life. It is now impossible to ascertain the popularity and influence of *Youxi shijie* at that time. Nevertheless, as mentioned earlier, Zhong's review was picked up quickly by another more popular periodical in the same year.²⁴ It can be assumed that *Youxi shijie* must have circulated fairly widely and carved a certain position in the late-Qing discursive space.

Zhong Junwen founded *Youxi shijie* in August 1906, soon after the imperial civil service examination system—a meritocratic examination system in imperial China that recruited candidates for the state bureaucracy—was abolished.²⁵ According to his biography in the *Genealogy of the Zhongs in Qianqing Town*, Zhong Junwen came from an educated family in the Jiangnan²⁶ area and was fairly talented and good at learning.²⁷ However, he did not pass the provincial examination (*xiangshi* 乡试) even after several attempts.²⁸ He was already distressed from failing the civil service examinations, and the abolition of the examination system completely cut off the path to sociopolitical power, status, and riches for him and millions of other examination

²³ It started as a semi-monthly in August 1906 but then changed into a monthly from April 1907.

²⁴ Its advertisements were published in *Zhongwai ribao* 中外日报 (Chinese and Foreign Daily) and *Xiaolin bao* 笑林报 (Forest of Laughter), which were two newspapers published in Shanghai, in 1906.

²⁵ See Elman (2013) for a detailed survey of the history of the imperial examination system from Ming to Qing dynasties.

²⁶ Jiangnan area, geographically, refers to the lands immediately to the south of the lower reaches of the Yangtze River. Culturally, Jiangnan area “has long been famed for its excellence in education” (Yeh 2006, 178).

²⁷ See Zhu (2015) for a study on Zhong based on his biography in the newly discovered *Genealogy of the Zhongs in Qianqing Town*. All quotations from and paraphrases of the biography are based on the version of it appended to Zhu's (2015) study.

²⁸ In his biography and autobiographical poem (*zishu shi* 自述诗) in the first issue of *Youxi shijie*, it is said that Zhong took the provincial examination eight times. However, Liu Delong's (2006) study argues that Zhong could not have taken eight provincial examinations. No matter how many times he had taken the provincial examination, Zhong was just one of the millions of failures in the civil service examinations, for the percentage of people who could get the provincial degrees was extremely small, let alone on higher levels in late imperial China (Elman 2013, 125).

candidates. This was a “path from literacy through literature to the expectation of lifetime employment in the service of the state” that had lasted in imperial China for over a millennium (McDougall 2003, 2). As noted in previous studies, the elimination of the imperial examination system exerted an enormous influence on the social structure as well as the life of almost every educated man in China like Zhong (e.g. Elman 2000; Yang 2003; Yeh 2006). Former examination candidates now had to turn to various other engagements to earn a living and redefine their role and value in the new world.

These men of letters, however, were not completely new to this kind of uncertainty in life. Before the abolition of the examination system, most of the examination failures had long been “us[ing] their linguistic and literary talents in a variety of nonofficial roles”; such sideline jobs ranged “from physicians to pettifoggers, ritual specialists, lineage agents; from fiction writers, playwrights, printers, and bookmen to examination essay teachers” (Elman 2013, 5). Zhong was once a substitute examination teacher, as recorded in his autobiographical poem (Yinbansheng 1906c).²⁹ He also started a publishing house/bookshop, *Chongshi zhai* 崇实斋, at least no later than the year 1903, when he published a collection of miscellaneous writings he had collected and edited—*Tianhua luanzhui* 天花乱坠 (literally, raining flowers from heaven). Sideline jobs relating to the civil service examinations were no longer

²⁹ The journal *Youxi shijie* is bound using the traditional thread-binding method which folds single-printed sheets of paper in half in a stack and stitches them together at the open ends. After binding, the original page numbers, marked in the middle of each paper sheet, are broken into halves, with half of the number showing on each side of a paper sheet. Therefore, I am unable to provide page numbers when quoting articles in this journal.

available, however, after the elimination of this thousand-year old educational, social, and political institution.

The development of the periodical press in late Qing, then, offered educated men like Zhong alternative career opportunities that matched their skills. As Yeh (2006) points out, it was rather natural for them to turn to the publishing industry as writers, journalists, editors, or translators for newspapers and magazines, using perhaps “their only capital—their education” (179). The periodical press and the *xiaoshuo* market had already been developing prolifically by the year 1905. As Zhong himself observes in the preface to the column ‘*Xiaoshuo xianping* 小说闲评’ (Idle remarks on fiction)’ in his journal *Youxi shijie*, “it was a world of *bagu* 八股 [essays] ten years ago, but recently it has suddenly become a world of fiction” (Yinbansheng 1906a). *Bagu wen* 八股文, the eight-legged essay, was an extremely formulaic style of composition used in the imperial civil service examinations since the Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) which required an eight part response to an essay question. Therefore, in this metonymic form, Zhong described the sea change educated men were experiencing in the years around the turn of the century.

Zhong himself dived into this new world of *xiaoshuo* with his own periodical and publishing house/bookshop. As he declares in the introductory piece in the inaugural issue of *Youxi shijie*, he established this periodical single-handedly as if he was setting up a game, and he calls for players from all corners of the country to participate in this game by submitting articles (Yinbansheng 1906b). He also explains why his fellow literati should join him: the whole universe, history, and life itself are nothing but a game. Common men of letters like him, he continues, do not have such capital as

power and wealth. What they have are their literary skills—or as Zhong puts it, the writing brush, paper, ink, and the mind (*xinsi* 心思)—as their tools (*ju* 具) to play games (ibid.). Therefore, the desk is their stage and words the performances they produce (ibid.). Even though it is quite noticeable that in Zhong’s description there is a strong sense of frustration and a feeling of being played with by fate or some higher uncontrollable force in the Heaven, the very fact that he launched this journal illustrates his effort to get back into the game and relocate his role. Chen Diexian, a writer, editor, and entrepreneur later associated with the ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ (see Chapter IV), echoed this view in his foreword to the first issue of *Youxi shijie*. He says that creating this world of *youxi* (game, recreation, amusement, etc.) is also a way for them to “occupy a small portion of space in today’s world” (Tianxu wosheng 1906).

As the name of the periodical *Youxi shijie* indicates, Zhong advocated the idea of ‘*youxi*’ to position himself in the heterogeneous late-Qing discursive space. Zhong in the first issue announces that the periodical “takes *youxi* as its purpose, and does not discuss current affairs or evaluate people” (Yinbansheng 1906b). The word *youxi*, as indicated above, has various meanings, including ‘game’, ‘recreation’, ‘amusement’, ‘playing’, and ‘whiling away the time’. In this case, *youxi* is a somewhat paradoxical and unorthodox outlook on literature, life, and ultimately the universe that Zhong and many other like-minded contemporaneous Chinese literati upheld.³⁰ Yeh (2006), in

³⁰ Other ‘*youxi*’ journals in late Qing and early Republican China include *Youxi bao* 游戏报 (Recreation Newspaper) founded by Li Boyuan 李伯元 (1867-1906) in 1897, *Youxi zazhi* 游戏杂志 (Recreation Magazine) established by Wang Dungen and Chen Diexian in 1913, and another *Youxi shijie* founded by Zhou Shoujuan and Zhao Shaokuang 赵若狂 (1892-1953) in 1921. Many more journals such as *Libai liu* 礼拜六 (Saturday) and *Xiaoshuo yuebao* 小说月报 (Short-Story Monthly) provided entertaining popular literature to a mass readership. These journals are associated with the so-called ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’, which is discussed in Chapter IV.

her study of late-Qing entertainment culture in Shanghai, traces this *youxi* attitude among late-Qing literati working in the Shanghai entertainment press to a long-standing tradition in premodern Chinese intellectual culture. As she puts it, “[l]iterati who felt unappreciated by or dissatisfied with the world, yet were powerless to influence it, had assumed this *guise* in the past” (16; my emphasis). As a kind of pessimistic emotional withdrawal from worldly affairs out of frustration, the concept of *youxi* is intimately associated with the Confucian tradition. A Confucian scholar pursues the common ideal of being a moral model and social leader and putting forward edifying words. Game, entertainment, and recreation were part of the intellectual life of Chinese literati but never the orthodox goal of either life or literature. Thus, explicitly proclaiming *youxi* as the purpose of writing essays or establishing a periodical ran counter to the time-honored orthodox view of literature as a vehicle for conveying the Way (*wen yi zai dao* 文以載道). However, as Yeh (2006) indicates, this stance is not a complete renouncement of the established ideal of literature and intellectual life or a thorough detachment from public life. This ‘playing’ or ‘game’ attitude is often more of a deliberate pretence of ‘unseriousness’ the dispirited literati adopted and cultivated to mentally reconcile their deep-rooted Confucian ideals with the bleak reality of their lives and to redefine their relationship to society.

Yang (2003), when discussing the marginalized literati and the emergence of modern aesthetic views in late Qing, more specifically traces this traditional outlook on literature and life to Daoism, a Chinese thought tradition that celebrates such key concepts as *wuwei* 无为 (non-doing) and *ziran* 自然 (naturalness). To summarize very briefly, Daoist—especially Zhuangzi’s 莊子—attitude towards life, as compared to

Confucianism, emphasizes accepting and being at ease with destiny, freedom of the mind, and carefree enjoyment of life (Liu 2011). Yang further argues that this attitude of *youxi*, however, is not simply a continuation of Daoist tradition. She maintains that the concept of ‘*youxi*’ expressed throughout the journal *Youxi shijie* also reflects Western influences, that is, the “non-utilitarian views of art in the West” pioneered by Kant, Nietzsche, and Schopenhauer’s philosophies (Yang 2003, 32). It is possible that Zhong Junwen, Chen Diexian, and their fellow literati had been exposed to this kind of non-utilitarian Western views of art and literature through their reading of Western learning in Chinese translation. For instance, at the end of the previously cited introductory piece, Zhong does mention some Western influence, but only anonymously:

西人有三大自由，曰思想自由、言论自由、出板[版]自由。
吾则请增为四，曰游戏自由。
Westerners uphold three types of freedom, i.e. freedom in thought, freedom in speech, and freedom in publishing. I would like to propose one more type of freedom, that is, freedom in *youxi*. (Yinbansheng 1906b)

Without more evidence, however, it is far-fetched to establish specific connections between the philosophies of Kant, Nietzsche, and Schopenhauer and Zhong’s view of *youxi*.

It is beyond the scope of this study to trace the conceptual origins of the idea of *youxi* in Chinese or Western intellectual traditions. Nonetheless, it is not difficult to notice that Zhong himself firmly grounded his notion of *youxi* in Chinese intellectual and literary traditions. When elaborating on his rationale for embracing the attitude of *youxi* in his introduction to the periodical, Zhong weaves in allusions to the Confucian classics, *Liji* 礼记 (Book of Rites) and *Lunyu* 论语 (Analects), as well as references to

the famous fiction commentator Jin Shengtān 金圣叹 (c.1610-1661) and an earlier *youxi* advocate Miao Lianxiān 繆莲仙³¹ (1766-1830). In particular, the anthology *Wenzhang youxi* 文章游戏 (Literary Games), compiled by Miao with ‘*wuyong* 无用’ (uselessness) as the criterion for selection, was explicitly taken by Zhong as the model for his own publications.

In Zhong’s case, though he declared that his periodical did not intend to discuss and evaluate people and current affairs, his journal includes a column called ‘Idle remarks on fiction’ devoted specifically to comments on newly published fiction, translated and original, in the market. As Zhong puts it, he intends his reviews in that column to serve as purchase guides for readers in the flourishing yet chaotic fiction market where a broad range of publications of uneven quality are competing for attention (Yinbangsheng 1906a). Moreover, as examined in detail in the following section, Zhong’s evaluation of Lin Shu’s ‘translation’ (which is not part of the column ‘Idle remarks on fiction’) even goes so far as to judge Lin’s conduct and character in accordance with orthodox Confucian standards of fine writing. Therefore, with the journal *Youxi shijie*, the space Zhong carved out for himself in the late-Qing discursive space was a paradoxical one.

Perhaps Zhong flaunted the attitude of ‘*youxi*’ to distinguish his own publication from the high-sounding reformist and revolutionary periodicals of the day and from the growing number of low-quality fictional works produced in the guise of public

³¹ This is the art name (*hao* 号) of Miao Gen 繆艮, who had also repeatedly failed the civil service examinations. Miao’s *Wenzhang youxi*, first published in 1816, was once very popular among literati in the greater Chinese cultural sphere. According to Chen and Lai (2011), *Wenzhang youxi* made Miao Gen known even in Vietnam. There is also a handwritten copy of *Youxi shijie* collected in National Institute of Japanese Literature, Tokyo, Japan. Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978) once commented that this collection of essays “rebelled against the dominant style of writing—the eight-legged essay—at that time like a cool, refreshing breeze” (quoted in Chen and Lai 2011, 226)

enlightenment. In fact, Chen Diexian, in his preface to *Youxi shijie*, expresses this idea. In the preface, Chen states his concern that “the intellectual culture is deteriorating” (*siwen zhi saodi* 斯文之扫地) for people “are loading their writings with new terms” (*yi xin mingci duiqi wenzi* 以新名词堆砌文字), but those writings lack substance (Tianxu wo sheng 1906). It is not difficult to infer from the context and the historical background that what Chen was referring to was the elevated discourse that was flooding the press at that time—‘freedom (*ziyou* 自由)’, ‘right (*quanli* 权利)’, ‘reform’ (*gailiang* 改良), ‘revolution’ (*geming* 革命), etc.³² Compared to the politically charged and propagandist publications that were raucous in the late-Qing discursive space, Zhong’s periodical was to a certain extent personal, light-hearted, and removed from direct politics. Yet the difference was only in degree, for it still tried to influence public opinion and convey the Way, in the domain of literature, in a less solemn and high-minded way.

With all kinds of dailies, weeklies, and monthlies that reached the public thick and fast, the late-Qing public discursive space accommodated and resounded with various voices—traditional and new, Chinese and Western, lofty and lowbrow, revolutionary and reactionary, propagandistic and entertaining. It was not just the prominent public figures who were able to utilize this new medium and voice their opinions in this public space. In principle, any common educated man had the freedom to join the fray. As Gimpel (2001) points out, there was a “large but disparate group of members of the educated elite who took part in the debates of their day” (46). To a large extent, it was the “extensive use of the newly available medium of the press as

³² See Xiong (2001) for a study of how the term *ziyou* 自由, among others, gained currency in late-Qing political discourse.

both readers and writers” that enabled these otherwise ‘aimless’ former examination candidates to become cultural actors and to actively engage in shaping public opinion on various matters in a rapidly changing society (ibid.). Zhong was just one individual in this large group of men of letters in late Qing. He established a small press/bookshop and a periodical; he also published in his periodical his own reviews of both ‘original’ and ‘translated’ fictions to influence public opinion.

3.2.2 A generalist view about *fanyi*

In his review of the two Chinese translations of *Joan Haste*, as I mentioned earlier, Zhong praises Panxizi’s sanitization of the text by not rendering the part of the story that is incongruous with traditional Chinese morals while decrying Lin’s full and more ‘faithful’ rendering. He speculates that being unable to obtain the first half of the novel is a mere excuse and in fact Panxizi might have intentionally left out the first half of the novel to present a pure, chaste image of the heroine Jiayin (Joan) and a virile, upright image of Hengli 亨利 (Henry). Yet Panxizi’s efforts, Zhong argues, are sabotaged by Lin’s rendition for it includes all those parts that Pan has omitted or rewritten.

These two translations as well as the controversies they raised is a well-known anecdote in Chinese translation history. The famous May-Fourth writers Lu Xun (1931) and Zhou Zuoren (1951), for instance, both recounted, on different occasions, what they remembered of this story.³³ In recent decades, this scandal has been approached in translation studies mostly from the perspectives of the translators’ choices and their

³³ Lu Xun’s brief recollection has two factual mistakes. He mistook the part untranslated by Panxizi and Tianxiaosheng as the second half of the original text and thought that the review that criticized Lin Shu’s full translation was written by the translator(s) of the earlier rendition.

subjectivity or late-Qing translation norms (e.g. Fong 1995; Hu 2000; Wong 1999, 2004; X. Wang 2006; Liu 2017). The existing studies usually focus on how the producers of these translations manipulated the text, however, and discuss the implications of their actions. Zhong's review is often cited to further support such analysis, for it is deemed representative of the dominant norms of translation at that time, especially the traditional or even conservative morals and ethics. For instance, in his study on translation problems in late Qing, Wong (2004) briefly mentions that Lin's full translation of *Joan Haste* set off "severe criticism from the conservatives" and refers in a footnote to Zhong's review (257). Hu Ying (2000) devotes slightly more attention to how Zhong went about his criticism. She touches on some interesting points regarding Zhong's understanding of the role of the translator with which I engage later. But she quickly turns her focus back to the famous translator, Lin Shu, and treats Zhong as no more than an anonymous reader who "published an angry letter passionately denouncing Lin Shu's version" (87).³⁴ Granted, Zhong's criticism of Lin's rendition fits and corroborates what we know about the translation norms of the day, but I think Zhong's review itself also merits attention and analysis for what it can tell us about how exactly literary conventions and cultural ideologies worked to impinge on the readings of translations in late Qing.

An interesting and revealing point that has often been missed is how Zhong advanced his argument in this review. After explaining in detail how the main characters presented by the earlier version as virtuous, become in Lin's version

³⁴ Hu's (2000) analysis of Zhong's criticism of Lin Shu serves to illustrate how close identification between the translator and the text, though helping to establish the translator's authority, could also leave the translator accountable for the text, see pp.87-8.

licentious and shameless, Zhong nonetheless sublimates his argument by revealing the underlying rationale for his criticism of Lin's version:

且“传”之云者何谓乎？传其品焉，传其德焉，而使后人景仰而取法者也。虽史家贤奸并列，而非所论于小说家言。

Moreover, what should a biography (*zhuan* 传) record? It should record and transmit the subject's virtue and moral excellence, so that posterity can look up to and follow the example of him/her. Even though historians do write about both the virtuous and the wicked, this does not apply to fiction (*xiaoshuo* 小说) writers. (Yinbansheng 1907)

Here Zhong is using the traditional Chinese criteria for writing, and more specifically the criteria for writing *zhuan* 传 (biography), to judge two translations of fiction. Hu (2000) has succinctly pointed out that Zhong is “operating on a time-honored assumption, that a writer's basic model is the historian/biographer, a figure whose social and ethical responsibilities had been well established since at least the Grand Historian Sima Qian, and perhaps Confucius” (88).³⁵ Since she only makes this observation in passing, I want to develop this line of argument further and examine in greater depth the association between the writer and the historian/biographer that she notes.

The word *zhuan*, which I translate into English as ‘biography’ in the quotation above, refers to a specific genre in Chinese history writing. In a broader sense, especially in consideration of the complex relationship between historiography and *xiaoshuo* in pre-modern China, *zhuan* can also refer to a narrative form that centers on

³⁵ Hu (2000) in fact starts the sentence by saying, “Although apparently naive in his conception, this reader is nevertheless operating on...”, but does not provide any reason for such a strong value judgment (88). It is not certain whether the naïve conceptualization refers to the fact that Zhong's “understanding of the task of the translator...has little to do with fidelity toward the original text” or to the fact that Zhong's understanding of the role of the translator was modelled on the exemplar historian.

historical or fictitious figures.³⁶ This kind of narrative existed in both traditional history writing and *xiaoshuo*. In a certain sense, *zhuan* epitomizes the porous boundary between history and fiction in the Chinese tradition. The concept of *xiaoshuo* (literally, ‘small talk’ or ‘minor discourse’) originally stemmed from historiography (see Lu 1994; Berg 2003, 176-80; Gu 2006, 21-4). *Xiaoshuo* had been long deemed a type of flawed work of history or quasi-history compared to official historiography. Moreover, traditional historiography had long imposed a poetics of historicity on traditional *xiaoshuo* until late imperial China.³⁷ That is, as Sheldon Lu (1994) puts it, “[h]istoriography taught one the goals, norms, and methods of composing narrative” and “fictional narratives were theorized and judged in accordance with the standards of historical narratives” (3). Traditional *xiaoshuo* constantly claimed historical authenticity and factual accuracy. It is a common phenomenon that a traditional *xiaoshuo* would contain such words as ‘*shi* 史’ (history) and ‘*zhuan*’ in the title.

Zhong’s definition of *zhuan* in the quote seems to oscillate between the strict and the broader senses of the term—that is, between *zhuan* as a specific historiographical sub-genre and *zhuan* as a general narrative form. It is difficult to comment on this conceptual ambiguity here—it might be interpreted as a deliberate move to advance his argument or a genuine conceptual confusion. In either case, Zhong’s argument illustrates, to borrow Hill’s (2013) formulation, the “long-standing ideas in Chinese literature about the ties between prose writing, historical writing, and fiction” (102).

³⁶ See Yu (1988) for an analysis of the relationship between traditional Chinese historiography and fiction, and Yu mainly focuses on the annals form of traditional Chinese historiography. See Nienhauser (2001) for a brief introduction to early biography in Chinese literary tradition.

³⁷ See Lu (1994) for a study on the shift in traditional Chinese narrative poetics from an emphasis on historicity to an emphasis on fictionality. Mair (1983) argues that the fictionalization of Chinese narrative tradition was greatly influenced by the dissemination of Buddhism in China.

An important element of this poetics of historicity is the *purpose* of historical writing or perhaps of all fine writing (*wen* 文). The main aim of traditional Chinese historiography, as Gentz (2009) summarizes it, is “the revelation of the *dao* [the Way] at work and the related correct moral judgment of historical events” (59; translation added). The historical truth thus lies not so much in historical fact as in “social norms and precepts upon which the reader should model his own life” (ibid., 60). Zhong’s argument is premised on exactly this feature of moral didacticism in *zhuan* writing and more generally in traditional Chinese historical writing.

Moreover, the translators of both renditions of Haggard’s *Joan Haste* chose to render the title as *Jiayin xiaozhuan*, which can be back-translated into English as “A brief biography of Joan”. This means, the translators themselves chose to rework and re-present the English novel as a ‘biography’ or *zhuan* in the Chinese tradition. It is well-known in the field of Chinese translation history that Lin Shu was constantly comparing Western novels with classical Chinese histories in the prefaces and postscripts to his translations (e.g. Hung 1998; Guo 2009, 70-1; Hill 2013, 101-2). For instance, Lin ([1906]1989) compares Haggard’s *Colonel Quaritch, V.C.* or, rather, his classical Chinese version of it, *Honghan nülang zhuan* 洪罕女郎传, with *Shiji* 史记 (Records of the Grand Historian) in the postscript to his translation. In that postscript, he first praises Sima Qian (c.145-86 BCE) and Han Yu 韩愈 (768-824) as the only two masters of *wenzhang* 文章 (fine writing) who never repeat themselves. Then he argues that the way Haggard uses *fluxian* 伏线³⁸, a foreshadowing technique, is quite similar to how Sima Qian uses it in *Shiji*. On another occasion, Lin ([1905]1989b)

³⁸ A term commonly used in traditional Chinese fiction commentaries. In Rolston (1990), it is translated into English as “prepare the way” when used as a verb phrase and as “narrative threads laid out in advance” when used as a noun phrase (345).

explicitly claims that he adopts the way Ban Gu 班固 (32-92CE) composes the biography of Zhao Feiyan 赵飞燕, Empress of Emperor Cheng (c. 32-1 BCE), in *Hanshu* 汉书 (Book of Han)³⁹ to rewrite a certain plot in Haggard's *Nada the Lily* (*Guishan langxia zhuan* 鬼山狼侠传). The fact that Lin Shu constantly mentioned such classical historical works in his prefaces and postscripts shows that he himself held historiography as an important touchstone and supreme model for writing and translating fiction.

This kind of cross-cultural comparison can be a deliberate move of self-legitimation, either to elevate the status of fiction (Hung 1998), to “create credibility and authority” of the translators (Hu 2000, 88), or to “establish[ed] lasting aesthetic and political relevance for their [Lin and his collaborators'] work” (Hill 2013, 50; my explanation).⁴⁰ However, it can also be viewed as an expression of the ingrained ideals of fine writing that had been internalized through decades of classical education and reading. What Lin was really comparing to the yardstick of such classical historical works, I would argue, was not so much the ‘original’ Western novel—in the form of oral renditions provided by his collaborators—as his own writing or rewriting. Whether it was a calculated strategy or a spontaneous expression, this use of the “rhetoric of universality” (Hu 2000, 87) shows that Lin Shu ([1905]1989a) as a man of letters sought ‘the Way of writing’ (*wenzhang zhi dao* 文章之道) in historiographical works when composing ‘translations’. In so doing, Lin was aligning

³⁹ *Hanshu* is a history of the Former Han dynasty (206 BCE-23CE) compiled by Ban Gu.

⁴⁰ Lin's comparison between Western fiction and traditional Chinese historiography is commonly viewed to be a move of self-legitimation, but previous scholars' specific concerns differ. For instance, Hung (1998) is concerned with the establishment of new literary norms in the late 19th and early 20th centuries while Hu's (2000) focus is on the double-edgedness of Lin's rhetoric of universality. Meanwhile, Hill (2013) focuses on the language and style Lin adopted.

himself with such exemplary historians as Sima Qian and Ban Gu just as Sima Qian once had “align[ed] himself with a long tradition of fictitious or legendary authors such as Confucius” in his postface to *Shiji* (Schwermann 2014, 32).

Therefore, Zhong’s criticism of Lin Shu on the ground of the ideals of history writing is not so far-fetched. He treated Lin as a man of letters—a Confucian generalist—the same way Lin identified himself. In the textual realm, a generalist can undertake various activities such as writing, compiling, editing, and commenting, but he should always put forth edifying words and be socially responsible.⁴¹ The same is true of composing a *zhuan* based on textual materials in a different linguistic form. Zhong holds Lin Shu accountable for compiling a pernicious biography rather than ‘translating’ corrupted foreign culture into China. As Hu (2000) observes, “[t]his reader’s understanding of the task of the translator...has little to do with fidelity toward the original text” (87). Throughout the whole review, Zhong does not take the ‘original’ foreign novel as a benchmark for his evaluation. He does not think it is problematic at all to judge translations “without reading the original book or knowing what it is like” (Yinbansheng 1907). All he is concerned with in this review is the social and ethical responsibilities of Chinese men of letters. To Zhong, a man of letters has a moral responsibility to his readers and should deal with textual materials in accordance with higher moral principles and social ideals—even when translating foreign fiction.

With the social and moral responsibilities of the Chinese ‘translator’ prioritized and with the historian as the very model of a good ‘translator’, for Zhong, deletions,

⁴¹ See Lee (2000) for a discussion on how Confucian ideals influenced traditional Chinese education history and intellectual life. Apart from different textual activities, traditional Confucian literati also participated in other various artistic activities such as Chinese painting, calligraphy, music, etc.

additions, and rewritings in the translation process are hence not only permitted but obligatory. Another two contemporaneous cultural actors with the pennames Haitian duxiaozi 海天独啸子 and Tie 铁 articulated more explicitly Zhong's understanding of what a 'translator' should do with the text. Haitian duxiaozi (1903), in the preface to his translation *Kongzhong feiting* 空中飞艇 (The flying ship of the air), and Tie (1908), in an article published in *Xiaoshuo lin*, both maintain that a translator should record what should be recorded and delete what should be deleted. Though their specific wordings differ, what they said about how to translate both allude to what Sima Qian had written about Confucius's alleged compilation of *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals).⁴² In his biography of Confucius, *Kongzi shijia* 孔子世家 (The Hereditary House of Confucius), Sima Qian writes:

孔子在位听讼，文辞有可与人共者，弗独有也。至于为春秋，笔则笔，削则削，子夏之徒，不能赞一辞。

When Confucius was hearing cases as a government official, he always discussed with others in terms of decision and wording. When it comes to the compiling of *Chunqiu*, he only recorded what [he thought] was worthy of recording and deleted what [he thought] should be deleted. Not even his disciples like Zixia could suggest [an addition or deletion]. (*Shiji* 47, 1944)

In this excerpt, Sima Qian praises the righteousness of Confucius. In terms of deciding cases, Confucius's righteousness lies in his openness to suggestions and opinions. In terms of history compiling, his righteousness lies in the fact that he edited the history to such a degree that his disciples could not find any of Confucius's emendations unnecessary. Such textual manipulations—additions and deletions—in compiling histories were not an arbitrary act meant simply to serve the compiler's own *personal*

⁴² *Chunqiu* is a generic term for the court chronicles during the pre-Qin period (2100-221 BCE). The only surviving *Chunqiu* from the early Eastern Zhou period (770-221 BCE) is the chronicle of the State of Lu 鲁 (722 - 481 BCE). Because it was traditionally considered to be edited by Confucius, this particular *Chunqiu* is one of the Five Classics (*wujing* 五经) of Chinese literature.

ego or agenda. Rather, the strong authorial agency in editing and organizing pre-existing historical materials should always be guided in principle by high moral standards and a strong sense of social responsibility. Even the slightest revision in *Chunqiu* manifests Confucius's understanding of the Way, the right Heavenly order, and conveys profound meaning. For instance, as Sima Qian illustrates in this biography, Confucius changed the title of the rulers of Wu 吳 and Chu 楚 from the self-proclaimed 'wang 王' (king) to 'zi 子' (baron) when editing *Chunqiu* (*Shiji* 47, 1943). In so doing, Confucius was condemning the heretical, illegitimate behavior of the rulers of Wu and Chu as a warning to other state leaders. In other words, the manipulation of the existing textual materials in historiography is an important way to expound moral standards and the right social order.

As with Lin's self-identification with the paradigmatic historians and prose writers in Chinese intellectual tradition, Zhong, Haitian duxiaozi, and Tie all looked to Confucius and Sima Qian as exemplars when expressing their opinions on the role of the 'translator'. These intertextual references to Confucius's and Sima Qian's writing of history are not only instances of looking for legitimation in the time-honored tradition of history writing or fine writing. They were also invoking and situating themselves in an equally well-established tradition of textual transmission and manipulation. In this tradition, to borrow Starr's (2007) words, texts "existed to be transmitted and re-worked, and therefore belonged to the whole scholarly community" (67). This textual tradition illuminates and adds some depth of understanding to how Zhong and his like-minded contemporary literati conceptualized *fanyi* as well as the common translatorial behaviors—rewriting, bowdlerization, insertion of comments,

etc.—in late Qing. The fact that these types of textual manipulation in translation were widely acceptable and even recommended at that time should not be understood only as reflecting late-Qing literati's pride in Chinese literature and culture, their contempt for foreign cultures and literature, or the pragmatic purpose of translation. On the textual level and in a very personal way, the idea of how one should deal with existent textual materials was also closely associated with late-Qing literati's sense of identity.

In terms of self-image, the late-Qing men of letters identified themselves as generalist Confucian scholars. This self-fashioned image seems to have outweighed and subsumed their specific roles as translators, writers, editors, or commentators. The 'translator', at that time, had not yet become a distinctive, self-contained identity; it was subject to Confucian rules and ideals of fine writing in general. The ultimate Confucian ideal of *wen* (fine writing) transcended the differences among specific textual activities. Textual manipulation, either in translating, editing, or the compiling of histories, was associated most closely with the fulfilment of the Confucian scholar's moral and social responsibilities.

3.2.3 On the blurred conceptual boundaries between specific textual activities

In this section, I add nuance to my argument that the category of translation in late-Qing China was not yet clearly differentiated from other types of textual activities like writing, compiling, commenting, editing, etc. By this time, there had already been words in Chinese for 'translation', such as *fan* 翻, *yi* 译, and their derivatives.⁴³

Moreover, Zhong Junwen did refer to the two Chinese translations of *Joan Haste* as

⁴³ See Cheung (2005) for an analysis of the four terms used in ancient China to refer to translation/translator. Hung (2005a) points out that the word *fan* 翻 only came to denote 'translation' during the Buddhist translation wave.

two “*yiben* 译本” (translated texts or translated versions) in his review. Then what exactly were the conceptual relationships between ‘translating’ and ‘writing’ amongst the range of textual activities? How blurred were the boundaries between them?

Overall, Zhong made rather loose use of the word *yi* in the journal *Youxi shijie*. As already discussed in the previous section, in Zhong’s review of what he calls the two ‘translated versions’ of *Joan Haste* he does not touch upon any of the translational aspects of these two translations. Moreover, when Zhong explains why he set up the column ‘Idle Remarks on Fiction’ in his preface to that column, he does not use the word *yi* or mention at all the category of translated fiction. Instead, he complains in this new world of fiction, more and more people are “*zhu* 著” (writing, composing) fiction hastily, and that the qualities of these new publications are unsatisfactory (Yinbansheng 1906a). In Chinese, *zhu* 著, along with *zuo* 作 and *zhuan* 撰, is a common word for authorship which began to gain currency by the 1st century CE (Li 2017, 361). Reading Zhong’s column preface, one would assume that what he reviewed are all original Chinese writings of fiction. In fact, 50 out of the 66 pieces of fiction he reviewed are translations according to the publication information Zhong provided in his reviews.⁴⁴ Therefore, even though Zhong in his writings used such different words as *yi* and *zhu* that designate different types of textual activities, he did not use them strictly to distinguish between ‘translated’ fiction and ‘original’ fiction.

For literati like Zhong, translating—just like writing, compiling, editing, and commenting—was just another form of textual transmission. Translation involved the

⁴⁴ All 66 reviews, which vary greatly in length, were written by Zhong himself. Zhu (2015) states that 49 of the works under review were translations. However, according to the publication information provided by Zhong concerning the works under review, the number should be 50.

reworking of textual materials in a different linguistic form and from a different cultural community, not so much different from the compilation of a history or the writing of literary works which are also textual re-workings of existent textual materials across time. Lu Liangcheng 陆亮成 (1906) captures this idea in his inaugural words to the aforementioned periodical *All-Story Monthly*:

本志小说之大体有二：一曰译，二曰撰。他山之玉，可以攻错，则译之不可缓者也；古人著作，义深体备，发我思想，继其绪余，则撰之有可观者也。

The fiction published in this periodical can be divided into two categories, one is *yi* 译 (translated) and the other is *zhuan* 撰 (composed). Stones from other hills can be used to polish [jade]; therefore, translation of [foreign fiction] cannot be delayed. The works of the ancients are profound in meaning and refined in style; they can inspire us in thinking to carry forward the learning. Therefore, composed fiction is [also] worthy of reading. (2)

The uses of the verbs *yi* (to translate) and *zhuan* (to compose) in this excerpt are relevant to our discussion. In the first sentence, *zhuan* seems to be used in opposition to *yi*, implying a conceptual distinction between the textual activity called *yi* and that called *zhuan*. When Lu goes on to explain why both the translation and the composition of fiction are beneficial, however, the difference between *yi* and *zhuan* becomes weakened. It turns out that this difference lies more in the different textual materials involved in these two activities. That is, *yi* deals with textual materials from “other hills” (*tashan* 他山), i.e., linguistic and cultural Others, while *zhuan* deals with ancient works from one’s own culture.

Moreover, the concept of *zhuan* 撰 itself illustrates a de-emphasis of the distinction in the Chinese textual tradition between ‘original’ and ‘derivative’ textual activities. The verb *zhuan* can mean ‘to write’ in the sense of putting down words with a writing brush or a carving knife. It can also mean ‘to compile’. In either case, the

word *zhuan* itself does not emphasize original creation. That is why I choose the English word *compose* to capture its conceptual vagueness. In discussing the category of ‘*zhuan*’, Lu first talks about how ancient works can inspire later generations, and then he states that it is also beneficial to read composed fiction. Therefore, to a large extent, the sense of ‘compilation’ is implied in his use of *zhuan*. That is, Lu believed the writing of fiction involves some sort of reworking of pre-existing materials. In other words, both translated fiction and composed fiction were conceived as the results of derivative textual endeavors. There was no essentialist difference or conceptual hierarchy, in this case, between translation and writing.

Complicating this already confused situation, the late-Qing translators’ apologetic statements, furthermore, seem to indicate a conception of translation as derivative of and inferior to (original) writing. For instance, some of Lin Shu’s prefaces and postscripts to his translations have been examined in previous studies to suggest or prove the existence of a certain idea of faithfulness to the original (see e.g. Chen 1996; Wang 2004; Pollard 1998a). One often-quoted excerpt is from Lin Shu’s preface to the 1905 translation of *Robinson Crusoe*, completed by him and Zeng Zonggong 曾宗珮. In it, Lin Shu states:

至书中多宗教家言，似译者亦稍稍输心于彼教，然实非是。译书非著书比也。著作之家，可以抒吾所见，乘虚逐微，靡所不可；若译书，则述其已成之事迹，焉能参以己见？彼书有宗教言，吾既译之，又胡能讳避而铲鋟之？故一一如其所言。

From the many references to religion in the book, it might seem that the translator is rather partial to that faith. To think that would be mistaken: translating a book is different from writing a book. A writer can express his own feelings and give play to his imagination without limit. But when one translates, he is narrating an already written story, how can he interpolate his own opinions? Since I am translating this book with references to religion, how can I shun them and weed them out?

Hence I preserved the wording just as it was. (revised on the basis of Pollard's translation, Pollard 1998a, 14-5)

Pollard (1998a) argues that this statement shows a “[g]rowing respect for the integrity of the original” in the early 20th century among Chinese translators (14). It is apparent from the above quotation that Lin explicitly distinguishes translating from writing. Furthermore, according to Lin, the difference lies in the degree of freedom of self-expression. He even seems to imply that the status of ‘translating’ (*yi*) is inferior to ‘writing’ (*zhu* 著) because the translator cannot freely express his own ideas. I want to point out, however, that it is simplistic to take such statements as proof of an essential conceptual hierarchy between translation and (original) writing. After all, Lin Shu did not know any foreign languages and had to rely on his collaborators’ oral translations—what did the ‘original’ mean to Lin Shu as a ‘translator’? In order to gain a more nuanced understanding of Lin’s above paratextual reflections, we need to consider three factors.

First, the time-honored convention of modesty in prefatory writing might contribute to the apparent conceptual hierarchy between translating and writing. For Chinese in general, it is customary to be self-effacing when writing prefaces and postscripts for one’s own work. Therefore, when Lin Shu says that as a translator he dares not to interpolate his own opinions, it is to a certain extent humble rhetoric. It is well known that Lin routinely interpolated his opinions into the translated texts and reframed the entire narratives of the translated stories in his prefaces according to his own understandings and intentions (e.g. Qian 2002; Guo 2009; Hill 2013).

Second, Lin Shu, in this excerpt, is trying specifically to justify why he did not delete or tone down the Christian references in his translation. In late Qing, as noted

by Wong (2004), “[t]ranslators had to be very careful when they dealt with religious matters, either deleting them altogether or disclaiming any association with them” (257).⁴⁵ In consideration of the strong anti-Christian sentiments in late-Qing China, which culminated in the Boxer Uprising⁴⁶ around the turn of the century, Lin Shu’s differentiation between translating and writing can also be viewed as a rhetorical strategy in anticipation of criticism of this aspect of his work by disassociating himself from the authorship of the text. This would explain why Lin Shu became particularly apologetic and respectful to the ‘original’ when it comes to religious elements.

Last, what has rarely been commented on in translation studies concerning Lin Shu’s above statement is the somewhat paradoxical conception of *shu* 述 in the Chinese intellectual tradition. In the above quotation, Lin Shu defines what a translator does as “narrating an already written story” (*shu qi yicheng zhi shiji* 述其已成之事迹). The verb *shu* means ‘to transmit’, ‘to state’, or ‘to narrate’. It has the connotation of continuing from or passing down what has already been said before, especially when used in contrast to the word *zuo* 作, which means ‘to write’, ‘to compose’, or ‘to create’. As Li (2017) puts it in her discussion of traditional Chinese concepts of authorship, “[i]f *zuo* implies authority and radical transformation, its lesser counterpart, *shu* 述, means reliance on antecedents and derivative power” (361). It seems that Lin in the above quotation is invoking this connotation of *shu* (as opposed to *zuo*) to define

⁴⁵ In the footnote to this statement, Wong (2004) comments that “Lin Shu [...] employed both ways to deal with religious matters in Western fiction” and mentions Lin’s “Notes on Translation” to the translation of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* as an example of the first strategy and Lin’s preface to the translation of *Robinson Crusoe* as an example of the latter. As Cheung’s (1998) detailed analysis shows, however, Lin Shu and Wei Yi’s treatment of religious material in their translation of *Uncle Tom’s Cabin* “is much more interesting, subtle, and complex” than what they claimed (129).

⁴⁶ The Boxer Uprising, or *Yihetuan yundong* 义和团运动, was an anti-foreign and anti-Christian uprising that took place between 1899 and 1901. See Cohen (1997) for a seminal study on the Boxer Uprising. The anti-foreign and anti-Christian sentiments existed long before and after the Boxer Uprising. Even in the 1920s there was a massive outbreak of anti-Christian sentiments.

his translation activity. However, the conceptual hierarchy between *zuo* and *shu* in the actual uses of these two words constantly collapses, which complicates Lin Shu's humble rhetoric.

In fact, as has been well discussed in the existing Chinese studies scholarship, the conventional use of *shu* and *zuo* demonstrates a de-emphasis of original creation and innovation in the traditional Chinese conception of authorship (e.g. Galik 1980; Huang 1990, 1994; Li 2017): Confucius claims he only “transmits but does not creates” (*shu er buzuo* 述而不作) when talking about his relationship to the Confucian classics (*Lunyu* 7.1; as quoted and translated in Li 2017, 361). For Confucius, the act of “[z]uo was often associated with the *shengren* 圣人 or the sage” (Huang 1994, 42). However, in *Shiji*, Sima Qian says Confucius “authored *Chunqiu* on the basis of historical records” (*yin shiji zuo chunqiu* 因史记作春秋) (*Shiji* 47.1943). He specifically uses the verb *zuo* to define the textual activities Confucius performed in relation to *Chunqiu*. Then Sima Qian distinguishes his compiling of *Shiji* from Confucius's compiling of *Chunqiu*, his being merely transmitting ancient affairs (*weishu gu shi* 谓述故事) and classifying and organizing existing historical materials (*zhengqi qi shizhuan* 整齐其世传). Confucius's compilation of *Chunqiu* and Sima Qian's compilation of *Shiji* were not so different in terms of the nature of the textual activities. Both must have involved collecting, editing, and commenting on previous historical materials. Huang (1994) argues that Sima Qian “was using the same rhetoric consciously or unconsciously to subvert Confucius's disclaimer of innovation (authoring) and then ultimately his own (he was in fact claiming what he was obviously trying to disclaim—he was an innovator)” (43).

One need not agree completely with Huang's psychoanalytical interpretation of Sima Qian, but he nonetheless points out the complexity and nuances in the traditional Chinese concepts of 'shu' and 'zuo'.⁴⁷ Though there seems to be a conceptual hierarchy between *shu* and *zuo*, the essential differences between them are complicated and nebulous in the disclaimers of authorship by the perhaps most renowned 'authors' in Chinese intellectual history. Sima Qian's and Confucius's self-effacing denials of creation show a conception of authorship in the Chinese tradition that views "the author as the amalgam of tradition and individual talent" and blurs the lines between 'derivative' transmission and 'original' creation (Li 2017, 363). In such a conceptualization of authorship, text can be said to have been conceived of "as an entity that continues to generate new meanings" and "transmitters, editors, compilers and commentators are all participatory 'authors.'" (ibid.). In consideration of the paradoxical conceptions of *shu* and authorship in the Chinese tradition, therefore, we cannot take Lin Shu's statement about translating as merely narrating (*shu*) an already told story at its face value.

I am not arguing that Lin Shu as well as Zhong Junwen and other contemporaneous Chinese cultural actors did not distinguish at all between translating and writing or other textual activities. Rather, I want to point out that such statements need more careful contextualization against traditional Chinese conceptions of authorship. Even if translation was deemed a kind of derivative transmission among late-Qing cultural actors, such a conceptualization carries a deeper cultural connotation in a culture that celebrates derivative textual transmission and "a model of authorship

⁴⁷ Li (2017) instead interprets Sima Qian's disclaimer as "no more than an attempt to forestall suspicion of subversion [...] or to distance himself from the rigid early Han application of rules derived from *Chunqiu*" (373).

that combines compilation with creation” (Li 2017, 373). If it is accepted in the Chinese tradition that Confucius and Sima Qian—two exemplary ‘authors’—were only handing down something from the ancients without creating it, then as Steineck and Schwermann (2014, 24) suggest, is ‘translation’ not already implied in the Confucian concept of authorship? In other words, since Confucius and Sima Qian were the ultimate archetypes of authorship in the Chinese tradition, then the conception of authorship they represent was already elastic enough to incorporate and subsume translatorship. It is this multifarious conception of authorship that late-Qing cultural actors assumed and emulated. Once this fact is accepted, then the issue of what constituted ‘translation’ in late Qing can be understood in a new light.

3.3 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have focused on the case of Zhong Junwen’s ‘non-discussion’ of two Chinese translations of *Joan Haste* to investigate how late-Qing Chinese literati conceptualized translation in relation to other textual activities such as writing, editing, and compiling. However, I want to clarify that I am not trying to make a sweeping generalization about conceptualizations of translation in late Qing in a statistical sense simply on the basis of Zhong’s review. Though Zhong was part of a large group of relatively marginalized late-Qing cultural actors, his case is neither simply exceptional nor typical. Taking a microhistorical approach, I have analyzed Zhong’s review as a ‘clue’ that opens a window on the cultural logic underlying the blurred conceptual lines between translating, writing, compiling, and editing in late-Qing China.

In my analysis, I have treated Zhong's review as a focal point and followed its lead to other closely related textual and paratextual materials—the journal in which his review was published, the two translations under review, translation prefaces and postscripts written by other relevant cultural actors such as the prominent Lin Shu, etc. In a New Historicist manner, I read these assorted textual materials all as 'intertexts' of equal discursive status and equal importance for understanding how translation was conceptualized in this period. In studying the history of translation in late Qing, as mentioned in 3.1, researchers face the fact that there were simply not that many direct discussions about translation from this period though there were many paratextual materials accompanying published translated fiction. A focus solely on the analysis of either the translated texts or the scarce theoretical writings about translation as 'theory' or 'thought (*sixiang*)' leads to a limited understanding of how translation was conceptualized in this period. By reading paratextual materials related to translated texts—whether they directly discuss translation issues or not—on the same plane as translated texts, my analysis has revealed previously unnoticed aspects of conceptualization of translation in this historical period.

As reviewed in section 3.1, the previous norms-based scholarship would lead to the conclusion that the understanding of translation at that time was uniformly utilitarian and conditioned by a late-Qing *zeitgeist* of national salvation. Moreover, the previous research generally downplays the human agency of Chinese cultural actors in their understandings of translation as mere reflections of or responses to the translation norms of the day. My analysis of Zhong's case, constantly shifting between

its micro and macro aspects, complicates the picture which the bulk of previous scholarship has constructed about conceptualizations of translation in late Qing.

First, I have paid close attention to the individual agency of Zhong Junwen, a common late-Qing educated man. I have shown how Zhong was able to voice his own opinions about fiction, translation, literature, and life in the context of the modern Chinese periodical press. As Zhong was actively playing the multiple roles of reader, writer, critic, and publisher in this burgeoning and heterogeneous discursive space, he chose to assume an unorthodox pose—*youxi* (game, entertainment, playing)—to present himself and his journal to the public. As I pointed out in 3.2.1, however, the idea of *youxi* was more of a pretence of posing as unserious which dispirited Chinese literati adopted to mentally reconcile their deep-rooted Confucian ideals with the bleak reality of their lives. In fact, as I discussed in 3.2.2, Zhong's review of the two translations of *Joan Haste* adheres closely to Confucian ethics and the orthodox ideals of fine writing.

Second, Zhong's review presents a conceptualization of translation that does not concentrate on the utility of (fiction) translation or any other aspects of translation in relation to the original text. The producer of a translated text was not identified and judged as a 'translator' as we understand it today but as a generalist Confucian scholar who in his engagement with various activities of textual transmission should always deal with pre-existing textual materials according to the Confucian ideal of fine writing. Such an understanding of translation was grounded in the traditional Chinese conceptualization of authorship that was itself multifarious, flexible, and communal.

Since Zhong is not concerned at all with the original text in his review, it can be said that Zhong, like a Barthesian reader-critic, is rather liberated from authorial intentions of the original text in his reading of the translations of *Joan Haste*. Different from the Barthesian reader-critic, however, Zhong is not the pivot of the intertextuality—“someone at a loose end” of the weave of signifiers (Barthes 1977a, 159). Rather, Zhong’s review and the other textual materials analyzed above all point back to a classical textual center to locate and position themselves. By alluding to past writers, these late-Qing writers are consciously inserting their writings—translations or reviews, textual or paratextual—within the long-established Confucian literary tradition and thus consolidating the tradition. It is in accordance with such a view of intertextuality that the Chinese cultural actors in this historical period perceived the nature of ‘translation’ and the role of the translator.

In previous scholarship, the porous conceptual boundary between translating and writing in late Qing has been viewed with negative value judgments and treated as a symptom of the outdated, traditional Chinese conceptions of translation. However, as my detailed analysis has shown, this conceptual blurring between translating and writing was not an unenlightened conception of translation but was deeply rooted in the well-established Chinese textual and intellectual traditions. As my following two case studies show, this conceptual blurring between translating and writing (among other textual activities) continued into the next two decades.

Chapter IV. Conceptualizations of translation in early Republican China (1912-1917): Challenging the linear ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ paradigm

The early years of Republican China, prior to the beginning of the May Fourth era (1919), has an awkward position in the existing narrative constructions of modern Chinese translation history.¹ When scholars mention or study the translation activities in those years, they always bundle this period together with the late-Qing period to constitute the *jindai* 近代 (early modern) history of translation in China. A typical treatment of the translation history in the early Republican years can be seen in Guo’s (2000) definition of the period from 1907 to 1919 as the “flourishing period” (*fansheng qi* 繁盛期) in the history of literary translation in *jindai* China. In this chapter, however, I focus on those early Republican years and a group of cultural actors who have been ideologically associated mostly with this period (or the *jindai* period), though they were highly active and influential from the 1910s through to the early 1930s. Labelled ‘*yuanyang hudie pai* 鸳鸯蝴蝶派’ (Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School)², this group of cultural actors has been marginalized since the early 1920s in modern Chinese historiography. The importance of their contribution to modern Chinese literature and their introduction of foreign literature to China began to be recognized only in the late 1980s, and their conceptions of translation have not yet received much scholarly attention.

¹ Link (1981) has pointed out a similar problem in the study of modern Chinese literature that “[e]xisting accounts in Chinese, Japanese, and Western languages all tend to move from late Ch’ing fiction to the May Fourth Movement, either skipping over the popular fiction of the 1910s or giving it brief treatment as a special category isolated from what came before or after” (7).

² Though, as will be explained later, this label was derogatory, biased, and totalizing in the history of modern Chinese literature, I still use this term, in a critical manner, to directly engage with the previous scholarship.

In this case study, I address this gap in the existing scholarship. My contention is that the thinking about translation which arose from this popular group of cultural actors cannot be ignored if we are to better understand the shifts in conceptualizations of translation that occurred in China from the late 19th century to the early 20th century. For evidence, I examine the divergent ideas about translation that co-existed in the different types of paratextual materials surrounding a 1917 translation anthology compiled by Zhou Shoujuan 周瘦鹃 (1895-1968), a leading figure in the ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’. As my analysis shows, the heterogeneity of the discursive space surrounding this publication challenges the linear grand narrative about the transformation from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ conceptualizations of translation in China from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

4.1 The ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ in early Republican China

As previous scholarship has pointed out, it is characteristic of the literary field of Republican China that cultural actors “were members of some sort of literary collective, ranging from informal, loose-knit groups of friends to highly structured, formal institutions” (Denton and Hockx 2008, 3; see also Hockx 2002).³ Especially from the beginning of the New Culture Movement in 1915, a new generation of Chinese cultural actors established a wide range of literary groups and societies to advocate their own visions of new Chinese literature. Among hundreds of literary groups of different sizes and natures, the most famous ones include *Wenxue yanjiu hui*

³ See Hockx (2002), pp. 17-26, for a discussion on the convention of forming literary societies in pre-modern China.

文学研究会 (Chinese Literary Association), *Chuangzao she* 创造社 (Creation Society), *Yusi she* 语丝社 (Threads of Talk Society), *Xinyue she* 新月社 (Crescent Moon Society), etc. Virtually all these literary groups had their own periodicals—for instance, the Chinese Literary Association’s *Xiaoshuo yuebao* 小说月报 (Short-Story Monthly)⁴ and *Wenxue xunkan* 文学旬刊 (Literature Decadaily), and the Creation Society’s *Chuangzao jikan* 创造季刊 (Creation Quarterly) and *Chuangzao zhoubao* 创造周报 (Creation Weekly). In a flourishing modern journalism, these cultural actors were not only actively involved in ‘original’ writing, translating, editing, and publishing, but they also took part in heated debates about various literary, cultural, and social issues of the newly founded Republic of China. The literary field of Republican China was therefore “a heterogeneous literary field occupied by many voices of different stripes” (ibid.).

The ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ in Republican China, however, was different from the aforementioned literary societies. It was different not only because it was not part of the New Cultural Movement and did not actively participate in the public debates about literature, culture, or translation, but also because it was not a self-proclaimed literary group.

The history of the ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ (hereafter abbreviated to the Butterfly School) has already been well discussed in previous scholarship (e.g. Link 1981; Chow 1986; Fan 1989; Xu 2008). The term—*yuanyang hudie pai*—was

⁴ The *Short-Story Monthly*, established in 1910, had been one of the most successful popular fiction periodicals in late-Qing and early-Republican China by 1920. Beginning from the 12th volume in 1921, it became the organ of the Chinese Literary Association. The history of *Short-Story Monthly* from 1910 to 1920 has long been considered as associated with the Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School while the period from 1921 to 1932 has been viewed as the modern period of the journal. There has already been scholarship that challenges such a simple dichotomy and the negative value judgement on the first stage of the journal (e.g. Gimpel 2001).

imposed as a hostile and pejorative label by May-Fourth intellectuals on a group of popular and commercially successful writers, translators, editors, and publishers in Republican China.⁵ The term was first used by Zhou Zuoren 周作人(1885-1967) in a lecture in 1918 to characterize and criticize the kind of sentimental love stories represented by Xu Zhenya's 徐枕亚 (1889-1937) sensational *Yuli hun* 玉梨魂 (Jade Pear Spirit, 1912).⁶ This label was later loosely employed to refer to "all kinds of contemporary popular fiction, whether in classical or vernacular language, including, in addition to love stories, social, historical, detective, and knight-errant novels" (Xu 2008, 48).

The May-Fourth intellectuals' attack on this group of writers⁷ was centered on their association with the traditional literary style, the Confucian ideals and morals in their works, and their goal of writing supposedly only for frivolous entertainment and commercial benefit. As Link (1981) has pointed out, the May-Fourth intellectuals' condemnation of these popular writers was, in a sense, an attempt to compete for the readership as well as the "leadership of the literary scene" in the early stage of the New Culture Movement (11). When the May-Fourth intellectuals entered the literary scene in the mid-1910s, these Butterfly writers were already enjoying great success as "professionals who gained their livelihoods from literary careers, involving writing, editing, and publishing" (Xu 2008, 58). These versatile cultural actors were producing

⁵ Since this is not a self-proclaimed literary group, as Xu (2008) points out, it is difficult to delineate the period of coverage of this school's activities. Xu suggests that "the period of the school's activities can be as short as the early years of the Republic up to 1917 or extend as long as from late Qing to the 1940s" (48).

⁶ Mandarin ducks and butterflies are stock images in traditional Chinese literature that symbolize pure love and were often employed in popular sentimental love stories produced in the early years of Republican China.

⁷ In this study, the members of the Butterfly School are collectively referred to, for the sake of convenience, as *Butterfly writers*, even though they actively undertook various textual and non-textual activities.

a large number of publications to satisfy a large readership in and beyond the booming Chinese cities (Link 1981, 16). The most popular periodicals that were run by the Butterfly writers include *Xiaoshuo shibao* 小说时报 (Fiction Times, 1909-1917), *Xiaoshuo huabao* 小说画报 (Fiction Pictorial, 1917-1920), *Libai liu* 礼拜六 (Saturday, 1914-1916, 1921-1923), and *Ziluolan* 紫罗兰 (Violet, 1925-1930).⁸ The readership of these Butterfly publications not only included “small merchants, various kinds of clerks and secretaries, high school students, housewives, and other modestly educated, marginally well off urbanites” but also consisted of members of the upper class such as government officials and rural gentry (Link 1981, 5; see also 189-95). The May-Fourth intellectuals, by demoting these popular writers to the realm of the ‘old/traditional’ while elevating themselves to the realm of the ‘new/modern’, were able to categorically mark their literary and cultural positions against the Butterfly writers and thus gather momentum.⁹

Even though the May-Fourth intellectuals’ portrayal of the Butterfly School was ideologically charged, simplistic, and self-serving, there is nonetheless some truth to it. The existing scholarship has already discussed the differences between the Butterfly writers and the May Fourth intellectuals, especially in terms of their educational backgrounds and literary ideologies (Link 1981; Xu 2008). That is, unlike the majority of May-Fourth intellectuals, few Butterfly writers studied abroad after receiving an education in traditional Chinese learning, and they more closely upheld traditional attitudes towards writing. These Butterfly writers, like Zhong Junwen (whom I

⁸ According to Wei’s (1962) calculation, there were over 160 types of publications—magazines, supplements to newspapers, and tabloids—that carried Butterfly fiction.

⁹ See Chen (2008) for a discussion of the Butterfly writers’ reactions to the May-Fourth intellectuals’ accusations and especially how their silence “helped to vindicate the ‘new’ writers in continuing their campaign to modernize Chinese literature and the Chinese language” (53).

discussed in Chapter III), experienced drastic social changes caused by the abolition of the imperial civil service examination system and turned to the publishing industry for the same reason Zhong did in his early 40s. Zhong passed away, however, before witnessing the establishment of the Republic of China (1912) and the turbulent young Republic under warlordism. Nor did he have the chance to experience the urbanization, industrialization, and boom in commercial publishing. It was under such particular social conditions of the early Republican years, Link (1981) argues, that the popular literature produced by the Butterfly writers secured its market and provided entertainment and comfort to the growing readership in China's cities.

The May-Fourth intellectuals' scathing criticism, however, had a profoundly negative impact on the Butterfly School's status in Chinese literary canons and historiography until the late 1970s. Since then, Butterfly literature has been receiving increasing attention and recognition in the field of Chinese literature (e.g. Link 1981; Chow 1986; Fan 1989; Xu 2000; Chen 2005). In translation studies, there has also been growing interest in Butterfly writers' translation activities in the last two decades (e.g. Fan 1996; Li and Deng 2004; Li 2006; Xiu 2014; Qiao 2015). Most studies focus on analyzing the characteristics of certain Butterfly writers' translation practices and pointing out the significance of their introduction of foreign literature in the history of modern Chinese literature. These Butterfly writers' conceptualizations of translation, however, have still been largely neglected, if not belittled, in Chinese translation historiography. On the one hand, none of the Butterfly writers are included in the major anthologies of Chinese translation discourse (e.g. Chen 1996; Wang 2004; Chan 2004). Granted, few Butterfly writers theorized or debated about translation issues, but some

of their late-Qing predecessors have received more scholarly attention despite their similarly sporadic and impressionistic discussions on translation (see Chapter III). Therefore, the Butterfly writers are still subject to biased exclusion in the construction of a Chinese history of discourse on translation. On the other hand, even in studies on Butterfly writers' translation practices, it is not uncommon to see implied or explicit value judgments regarding their underlying understandings of translation. That is, though the overall contributions of their translation activities have been acknowledged, their specific translation practices are often characterized as mainly continuing the outmoded late-Qing translation norms (e.g. Li and Deng 2004; Chen 2005).

I contend that these popular writers' conceptualizations of translation deserve closer investigation without being measured by the standards of the May-Fourth discourse on translation or contemporary translation theory. Rather, a contextualized examination of their conceptualizations provides valuable evidence for challenging the May Fourth paradigm in the existing scholarship on modern Chinese history. In the following, I focus on the diverse discourses about translation found in the different paratextual materials surrounding Zhou Shoujuan's translation anthology, *Ou-meimingjia duanpian xiaoshuo congkan* 欧美名家短篇小说丛刊 (Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers). This anthology was published in 1917, two years into the New Culture Movement, but the beginning of its preparation went back to at least 1914. Moreover, the contributors of its various paratextual materials include not only Butterfly writers but also Lu Xun, one of the most prominent May-Fourth intellectuals in Chinese historiography. Therefore, an intertextual reading, in a New Historicist manner, of the different types of paratext and the journeys they

went through in the making of this translation anthology offers us contextualized insights into the conceptualization of translation in those transitional years.

4.2 Zhou Shoujuan and his *Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers*

Zhou Shoujuan (1895-1968) was a popular, prolific writer, translator, and editor in Republican China. Though Zhou's father, the breadwinner of the family, died when he was only 6, his widowed mother tried her best to ensure that Zhou received a proper education. He started to learn English in primary school and was already able to read literature in English at the age of 14 or 15 (Wang 1993, 10-2). In 1911, while still studying in middle school, Zhou published his first two works in Shanghai periodicals.¹⁰ These publications were instant successes, and he received considerable contribution fees, which was a great motivation for the young Zhou Shoujuan who grew up in a poor family (Zhou 1995). Ever since then Zhou started, as he himself described it in his later years, "making a living with his pen and ink" (ibid.). He contributed original writings, translations, and pseudo-translations to various journals, including *Saturday*, *Fiction Times*, *Youxi zazhi* 游戏杂志 (Pastime), *Funü shibao* 妇女时报 (Women's Eastern Times, 1911-7), *Xiaoshuo daguan* 小说大观 (The Grand Magazine, 1915-20), among others.¹¹ He also served as editor for such publications as

¹⁰ His short story *Luohua yuan* 落花怨 (The Complaints of Fallen Flowers) was published in the inaugural issue of *The Women's Eastern Times* in May 1911 and his *Ai zhi hua* 爱之花 (The Flower of Love), a play adapted/translated from a story he read in a periodical, was serialized in *Short Story Monthly* in that year too.

¹¹ For a discussion of Zhou's pseudotranslations, see Pan (2011).

Saturday and *Ziyou tan* 自由谈 (Unfettered Talk, 1911-32)¹², and even established and ran his own periodicals such as *Banyue* 半月 (Semi-Monthly, 1921-5) and *Violet*.

In 1916, Zhou collected his previous published translations of short stories (and perhaps some newly translated ones) into an anthology and sold the copyright to the publishing house *Zhonghua shuju* 中华书局 (Zhonghua Book Company) in order to fund his wedding.¹³ By that time, he had served as a columnist and in-house translator for Zhonghua Book Company for over a year (Wang 1993, 16-9). This collection of Zhou's translations, *Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers* (hereafter referred to as *Collection*), was published in March 1917. It was a great success both commercially and critically. A second edition was published shortly thereafter, in February 1918. Moreover, the *Collection* received a commendation from the Ministry of Education. That is, Zhonghua Book Company submitted the *Collection* to the Popular Education Research Committee (*tongsu jiaoyu yanjiuhui* 通俗教育研究会, hereafter referred to as the Committee) under the Ministry of Education for examination and registration. Established in 1915, the Committee was in charge of censoring and managing three main areas of popular education: fiction, drama, and public speech (see Chen 1977; Shi 2016).¹⁴ On November 30th 1917, the Committee published a review in the 15th issue of *Jiaoyu gongbao* 教育公报 (Education Bulletin)

¹² *Unfettered Talk* is a literary supplement to *Shen bao* 申报 (Shanghai News), the most influential and longest lasting commercial newspaper in Republican China. *Unfettered Talk* continued after 1932, but because of the change of editorship, it became a bastion of left-wing literature.

¹³ Zhou's own recollections about the *Collection* are not consistent. In one instance, he states that all of the 50 short stories were previously published (Zhou 1995), but in another, he says some of the 50 short stories were newly translated (Zhou 2010).

¹⁴ Rewarding and promoting high-quality publications was an important part of the Committee's responsibilities. The criteria for judging a publication included its theme, content, and style of writing. In terms of fiction, there were three award categories: the first category was for high-quality original writings, the second for high-quality translations, and the third for high-quality collections of miscellaneous anecdotes, news, and stories either from abroad or home, ancient or contemporary (see Shi 2016).

that gave a high appraisal of the *Collection*. The Committee also issued a certificate of award to Zhou Shoujuan to commend his translation work.

The *Collection*, in three volumes, includes 50 short stories by 47 authors including Walter Scott, Alexandre Dumas, Guy de Maupassant, Edgar Allan Poe, Leo Tolstoy, etc. (see Appendix for a full list): The first volume contains translations of 18 short stories from England; the second volume includes 10 short stories from France and 7 from the US; the third volume consists of 4 short stories from Russia, 2 from Germany, and 1 each from Italy, Hungary, Spain, Switzerland, Denmark, Sweden, the Netherlands, Serbia, and Finland. Since the only foreign language Zhou knew was English, the short stories in other European languages were relay-translated from their English translations (Zhou 2010, 25). Among these 50 stories, 18 are translated into classical Chinese and the rest into vernacular Chinese.

There are not many studies specifically on the *Collection*, though it is often mentioned to demonstrate Zhou's achievements and contributions in translation. In the existing scholarship on the *Collection* or stories in it, the focus has been mainly on Zhou's characteristic translation strategies, his selection of source texts, and the personal and social causes of his particular translation practices (e.g. Li 2006; Chen and Zhang 2011; Yan 2011; Qiao 2015). The existing studies usually examine the text proper of the *Collection*. Some studies do briefly discuss certain paratextual materials such as the translation of titles (Qiao 2012) and insertion of notes (Chen and Zhang 2011), but rarely have any studies focused on an investigation into the various paratextual materials accompanying the translations in the *Collection*.

In the following, I examine three kinds of paratextual materials that surround the *Collection*. The first level consists of three forewords, written respectively by Tianxiao sheng 天笑生 (i.e. Bao Tianxiao 包天笑, 1876-1973), Tianxu wo sheng 天虚我生 (i.e. Chen Diexian 陈蝶仙, 1879-1940), and Dungen 钝根 (i.e. Wang Dungen 王钝根, 1888-1951). Bao Tianxiao, Chen Diexian, and Wang Dungen were the three leading figures among the Butterfly writers (Link 1981, 164). Not only did they themselves actively engage in writing, translating, editing, and publishing, but they also provided patronage and mentoring to younger and emerging writers. Writing forewords for Zhou's *Collection* is one concrete manifestation of their support of this rising star on the Shanghai literary scene at that time. In section 4.3, I focus on this layer of paratext in the *Collection* to examine how these leading Butterfly writers discuss translation in forewords to their friend's translation anthology.

The second type consists of the immediate paratexts accompanying each translated short story within the *Collection*. As noted in the Committee's review, the *Collection* provides detailed information about each foreign author before each short story. Since then, this aspect of the *Collection* has been viewed in the existing scholarship as a demonstration of Zhou's "sincere" (*kenzhi* 恳挚) attitude toward translating (TSJYYJH 1917, 31). However, no studies have compared the immediate paratexts in the initial publications of these translations in periodicals and their reappearance in the *Collection*.¹⁵ In section 4.4, I take a closer look at these paratextual materials and focus especially on the changes they had gone through by the time these

¹⁵ One exception is Gamsa's (2008) discussion of Zhou's translation of "The Red Laugh" in both its periodical version and its anthology version (293-302). Gamsa has briefly noted the changes Zhou made to the introductory notes in the two versions of this translation.

short stories were anthologized to show a more complex picture of Zhou's understandings of translation in that transitional period.

The third kind of paratext is the Committee's review. According to the existing scholarship, this official review was drafted either by Lu Xun (i.e. Zhou Shuren 周树人), who was at that time the director of the fiction section of the Committee, or by Lu Xun and his younger brother Zhou Zuoren.¹⁶ It is beyond the purpose of this study to determine exactly who contributed to the drafting of this review. However, I treat this review as written by 'Lu Xun', for 'Lu Xun' is Zhou Shuren's pseudonym—a symbol that should not be equated with the historical figure Zhou Shuren—and the Zhou brothers at that time were still in close collaboration with each other.¹⁷ The canonization of 'Lu Xun' in PRC historiography even changed the status of this review. That is, it is included as "Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren's comment" in the 1987 modern edition of the *Collection* published by *Yuelu shushe* 岳麓书社, alongside the three original forewords. Moreover, in Zhou's own reminiscences of his translation career as well as the scholarship on Zhou's translations, this review is always explicitly associated with Lu Xun and his positive evaluation is repeatedly mentioned as the ultimate confirmation of the quality of Zhou Shoujuan's translations. In my analysis, however, I demystify this review and analyze it on the same plane as the aforementioned paratexts and the *Collection*.

In Chapter II, I challenged the insistence on precise demarcations between text, paratext, and extratext in Genette's original framework of paratextuality and its

¹⁶ Chen Pingyuan even attributes the authorship of this review to Lu Xun in one instance (Chen 2003, 176) and to the Zhou brothers in another (Chen 2005, 54).

¹⁷ See Pollard (2002), pp. 75-82, for an account of Lu Xun's falling out with Zhou Zuoren in 1923.

common applications in translation studies. Such a view of textual materials erects, I have argued, a conceptual hierarchy between different textual materials based on their closeness to authorial intentions, which is unhelpful for a study on historical conceptualizations of translation. Instead, adopting and extending the non-hierarchical New Historicist treatment of textual materials, I view various forms of ‘textual’ and ‘paratextual’ materials as ‘intertexts’ and give equal discursive status to them. In this case study, by reading all the above three types of paratextual materials on equal terms, I can show the plurality of attitudes toward translation in this largely neglected historical period and challenge the idea of a clean shift in conceptualizations of translation between the late Qing period and the May Fourth period.

4.3 Conceptualizations of translation in the forewords to the *Collection*

The three forewords, or what Genette calls *allographical prefaces*, are all written in simple classical Chinese¹⁸ and are rather short. Nonetheless, they are very informative about how translation was conceptualized by the three leading Butterfly writers. Before analyzing the ways in which they discuss translation, I provide a summary of each foreword as follows.

Bao’s preface is anecdotal. The first half narrates how Zhou came to ask him to write a preface for the *Collection* and why he had to write one without reading the manuscript. In the second half of the preface, Bao focuses on discussing the joy of “achieving something” (*bi yiye* 毕—业) and congratulates Zhou on the publication of

¹⁸ Though classical Chinese had a distinctive tendency towards archaization, it was not a static language but changed throughout history. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, many popular writers wrote in a simple, plain kind of classical Chinese.

the *Collection* before his wedding (Tianxiao sheng [1917]1931, 1). He concludes the short preface by vouching for the high quality of Zhou's works in general. Chen's foreword is the longest among the three. He presents an elaborate argument concerning the misfortune of being a man of letters who also translates. I discuss his argumentation in detail in 4.3.2 and 4.3.3. Wang's preface mainly tries to justify Zhou's achievement, i.e., publishing a collection of translations at the young age of 23. It briefly describes how captivated Zhou has been by fiction since a very young age and how diligently Zhou has worked on writing and translating fiction to attain such an achievement. In this way, Wang wants to "let [people] know that [Zhou's] great reputation does not come from luck" (Dungen [1917]1931, 2).

4.3.1 (Self-)Identification as a 'master of fiction' instead of a 'fiction translator'

There is a common feature manifest in all three forewords to the *Collection*, that is, Zhou is treated as a 'master of fiction' (*xiaoshuo jia* 小说家) who translates instead of a 'translator'. I translate the term *xiaoshuo jia* into English as a *master of fiction* rather than a *writer of fiction* to capture Bao, Chen, and Wang's de-emphasis of the distinction between translators and writers of fiction on the one hand and their emphasis on expertise in the field of fiction. Though they identify Zhou's published work in question as a collection of 'translations' and talk about the textual activity Zhou performed as 'translating', they do not label Zhou specifically as a 'translator'.

Bao Tianxiao, in his entire preface, downplays the translational aspects of Zhou's collection of translated short stories. As summarized above, he uses his foreword mainly to congratulate Zhou on his achievement—the publication of the *Collection*.

However, when Bao is discussing the joy of accomplishing something, he does not specify the accomplishment in question. That is, before discussing the joy of Zhou's achievement of publishing a collection of translations, Bao makes the following overarching statement:

凡人毕一业，辄自慰。工者成一器，商者营一肆，与夫文人撰一书，其道同也。前者我每毕译一书，恒以斗酒自劳……

When one finishes and achieves something, one should be delighted. When a man of letters composes (*zhuan* 撰) a book, it is an achievement just as when a craftsman makes an object or a businessman [successfully] runs a shop. Before, every time I finished translating (*yi* 译) a book, I treated myself to some wine ... (Tianxiao sheng [1917]1931, 1)¹⁹

I have already discussed the conceptual vagueness of the word *zhuan* 撰 in the late-Qing discourse on translation in Chapter III. That is, though *zhuan* and *yi* 译 were used as distinctive terms, the differences between these two concepts were more nuanced than an essential hierarchy between 'original' writing and 'derivative' translation (see 3.2.2). Here, the distinction between original writing and translation is not important for Bao either. Bao subsumes both his own "translating a book" and Zhou's publication of a translation collection under the rubric of "a man of letters composes (*zhuan* 撰) a book".

The above excerpt is the only time Bao uses the word *yi* (translate) in his preface to Zhou's *Collection*. In other instances, when Bao talks about Zhou's *Collection*, he uses such words as "*gao* 稿" (manuscript), "*ji* 集" (collection, anthology), and "*zhuzuo* 著作" (composition, works, writings). The nouns *gao* and *ji* are unproblematically neutral; they can refer to either translations or original writings. What is interesting is his use of *zhuzuo* when he describes an imaginary scene in which Zhou is showing the

¹⁹ Each foreword starts from page 1 in pagination.

Collection to his fiancée and saying, “My love, this is my new *zhuzuo*” (ibid.). *Zhuzuo*, in its current usage in the modern Chinese language, only denotes original writings that are produced using creativity. In classical Chinese, however, *zhuzuo* as a noun refers to works in a more general sense, which also include history-compiling²⁰. It is unclear when in the history of the Chinese language the meaning of the word *zhuzuo* narrowed to ‘original writings’. However, in this case, *zhuzuo* still seems to be a generic term, and ‘translating’ is within the range of similar textual activities to which it refers. Bao ends the foreword with a further blurring of the distinction between original writing and translation. At the end of the foreword, when Bao tries to justify the fact that he wrote this preface without reading the *Collection*, he writes:

至于兹集之内容，我实未见，不妄赘。然而我之读鹃之小说也多矣，他人之读鹃之小说也多矣。鹃之文字，自有价值，我何赘焉。

As to the content of this collection, since I have not read it, I am not in the position to discuss it in detail. However, I have read much of Juan’s²¹ *xiaoshuo* 小说 (fiction), and so have other people. The value of Juan’s *wenzi* 文字 (words, writing) is self-evident and I do not need to say much about it. (ibid., 2)

What is implied in this final endorsement is that, to Bao, the value of this collection of translated short stories can be confirmed by the quality of Zhou’s earlier writings, whether original or translated. For Bao, they are all ‘fiction’ and the distinction between translated and original ones does not matter.

Both Chen Diexian and Wang Dungen in their prefaces more explicitly refer to Zhou Shoujuan as ‘*xiaoshuo jia*’. Chen ([1917]1931) throughout his foreword identifies Zhou as ‘*fanyi zhi xiaoshuojia* 翻译之小说家’ (a master of fiction who

²⁰ In *Hou hanshu* 后汉书 (Book of the Later Han), for instance, *zhuzuo* is used to refer to Sima Qian’s compilation of *Shiji*.

²¹ ‘Juan’ refers to Zhou Shoujuan. It is customary in Chinese to refer to a person by the last character of his or her given name.

translates). Similarly, Wang Dungen in his foreword states: “Shoujuan thus became famous as a master of fiction (*xiaoshuo jia*), and the majority of Shoujuan’s fiction are translated ones (*yi zhe* 译者)” (Dungen [1917]1931, 1). Therefore, in both Chen’s and Wang’s conceptions, expertise in the field of fiction includes translating foreign fiction, or to put it differently, being prolific in fiction translation qualifies one as a master of fiction rather than a translator.

A noteworthy yet easily neglected aspect of Wang’s line quoted above, which sheds light on the conceptualizations of translation at that time, is lost in translation. That is the phrase in the Chinese original, *yi zhe* 译者, which I have translated into English according to the context as ‘translated ones’. The phrase *yi zhe* in the modern Chinese language is a compound word (transcribed more correctly as *yizhe*), used to specifically refer to a ‘translator’. However, in Wang’s preface, written in simple classical Chinese, it grammatically consists of two words (*yi* and *zhe*) and means ‘those that are translated’. The word *zhe* 者 is a particle used after a verb, noun, or adjective to refer to certain person(s), thing(s), or item(s). Classical Chinese is a highly condensed language in terms of wording and consists overwhelmingly of monosyllabic words, while modern Chinese is a largely polysyllabic language (Dong 2014). Therefore, *yi zhe* in classical Chinese is a phrase with two monosyllabic words, and it can mean, based on the context, either the person(s) who translate(s) or the text being translated. In Wang’s preface, *yi zhe* means the texts that are translated, while the term also appears once in Chen’s preface which refers to the person who translates foreign fictions. It is beyond the scope of this study to delve into the historical transformations of the Chinese language and how it might have influenced (the

articulation of) the conceptualizations of translation.²² However, this linguistic nuance causes difficulties in our interpretation of Bao's, Chen's, and Wang's identification of Zhou as a master of fiction instead of a translator. Based on the particular nouns and verbs these Butterfly writers employ in talking about Zhou's translation anthology, a translator—a person who renders writings or speeches from one language into another—was still not yet a clearly distinguished identity or profession for these popular cultural actors at that time. Yet it also leaves one wondering whether these Butterfly writers were intentionally choosing to identify themselves as masters of fiction (or men of letters) or this was due to the particular language register in which they chose to write the forewords. After all, in the kind of simple classical Chinese they wrote, the phrase *yi zhe* was not yet a designated term for the distinctive identity of translator as 'the person who translates from one language into another'.

4.3.2 The misfortune of being a master of fiction who translates

Chen Diexian starts his preface by claiming that “it is unfortunate for a man of letters to be a master of fiction, and it is even more unfortunate to be a master of fiction who translates” (Tianxu wo sheng [1917]1931, 1). In the rest of the preface, he elaborates on this statement and concludes by connecting it with Zhou's *Collection*. Let us first take a close look at Chen's argumentation.

Chen first explains the misfortune of being a master of fiction: Men of letters who resort to composing fiction are mostly people who are diligent and talented but unrecognized for their talent. After suffering many a setback in their lives, they start

²² For a general survey of the history of language reform since the late 1890s, see Chen (2015). For a study on the history of language reform in relation to the education system in China from 1895 to 1919, see Kaske (2008).

to vent their discontent, grievances, and criticism of society through fiction writing. The more they fight back, the poorer they become; yet the poorer they become, the better their writing. This is, according to Chen, “the inevitable path to becoming a master of fiction” (ibid.). Therefore, what Chen means by ‘the misfortune of fiction masters’ is the adversity they go through that forces them to take up the brush to compose fiction. This description is in accordance with the stereotype of fiction writers in the Chinese tradition.²³ As mentioned in Chapter III, fiction had long been considered an inferior genre in the Chinese literary tradition. Usually men of letters who were unsuccessful in the civil service examinations—the only orthodox path to social status—would resort to writing, editing, or commenting on fiction as side jobs.

However, Chen goes on to acknowledge that the misfortune of the fiction masters would turn into good fortune if their works become widely known. Building upon a quote from Confucius that “what a gentleman dreads the most is not being able to have established a name for himself when he dies” (*Lunyu* 15.20; as quoted in Yang 1934, 247), Chen explains that “a master of fiction will not have such regrets and is thus fortunate” (Tianxu wo sheng [1917]1931, 1). It means, though the masters of fiction do not achieve success in the orthodox way, they still manage to avoid falling into oblivion and even to have their name handed down from generation to generation because of the popularity of their fiction.

After having explained the (mis)fortune of a master of fiction, Chen moves on to explain why it is more unfortunate to be a master of fiction who translates. That is,

²³ See Li (2016) for a discussion on how the idea of an essential connection between adversity and textual endeavor, posited by Sima Qian, “reverberate[d] through the ages in prefaces, postscripts, and biographies extolling poetic genius or defending fiction and drama” (97).

when a Western fiction master's work is disseminated in China, this Western fiction master is of course lucky, but it is the misfortune of the Chinese fiction master who translates this Western writer's fiction. Chen argues that because of the sharp differences in language, customs, and culture, only a Chinese fiction master can translate Western fiction in a way that ensures its quality and reception. For Chen, a Chinese fiction master's skills and talent are vital for the dissemination of Western fiction in China just as the skills and talent of good actors²⁴ are vital for the reception of a play. (This analogy will be analyzed in 4.3.3.) However, Chen dreads that the Chinese readers might not recognize the important role played by the Chinese fiction master or the amount of effort and talent the Chinese fiction master puts into his translation work. He laments:

人但知翻译之小说，为欧美名家所著，而不知其全书之中，除事实外，尽为中国小说家之文字也。岂非吾侪小说家之大不幸耶。

People only know that translated stories are written by famous European and American writers, but fail to realize that, apart from the plot (*shishi* 事实), the entire translated book is the Chinese fiction master's writing (*wenzi* 文字). Is not this the worst misfortune for us fiction masters? (*ibid.*, 2)

In the previous scholarship, Chen's comment—mostly the first line—has often been cited as a contemporaneous statement that corroborates the target-culture oriented translation norms in late Qing and early Republican China (e.g. Gao 2000; Deng 2010). Yet this excerpt and, for that matter, Chen's entire preface have rarely received any critical attention. I would like to discuss the anxiety which Chen takes such great pains to elaborate on in his preface. This anxiety, as is made clear in the above quote, is about being unrecognized and invisible among Chinese readers in the dissemination

²⁴ In the rest of the chapter, the term *actor* is used to refer to both male and female performers.

of works by famous Western authors. However, it is pertinent to ask whether the kind of ‘invisibility’ Chen Diexian was concerned with is the same as what Lawrence Venuti (1995) calls ‘the translator’s invisibility’ in contemporary translation studies.

First, the kind of invisibility Chen discusses is different from the concept of ‘the translator’s invisibility’ in the discourse of contemporary translation studies in terms of their underlying concerns. While Venuti’s concept of ‘the translator’s invisibility’ focuses on the dominant fluent translation practice and its ethnocentric, imperialist cultural consequences in contemporary Anglo-American culture, the kind of invisibility Chen is concerned with is related to the idea of ‘establishing a name for oneself’ (*chuanshi* 传世), one of the ultimate goals a Confucian man of letters aspires to in his life. It is well known in translation studies that Venuti’s (1995) concept of ‘the translator’s invisibility’ refers to the “illusion of transparency” of the translator’s interventions in the translation at the textual level (1), the marginal, “ambiguous and unfavorable legal status of translation” at the social level (8), and “ethnocentric violence” (20) at the cultural level. Venuti is against the prevailing domesticating, fluent translation practices performed by translators and recommended by publishers, reviewers, and readers. Moreover, he tries to draw more attention to the political and ethical aspects of translation and especially the issue of the relations with the cultural other. That is, for Venuti, the invisibility of the translator is also about how cultures interact and re-present others.

However, Chen supports domestication and explicitly opposes the kind of literal translation practice which keeps the linguistic or even cultural characteristics of the foreign text. The anxiety about being ‘invisible’ expressed in Chen’s preface is an

anxiety deeply rooted in the Confucian intellectual tradition. What Chen is concerned with is that, despite all the talent and hard work the Chinese fiction masters put into translating Western fiction, these Chinese fiction writers are not able to *establish a name* for themselves. As Xu (1998) points out, to establish a name—especially an immortal one—for oneself was a common goal shared by traditional Confucian men of letters through the ages and the apprehension of not being able to do so, for many, was the internal motive that drove them to make a difference. Moreover, it is stated in *Xiaojing* 孝经 (The Classic of Filial Piety), one of the thirteen Confucian classics, that to establish one's name is not simply a matter of personal achievement, but also a way to honor one's parents and ancestors (see Sih 1961, 3). Therefore, unlike the concept of invisibility in contemporary translation studies that specifically addresses the troubling relationship between translator and original author and between target culture and source culture, Chen's complaint about the misfortune of the Chinese fiction master is ultimately concerned with the self in relation to the collective (i.e., family, clan, or the society) within the target culture. It was a new manifestation of the age-old problem for Chinese Confucian intellectuals in Chen's time. Though in his case this problem was partly caused by the introduction of a dimension of the cultural Other, Chen was not concerned with the power relations or dynamics across cultural boundaries. The invisibility Chen was anxious about is the invisibility of a Chinese man of letters in general, not the invisibility of a Chinese 'translator'.

Meanwhile, we should not take at face value Chen's complaint about the misfortune of the fiction masters who translate. Chen's preface creates the impression that writers-translators like him and Zhou Shoujuan were suffering from such

unfortunate invisibility. However, the fact is that they enjoyed high levels of visibility in the texts, in the reception of foreign fiction, and in the overall public discursive space. The extensive textual manipulation and presence of these writer-translators in their translations have already been discussed in previous studies (e.g. Chen 2005; Shen and Kong 2011; Qiao 2015). I mentioned in 4.2 the popularity and prominence of Chen, Bao, and Wang. Also, Wang Dungen's preface focuses precisely on the growing fame of Zhou Shoujuan and states that Zhou enjoys great reputation as a fiction master. In other words, Wang thinks Zhou has already established a name for himself at a very young age. I would argue that this inconsistency between Chen's and Wang's prefaces lies in their respective rhetorical strategies for preface-writing (see also 3.2.3). That is, Chen chooses to complain about the *misfortune* of the fiction masters to draw the readers' attention to Zhou Shoujuan's hard work and talent and in an indirect way highlights Zhou's achievement, while Wang more directly praises Zhou's attainments. No matter what specific rhetorical path they choose, it is evident that 'ming 名' (literally 'name')—reputation, social recognition, and glory of the family or clan—is a shared theme underlying both Chen's and Wang's prefaces.

4.3.3 Translating as acting

When Chen Diexian explains why Chinese masters of fiction become invisible in the process of introducing Western fictions to China, he draws an elaborate analogy between translating fiction and “putting on old plays” (*banyan jiuju* 搬演旧剧) (Tianxu wo sheng [1917]1931, 1-2).²⁵ Chen's argument is that, just as only good actors

²⁵ Though Western-style spoken drama had already been introduced to China by then, the 'ju 剧' (play) in Chen's analogy refers to traditional Chinese theatre. For an account of the appearance of Western-style drama see Dolby (1976), pp. 197-215.

can bring to life the characters in an old play and make it popular again for a new audience, only a Chinese master of fiction can provide an enjoyable Chinese rendition of a piece of Western fiction and make it popular among Chinese readers.

In his detailed argumentation, Chen first establishes the importance of good actors for the reception of a play: “with the same play, a production by good actors is spectacular but one by amateurs is detestable” (ibid., 2); therefore, the popularity of a play, Chen argues, “has nothing to do with the quality of the script itself” but “in fact depends on the actors’ performance” (ibid.). He argues that the most important quality of good actors, which distinguishes them from amateurs and mediocre actors, is the self-sufficiency of their talent and skills. That is, in Chen’s words, “a master of drama is especially good at adding his or her own ideas (*can yi ji yi* 参以己意) to the chanted dialogues (*daobai* 道白) and interpolated actions (*chake* 插科), and giving full play to his or her talent (*jin qi nengshi* 尽其能事) against the [limited] setting and decor” (ibid.). Then Chen moves on to explain the similar importance of a master of fiction for the reputation of Western fiction in China: “If no Chinese fiction masters translate them, these short stories will never be known in China. If the one who translates is mediocre, then even if a work starts circulating in China, it will not be popular in society” (ibid.). The reason why Chinese fiction masters can ensure the popularity of Western fiction, Chen maintains, also lies in the fact that they can “add their own ideas” and “give full play to their talent” in their re-presentation of the foreign texts (ibid.).

Hence, it is evident from Chen’s argumentation that he attaches great importance to the subjectivity—skills, talent, and efforts—and creativity of the translator as well as the actor. For him, what matters most is not faithfulness to the original text; the

quality of the original text does not matter so much in the reception of a play in a different time or a short story in a different cultural space. Rather, he explicitly stresses that one needs to add one's own interpretation and ideas to a text and give full play to one's skills to animate the text and to offer an excellent rendition of either a pre-existing play or a Western story. In other words, it is important, according to Chen, for both actors and translators to foreground their own presence and agency.

Chen's metaphor of translation as acting might not seem unique. In the West, especially in contemporary translation studies, this comparison of translating to performance, either theatrical or musical, is not uncommon (e.g. Benshalom 2012; Van Wyke 2014; Cheetham 2016).²⁶ As Benshalom (2012) summarizes it, "the basic similarity between the two practices" as perceived in the Western tradition is that "both acting and translating involve some degree of representation or imitation" (16). But he also points out that many contemporary uses of this metaphor emphasize the subjectivity and creativity of both translators and actors in the process of representation (Benshalom 2012). Cheetham (2016) even argues in favor of using the metaphor of translation as performance to replace the common conceptual metaphors of translation as movement or replacement for its potential of changing the negative views of literary translation and translators. The metaphor of translation as performance in Western discourse on translation, however, is based on the Western theatrical tradition and conceptualizations of performance, while Chen's analogy operates within the conceptual framework of traditional Chinese theater. Therefore, to

²⁶ Both Benshalom (2012) and Cheetham (2016) provide a review, though not extensive, of the existing comparisons of translation to performance in the West. Moreover, according to Tan's (2006) comparative studies on Chinese and Western metaphors of translation, comparison of translation to musical and/or theatrical performance is the second largest category out of the 10 categories he classifies.

fully understand Chen's analogy, we need to develop a better understanding of the particular relationship in traditional Chinese theatre between dramatic text and performance.

In traditional Chinese theater, the text is relatively insignificant. Generally, “[a]ll genres of traditional Chinese theatre are a form of musical theater” and have “no intrinsic need for written-out texts” (Idema 2001, 794). Improvisation is one of the essential skills of actors in traditional Chinese theater, and for existing plays, “the plots of the plays and the parts for each of the roles were orally transmitted by the teacher to his/her pupils” (Idema 2001, 794; see also Hsu 1985, 69-76). According to Idema (2005), apart from serving as concise role texts for leading actors, the reasons for writing (out) a play were mostly irrelevant to performance: many early play scripts in print in the 14th century were produced either to help an audience who could not understand the arias because of dialectal differences, to submit to the Court for censorship, or to be *read* as closet-dramas among elite literati. Moreover, the emergence of written-out scripts and librettos did not alter the ways in which actors learned their parts or change the fact that the dramatic text was subject to continual revisions and changes either by the actors or the playwrights (Idema 2001, 795). In sum, performance in traditional Chinese theater is not about re-presenting a fixed, written script, let alone realizing the original intentions of a single playwright.

Closely associated with the relative insignificance of the script, another distinctive characteristic of traditional Chinese theater is its actor-centrality. That is, as Fu (2000) argues, actors constitute the core of a traditional Chinese theater troupe in relation to the other agents involved, and the performance of the actor is the

dominant medium on stage in relation to the other theatrical elements. As Idema (2001) points out, “traditional Chinese theater until recently did not have a director [or conductor] in command of the total performance who gives the performance his or her individual stamp” (792). That means, instead of having one single person in charge of interpreting a script and deciding how a play will appear on stage, the production of a play is a “collective creation” (*qunti de chuangzuo* 群体的创作) among actors, masters in charge of training young actors, and sometimes a playwright (Fu 2000, 40). In particular, the leading actors (角儿 *jue'er*) enjoy great freedom in acting out an existing script or simply improvising. Theater goers usually find a production attractive because of its leading actors. Moreover, the stage settings, props, and other theatrical elements are all kept to a minimum in traditional Chinese theater. Such an unadorned style of *mise-en-scène* ensures the centrality of the actors on stage and leaves ample space for the actors to use their execution of the arias, dialogues, dance, mime, etc. to indicate the change of settings and plot development (Scott 1983). In sum, actors are the absolute center of traditional Chinese theater, and their competence and performance constitute the key to a good production.

In consideration of these two interrelated features of traditional Chinese theater, Chen’s analogy between translating and acting does present some significant differences from similar metaphors in the Western discourse. The subjectivity and creativity of the Chinese actors and masters of fiction—especially giving full play to their own ideas and interpretations—were genuinely justifiable in Chen’s time, for there had been no problematic relationships between text and performance in the long-established Chinese textual and theatrical traditions. Chen’s analogy, therefore, shows

that Chinese translators, just like actors, played an integral part in the creative process of producing the text.

In the Western tradition, however, as theater theorist and historian Marvin Carlson (1985) points out, the text-performance relationship has been a vexed problem since the Romantic period, when texts started to be viewed as “organic wholes, complete within themselves” and conveying authorial intentions of individual geniuses (5-6). Such a conception of the dramatic text necessarily led to a dismissive view of performance as unnecessary or even menacing to the very status of the text “in that it threatens always to corrupt the original vision by ‘interpretation’—making it something other and...necessarily inferior” (ibid., 6). Interestingly, in the early 20th century, a strand of Western theater theorists began conceptualizing the performance of a script as the translation of a text in an effort to “elevat[e] performance to a position of authenticity equal to that of the written text” (ibid., 8).²⁷ However, as Carlson notes, this comparison is intrinsically problematic, and he lays out the reason clearly:

The more literally one takes the linguistic analogy, the more one foregrounds the script, the very thing these theorists are attempting to avoid. Their model is conditioned by the normal presuppositions of theatrical production, in which this so-called translation runs always from script to performance and not vice versa; such a situation necessarily privileges the script as defining the originary parameters of the translation and makes performance subservient not only temporarily (sic), but artistically, since it is unusual indeed for a translation to be considered aesthetically superior to its original. (ibid., 8)

In other words, both ‘performance’ and ‘translation’ in the Western tradition have long been trapped in their hierarchical relations with the ‘original’ text. The effort to form

²⁷ According to Carlson (1985), the other three main approaches to the fraught relationship between text and performance in the Western theater tradition are the theories of performance as illustration, fulfilment, and supplement (in the Derridean sense). He suggests that Derrida’s idea of supplement “provides a new way of thinking about several of the key paradoxes which bedevil theories of performance as illustration, translation, or fulfillment” (ibid., 9).

an analogy between them, therefore, cannot entirely free either the concept of performance or that of translation from the phantom of the formidable original text—at least not until poststructuralist theories of text deconstructed the conventional Western understandings of text, author, and meaning in the late 20th century.²⁸

What makes Chen's analogy more interesting is the fact that he was also actively composing dramatic texts. He wrote not only librettos of *tanci* 弹词 (literally 'plucking lyrics'), a traditional Chinese theatrical form that combines storytelling, singing, and instrumental music, but also scripts for *xinju* 新剧 (literally 'new-style play')²⁹, an early Chinese form of modern Western-style spoken drama. When in the role of a playwright, Chen also fully embraced the derivative nature of text and the tradition of communal textual production. In one of the *xinju* scripts he wrote, *Shengsi yuanyang* 生死鸳鸯 (Mandarin Ducks in Life and Death), Chen adapts a short story in *Liaozhai zhiyi* 聊斋志异 (Strange stories from a Chinese studio) to a long new-style play.³⁰ What Chen did, as is described in his own introductory note to the script, was "editing anew, extending, and elaborating on [the original] to remedy its defects according to the current norms while still keeping the original story intact" (Tianxu wo sheng 1914, 1). The textual reworking involved in this script is more than that. *Liaozhai zhiyi* is a collection of around five hundred 'strange' short tales—tales about ghosts, spirits, gods, monsters, extraordinary natural phenomena, etc.—by Pu Songling 蒲松龄

²⁸ In translation studies scholarship, for instance, Littau (1993) adopts the poststructuralist understanding of translation to rethink the relationship between text and performance and propose a model of conceptualizing dramatic translation.

²⁹ Also known as 文明戏 (literally 'civilized drama'), Chinese *xinju* was adapted from the Japanese *shimpa* ('new drama') and introduced by Chinese students who studied in Japan to Chinese audiences in the early 20th century. See Dong (2005) for a list of Chen Diexian's publications.

³⁰ The script was serialized in the 8th to 10th issues of the periodical *Youxi zazhi* 游戏杂志 (Pastime) in 1914. According to Dong (2005), together with several other scripts, it was written on the request of certain new-style societies and was put on stage in Shanghai.

(1640-1715). Pu, in his preface to *Liaozai zhiyi*, identifies himself as a “Historian of the Strange” (*Yishi shi* 异史氏) and “attributes his sources to oral tales and written reports by others” (Chiang 2005, 31). Therefore, in this case, before this new-style play was staged, it already had gone through several stages of textual reworking. In other words, the dramatic text he produced resulted from textual transmission and was subject to further transmission just like what was happening to Western fiction being translated into Chinese. In this potentially endless web of textual reshaping and transmission, what mattered for Chen was the “painstaking efforts” (*kuxin guyi* 苦心孤诣) as well as the talent one puts into each stage of the transmission, not the authoritative, originary status of a particular text (Tianxu wo sheng [1917]1931, 2).

So far, I have analyzed how translation is discussed and conceptualized in the three forewords to Zhou’s *Collection*. Bao, Wang, and Chen all identify Zhou and themselves more generally as ‘fiction masters’ or ‘men of letters’ that incorporate the role of the translator; they also greatly emphasize the freedom and agency a fiction master has in translating foreign fiction. In other words, the boundaries between translating and writing are blurred in their understanding of the role of the ‘translator’. This dovetails with Barthes’s model of intertextuality and the resultant notions of translatorship to which such a model gives rise in contemporary translation studies scholarship, yet only on the surface. As discussed in Chapter II, Barthes’s theory of intertextuality helps break down the conceptual hierarchy between writing and translating by deconstructing the Romantic notion of authorship in the Western tradition. However, the conceptual blurring between translating and writing in these Butterfly writers’ conception, as my analysis of Chen’s performance analogy most

evidently shows, is intimately associated with the traditional Chinese notions of authorship and intertextuality. Since the Chinese textual tradition does not have an individualist conception of authorship or a notion of text as the product of *creatio ex nihilo*, all textual activities are considered derivative and there are no essentialist differences between different kinds of textual activities—be it writing, editing, or compilation. Translation, as another type of textual transmission, naturally fits into this long-established non-hierarchical conceptual paradigm.

Enjoying great subjectivity and freedom in dealing with the translated text, the ‘translator’ in these Butterfly writers’ conception is quite similar to the emancipated translator whom the first strand of translation studies scholars (discussed in 2.1.2) envision as an outgrowth of the death of the Author. However, in contrast to these contemporary scholars who argue for the elevation of the translator’s status vis-à-vis the original author, these Butterfly writers had a different framework of reference in their discussions about translatorship. They were not concerned with the status of the translator in relation to the foreign author. Rather, as Chen’s emphasis on ‘establishing a name’ shows, they comprehended the value of a ‘translator’ only in relation to the target-culture tradition, for the ultimate goal of this ‘translator’ was to achieve glory for the family and the clan by earning a place in the Great Tradition.

While it seems that these three major figures of the Butterfly School held rather traditional ideas about translation, a closer look at the paratexts immediately surrounding the short stories in the *Collection* reveals a more complicated picture about the conceptualizations of translation by this group of cultural actors.

4.4 The immediate paratexts, from first publications to the *Collection* iterations

The *Collection* was published in 1917, but the actual translation of the stories went back to at least 1914. According to the existing scholarship, the *Collection* falls into the early stage of Zhou's translation career. Taking the beginning of the May Fourth era (1919) as the watershed, both Li Dechao (2006) and Wang Minling (2015) maintain that Zhou's translation career evolved from an early, traditional stage to a late, modern stage in terms of his translation practice and underlying understanding of translation. In the early stage, Zhou mostly adopted liberal, target-culture oriented translation strategies while in the late stage his translation practice was mostly literal and source-culture oriented. However, in my analysis of the immediate paratexts surrounding each translation in the *Collection*, I question their linear, teleological characterization of Zhou's translation career based on the May Fourth paradigm and therefore their understanding of Chinese translation history. I will show that the so-called 'modern' and 'traditional' attitudes toward and practices of translation coexisted in fluctuation in Zhou's translation activities in the years from 1914 to 1917.

Of the 50 short stories in the *Collection*, I have been able to track the 'prehistory' of 27 stories that were previously published in such popular periodicals as *Saturday* and *Pastime* or anthologies of translations (see Appendix for a full list and more details).³¹ Comparing the first publication and the *Collection* version of these 27 short stories, it can be said that in the *Collection* Zhou did not make any substantial changes to the translated short stories themselves, but he did alter certain paratextual elements

³¹ Wang Zhiyi's (1993) *Research Materials on Zhou Shoujuan* indicates the periodical publications for 18 stories included in the *Collection*. I have found 9 more first publications.

to re-present all these translations in a relatively uniform paratextual format.³² The provision of the paratextual information shows, to a large extent, Zhou's great respect for the original text.

This uniform paratextual format comprises the story's title in both Chinese translation and the original language (or English translation), the original author's name in both Chinese transliteration and the original language (or English), a brief biography of the original author, and a portrait of the original author.³³ Moreover, the foreign authors' biographies are all signaled by a section title "...*xiaozhuan* 小传" (a brief biography of ...). In all the biographies, most of the proper names appear in both Chinese translation and the original language (or English) too; the half-bracket symbols (〔 〕) function as quotation marks when works are referred to, and Zhou's explanatory notes all appear in a single line in parentheses. However, there are three exceptions: that is, there are no portraits for Anna Kaubert³⁴ (1870-1899) from the Netherlands, T. Drakulitch (dates unknown) from Serbia, and Juhani Aho (1861-1921) from Finland, and their biographies, which contain much less information than the other authors', have no section titles. The reason for these exceptions are probably due to a lack of available information rather than sloppiness. These authors and literature from these countries were perhaps not well-known at the time even in English.

³² When discussing Zhou's translation of "The Red Laugh" in both its periodical version and its anthology version, Gamsa (2008) points out that in the text proper Zhou made some small "lexical updating" in the anthology version, changing certain phrases from their "literary", "ancient" versions to more "colloquial" or "modern" forms (300).

³³ For those authors who have more than one story included in the *Collection*, the biography and portrait only appear once in front of the first short story.

³⁴ This name provided by Zhou is not correct. It should be Anna Koubert, one of the pseudonyms used by Anna Christina Berkhout.

Zhou's intention of maintaining such a uniform paratextual format throughout the *Collection* is evident when we compare the *Collection* versions with their first publications in terms of paratextual makeup. In the 27 first publications I have found, the short stories appear in various paratextual formats. Some have more paratextual information than their *Collection* versions while others have much less.³⁵ On the whole, when compiling these previously published stories into an anthology, Zhou removed the relatively subjective, personal paratextual materials in which his own personal comments and responses to the source text were prominent and added more biographical information about the foreign authors.

On the one hand, the common paratextual elements that Zhou removed from the *Collection* include classification labels, the relatively subjective comments at the beginning or at the end of the short story, and illustrations.³⁶ The deletion of classification labels and illustrations might just be a stylistic decision. What is more intriguing for our discussion is the removal of the subjective, personal notes, in which Zhou comments on the theme or value of the translated text, explains the reasons for translating the particular text, relates how he encountered the original 'text'³⁷ or even how he once lost and then rediscovered the translation manuscript, etc. For instance,

³⁵ The differences in the amount of paratextual information between the 27 stories were not a result of following certain editorial guidelines of the particular periodicals in which they were published. Within the same periodical, the paratextual formats vary from text to text. For instance, 17 out of the 27 short stories were first published in *Saturday*—of which Zhou Shoujuan was also one of the editors—but each provides various types of paratextual information.

³⁶ It was customary in popular periodicals at that time to classify fiction into diverse categories such as 'sentimental fiction' (*aiqing xiaoshuo* 哀情小说), 'patriotic fiction' (*aiguo xiaoshuo* 爱国小说), 'social fiction' (*shehui xiaoshuo* 社会小说). This practice of specifically labeling a fiction started from Liao Qichao's publication of the journal *Xin xiaoshuo* 新小说 (New Fiction) in 1902. Only four short stories have illustrations in their first publications.

³⁷ The original 'text' of "A *xiong* 阿兄" (Le Petit Chose), as is explained in Zhou's comments, is a film adaptation he watched (Zhou 1914a, 11). According to Chen (2014), at least eleven of Zhou's fiction translations are translated from the films he watched.

in the periodical version of Zhou's translation of Leonid Andreev's "The Red Laugh" (*Hong xiao* 红笑) published in 1914, there is a brief introductory note in front of and a brief comment after the text. Zhou (1914b) starts the introductory note by commenting on the devastating consequences of warfare, and then introduces "The Red Laugh" as a Western masterpiece on this theme. He ends it by stating that he translated this story to promote anti-war ideas among readers. In the comment immediately following the text, Zhou states that he followed the original text closely without daring to make any deletions or changes when translating this masterpiece. If he does not stay true to the original, Zhou continues to explain, its value as a masterpiece will be lost in the translation. Finally, he urges the reader to read this story closely and slowly to comprehend its subtly implied meanings. Another example of personal comments is his translation of Madame de Staël's "Corinne" (*Wuke naihe hua luoqu* 无可奈何花落去). In its first publication in *Saturday* in 1914, there is a short comment at the end of the story. In this comment, Zhou (1914c) defends the sentimental proclivities in his works by explaining that he was born such a sentimental person and that he could not help but produce such works. He also announces that a piece of his work that will appear in the next issue would counterbalance the sad mood created by "Corinne". All these comments, mostly about Zhou's own understandings, emotions, and experience, highlight his own presence in the translated texts.

It is unclear exactly why Zhou did not keep such comments when compiling these stories into a collection. Of course, the content of some notes and comments was no longer relevant to the new publication in 1917. It is unfitting, for instance, to keep in the *Collection* the advertisement for a piece of work published in 1914. However, there

seems to be a deliberate and consistent endeavor on Zhou's part to refrain from expressing personal comments and emotions so as to erase his visible presence in the translations and foreground instead the original authors in the *Collection*.

On the other hand, the periodical versions of some other short stories provide little paratext and thus minimal information about the original text in the paratext. For instance, the first publication of Zhou's (1915a) translation of François Coppée's "The Bullet-Hole" (*Gong zui* 功罪) in *Saturday* only has the classification label—'fiction about soldiers' (*junren xiaoshuo* 军人小说), the title of the story in Chinese translation, and Zhou's pen name. It does not even identify the original author's name. However, it has to be pointed out that, apart from *Gong zui*, the other 26 short stories in their first publications all provide the name of the original author (at least its Chinese transliteration) and his or her nationality. It can be said that Zhou was already providing a considerable amount of information about the original texts in the first publications of these stories, a practice that was not very common at that time.

Moreover, it is important to note that 12 short stories in their first publications already have a brief biography (or a note that contains biographical information) of the original author. In terms of content, these brief biographies are quite similar, in varying degrees, to the ones in the *Collection*. There might be inconsequential differences in wording, the list of the author's major publications, the translation of certain titles or names, punctuations, and Zhou's interlinear notes.³⁸ Yet the most important changes

³⁸ In the *Collection*, Zhou adopts the *pingdian* commentary tradition which is a long-established practice of commenting and punctuating in the traditional Chinese system of writing and reading. As will be discussed in great detail in Chapter V, its most basic components are notes or comments placed as close as possible to the commented text and dots and circles placed closely on the right side of the lines of the text as emphatic punctuations.

made in the biographies are the corrections of mistakes—both factual and typographical—and the addition of information about the original author. For example, the biography of Nathaniel Hawthorne in the periodical publication of the translation of “The White Old Maid” (*Weiying* 帷影) is almost identical to that in the *Collection* with only one alteration. In the periodical version, the title of one of Hawthorne’s works, “Liberty Tree”, is mistakenly translated as *ziyou yi* 自由椅 (liberty chair) (Zhou 1915b, 18), but this typo is corrected in the *Collection*.³⁹ The biographies of Madame de Staël in its *Saturday* version and its *Collection* version do not differ significantly in content either. However, in the *Saturday* version, only the name of the original author and the title of “Corinne” appear in French right after their Chinese translations. In the *Collection* version, Zhou provides French originals for all the works and famous figures mentioned in the biography. Moreover, he corrects a factual mistake in the original version. That is, in the original version, Madame de Staël is erroneously said to have passed away in Switzerland but the location is changed to Paris in the *Collection* version. Seen from these examples, Zhou was rather meticulous and rigorous in ensuring the accuracy of the biographical information about these famous European and American writers when compiling the *Collection*. He did not merely copy the existent biographies in their first publications but went through them to make alterations, rectify mistakes, and provide more information about the original authors to maintain a uniform format for all the biographies.

All the above changes Zhou made to the paratextual materials—removal of personal comments, provision of more information about the original authors, and

³⁹ In this biography, the English titles of Hawthorne’s works are provided immediately following the Chinese translations. One line before (to the right of) “Liberty Tree”, the piece of work being mentioned is “Grandfather’s Chair”. Therefore, this seemingly ridiculous mistranslation might be a slip of the pen.

correction of mistakes and typos—suggest an increasingly source-culture oriented attitude toward translation. In other words, during the time of the publication of the *Collection*, Zhou seemed to show greater respect for the original text. However, I would like to emphasize two points which complicate such an initial conclusion.

First, to complicate matters, the paratextual elements within the short stories themselves are not very consistent throughout the *Collection*. The paratextual elements at issue are certain punctuations and the interlinear notes. For example, in some stories, the translator's interlinear notes appear in a single column within parentheses, while in others, the interlinear notes appear in double columns without parentheses. In some stories, vertical brackets are used to function as quotation marks, but in others the half brackets serve that function. This phenomenon might be part of the problem of “inconsistency in style and format” (*tili weineng tongyi* 体例未能统一) mentioned in Lu Xun's review (TSJYYJH 1917, 30; see 4.5). That review attributes this inconsistency to the fact that these stories were previously published in different periodicals. However, this does not explain why Zhou endeavored to achieve consistency in the framing paratextual materials. What is more bizarre is Zhou's translation of Edward Hale's “The Man without a Country” (*Wuguo zhi ren* 无国之人). In its journal publication, all the interlinear notes appear in single columns and parentheses. However, in the *Collection* version, the first two interlinear notes appear in a smaller type in double columns without parentheses and the rest of the notes remain in the form in the original version. Did Zhou attempt to make all the interlinear notes consistent but somehow never carried it through even for one single story? Why did Zhou only manage to achieve consistency in the framing paratextual materials but

not in the paratextual elements within the text of the short stories? Due to lack of information about the editing process⁴⁰ of the *Collection*, it is now impossible to answer these questions. Nonetheless, this odd phenomenon complicates our understanding of Zhou's conception of translation. Even in one publication, there are signs of differing attitudes toward translation and the translator's role.

Second, the comparison between how Zhou dealt with the text and the paratext in compiling the *Collection* reveals a more complicated picture of Zhou's understanding of translation in late 1910s. As mentioned earlier, though Zhou was rather meticulous about reviewing his previous publications and correcting mistakes in the immediate paratexts, he did not make any significant changes to the text of those previously published translations when compiling them for the *Collection*. It has already been discussed in previous studies that, at the textual level, Zhou practiced extensive domestication in his early translations (including the *Collection*) (e.g. Chen 2005; Li 2006; Qiao 2015). For instance, Li (2006), in his diachronic study on Zhou's fiction translations, discusses in detail Zhou's manipulations of the text—simplification, omission, expansion, addition, etc.—at the narrative level in the early stage of his translation career, with many examples drawn from the *Collection*. Due to such translation strategies, Li (2006) argues, Zhou's early translations “present a distorted picture of foreign fiction” (487). Li's conclusion is reached without analyzing such paratextual materials as I have discussed above. If we take into consideration both the text and the paratext, however, we find that even within one publication there are signs of differing attitudes toward translation. As far as the *Collection* is concerned, Zhou is

⁴⁰ According to Zhou's (2010) own recollections, he compiled and edited the manuscript of the *Collection*.

more target-culture oriented at the textual level while at the paratextual level he is more source-culture oriented.

Lastly, the changes Zhou made to the paratexts in compiling the *Collection* do not attest to a simple, linear transition in his attitudes toward translation from the ‘traditional’ to the ‘modern’. In other words, the relatively consistent paratextual elements in the *Collection* cannot be viewed as the result of Zhou’s evolving understanding of translation. From the first publication to the *Collection* version of these short stories, there is no triumphant temporal trajectory from ‘traditional’ to ‘modern’ in terms of Zhou’s understanding of translation. Regarding the 27 translations whose first publication dates range between 1914 and 1916, it is difficult to say if there is a gradual increase in factual paratextual information or a decrease in subjective paratextual information over those three years. For example, Zhou’s translation of “Corinne”, first published in 1914, provides more information about the original text than his translation of John Brown’s “Rab and his Friends” (*Yigou labo zhuan* 义狗拉勃传), first published in 1916. It can be said that there were many fluctuations in his attitudes toward translation—or how he practiced the different ideas about translation he had already developed—over the course of the four years leading up to the publication of the *Collection*. Therefore, even though there were transitions in Zhou’s translation career in terms of his translation practice and underlying understanding of translation, such transitions were not simple, linear developments from the ‘traditional’ to the ‘modern’. Nor are such changes in his attitudes toward translation the mere result or reflection of the changing norms. Rather, Zhou’s conceptualizations of translation in the period under study seem to be rather

heterogeneous, erratic, and amorphous. The case of the *Collection* challenges the common measurement of conceptualizations of translation along the one-dimensional ‘traditional-to-modern’ line.

4.5 Lu Xun’s review of the *Collection*

Lu Xun’s review of the *Collection* is very concise (under 300 characters) but touches upon various aspects of Zhou’s translations—selection of texts, the treatment of original texts and authors, the language for translation, etc. Compared to the previously discussed forewords by the three Butterfly writers, it is more analytical of the translational aspects of Zhou’s translations.

I have previously mentioned that Lu Xun praises the provision of information about the original authors. Another aspect that he commends is the selection of works for translation, for the *Collection* includes works from nations whose literatures were rarely introduced to China and he judges most of the texts selected to be of high literary quality. After giving these positive comments, Lu Xun also lists some “minor problems” (*xiaoshi* 小失) in the *Collection* (TSJYYJH 1917, 31). First, he finds that the “*tili* 体例” (style and format) of the translations are not consistent throughout. By the general term *tili*, Lu Xun could be referring to the use of both vernacular and classical Chinese for translating different stories as well as the inconsistency in punctuation and the interlinear notes in the text. Second, Lu Xun regards Zhou’s use of Chinese idioms and phrases in his translations as “dishonest” (*bucheng* 不诚), for the original texts do not have Chinese idioms and phrases (*ibid.*). Third, Lu Xun points out that short stories from England make up a majority of the works in the *Collection*;

yet the short story, Lu Xun argues, is not the strong suit of English literature and some of the works included are essays, not short stories. Moreover, Lu Xun finds it a pity that the *Collection* does not include more works from continental Europe. The final minor failing Lu Xun points out is that, “though the works are categorized in terms of nationality of the author, the categorization is not ordered according to race” (ibid.). However, at the end of the review, Lu Xun emphasizes that these problems do not detract from the high overall quality of this publication and considers it “twilight in the dark night” and “a singing crane among a crowd of chickens” (ibid.). That is, Lu Xun thinks that “the publishing market is full of vulgar, obscene books and that the publication of the *Collection* will let readers know that there are such pure and refreshing works other than the sentimental, melodramatic ones” (ibid.).

As mentioned in 4.2, Lu Xun’s review has been constantly quoted in studies of the *Collection* or Zhou Shoujuan’s translations. As a positive comment from one of the most preeminent May-Fourth intellectuals and perhaps the most canonized figure in modern Chinese literature, this review has served as the most authoritative testimonial to the quality of the *Collection* and contributed to the recent reappraisal and rehabilitation of Zhou Shoujuan (e.g. Fan 1996; Wang 2007; Chen and Zhang 2011; Chen 2014). Most studies simply quote this review without further analysis or elaboration. In such a way, Lu Xun’s review has been mostly treated as if it were atemporal, devoid of any historical, social, or ideological specificities.

Some scholars do comment on the review. Yet the ways in which they handle this review betray a strong influence of the May Fourth paradigm. For instance, quoting Lu Xun’s review, Wang (2015) argues that the introduction of literature from “weak

and small peoples” (*ruoxiao minzu* 弱小民族) in the *Collection* reflects the modern aspect of Zhou’s early translation practice.⁴¹ The concept of ‘weak and small peoples’ (and similarly ‘oppressed peoples’) is most famously associated with Lu Xun and the development of the New Culture Movement in the 1920s (see Eber 1977), yet Lu Xun never uses the phrase in this review. Therefore, the basis on which Wang (2015) attempts to elevate Zhou’s status in Chinese translation history comes from the affinities between Zhou’s selections of source texts and certain May-Fourth ideologies. Taking Lu Xun’s views as an objective set of criteria, Gu (2012) even interprets the positive comments and the minor criticism in the review as “Lu Xun’s recognition of and exhortations for the Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School”.

I want to challenge the way these previous studies have read and treated this review. If we situate this review in its historical background, it becomes clear that it is anachronistic to attribute so much critical currency to it. In 1917, the New Cultural Movement was still in the bud, and the cultural prominence of the New Culturalists, including Lu Xun, could not be compared to the widely-read Butterfly writers. The views of translation expressed in Lu Xun’s review cannot be used to pass judgment on the degree of modernity of Zhou’s understandings of translation. Rather, it is important to view Lu Xun’s comment in relation to his own experience of writing and translating by that time.

Qiao (2016) is one of the few scholars who holds a more critical and contextualized view of Lu Xun’s comments on the *Collection*. He briefly argues that

⁴¹ It is not uncommon to see explicit statements in existing scholarship that Zhou introduces literature from ‘weak and small peoples’ in the *Collection*. Even in Zhou’s (2010) own recollection in his late years, he also specifically aligns himself with that concept.

Lu Xun's criticism regarding the dominance of short stories from England in the *Collection* reflects Lu Xun's lack of a comprehensive knowledge of English literature. He also suggests that Lu Xun's criticism of Zhou's domesticating translation strategy might come in part from his own personal preference for the foreignizing 'zhiyi 直译' (literal or word-for-word translation) strategy. I would like to extend Qiao's brief remarks to show that Lu Xun's review might reveal more about his own understanding of translation at this stage in his career than it does of Zhou's translations.

In 1909 Lu Xun and his brother Zhou Zuoren published in two volumes their own collection of translated short stories, *Yuwai xiaoshuo ji* 域外小说集 (Stories from Abroad).⁴² In that anthology, the Zhou brothers also tried to introduce Russian literature and literature from such minor European countries as Poland, Bosnia, and Finland. The Zhou brothers rendered the texts into a rather abstruse, archaic form of classical Chinese and followed the original text in an "uncompromisingly literal" way (Pollard 2002, 37). The anthology was a complete commercial failure, so the Zhou brothers had to abandon the project of translating and publishing subsequent volumes.⁴³

Lu Xun's life experience is an important factor for consideration in coming to a clear understanding of his comments on Zhou's translation collection. It is likely, as Zhou Zuoren pointed out in the 1950s, that Lu Xun saw in Zhou Shoujuan's translation anthology a call for movement in the same direction that he had advocated in *Stories*

⁴² For studies on Lu Xun's translation career see e.g. Gu (2009) and Wang (2005). For studies on the Zhou brothers' *Stories from Abroad*, see e.g. Liao (2009) and Wang (2011).

⁴³ According to Zhou Zuoren (1998), the first two volumes of the anthology only sold 41 copies in Tokyo and around 20 copies in Shanghai. However, as already noted by Gamsa (2008), this anthology has been canonized in modern Chinese literary history and translation history because of the iconic status of Lu Xun (234).

from Abroad (Zhou 1952, 303). Zhou Zuoren himself identifies this ‘movement’ as translating literature from the European continent and especially ‘weak and minor peoples’. However, I would argue that what Lu Xun saw in the *Collection* might not be specifically the glorified cause of introducing literature of the ‘weak and small peoples’ or ‘oppressed peoples’ but rather an interest in literature from nations unfamiliar at the time to Chinese readers. After all, the review itself does not contain such phrases as ‘weak and small peoples’. Moreover, Lu Xun’s criticism of Zhou Shoujuan’s use of Chinese phrases and idioms reflects his own preference for the foreignizing approach of *zhiyi*, especially at the linguistic level. It has been commonly agreed in the extant scholarship that the publication of *Stories from Abroad* was the turning point when Lu Xun shifted from the liberal translation practices popular in late Qing to the literal *zhiyi* translation practice (e.g. Gu 2009; Wang 2011). However, Lu Xu’s practice of *zhiyi*, which later became the syntactically unintelligible *yingyi* 硬译 (hard/stiff translation), incurred considerable criticism in the late 1920s and 1930s.⁴⁴ This means Lu Xun’s preference for keeping the ‘foreignness’ of the original text at the lexical and syntactic levels was only one strand of conceptualization of translation in Republican China, coexisting and competing with other ideas of translation. His comment on Zhou Shoujuan’s use of domestic idioms as “dishonest” is not simply a generic criticism of ‘unfaithful’ translation. Rather, the dishonest aspect is mostly at the linguistic level, reflecting Lu Xun’s own view of how translation should contribute to the target language.

⁴⁴ According to Wang (2011), *yingyi* was a compromised form of *zhiyi* Lu Xun resorted to when he could not make the translation easily comprehensible while trying to follow the order of words and sentences in the original as close as possible. See e.g. Nolla (1992), Gu (2009), and Wang (2011) for discussions on Lu Xun’s hard translation and the debate on approaches to translation it incurred in the late 1920s and 1930s.

4.6 Conclusion: The heterogeneous discursive space around the *Collection*

In this chapter, I have focused on the paratextual materials surrounding Zhou Shoujuan's 1917 translation anthology to probe into the conceptualizations of translation in the transitional years just before Chinese translation history entered its so-called 'modern' stage. Unlike Genette's concept of paratext as it has been commonly adapted in translation studies, I do not classify the assorted primary sources in this case as textual, paratextual, and extratextual according to their relations to the original author's (or the translator's) authorial intention. Rather, I view all these textual materials as paratexts that accompanied the production and reception of the *Collection*. Moreover, I have adopted the New Historicist approach in reading in parallel these different textual traces as culture-specific discursive practices and have reached a different interpretation of conceptualizations of translation in this historical period. The examination of the different paratexts and their relationships shows that, in the years between 1914 and 1917, not only did different ideas about and attitudes toward translation coexist, but also that the transition of conceptions of translation was not a simple linear development from the 'traditional' to the 'modern'.

The forewords written by the three leading figures of the Butterfly School present rather traditional understandings of translation similar to those discussed in Chapter III. The ways in which these writers discuss translation indicate that, for them, there was still no essential distinction between translation and original writing. They identify Zhou as a master of fiction rather than a translator and are concerned with the 'visibility' of being a master of fiction, that is, establishing one's name as the ultimate

goal of a Confucian man of letters. However, the transitional nature of the Chinese language in that period complicates our ability to properly interpret their seemingly traditional (self-)identification. It is uncertain whether they were consciously sticking to traditional conceptions of translation, or whether the particular language register they wrote in did not provide the medium for articulating different conceptions.

The immediate paratextual materials surrounding each translation in the *Collection*, especially when compared to the paratextual constituents in these stories' first publications, show a different picture. In his endeavour to remove his personal comments, provide more complete and accurate information about the original authors, and provide proper names in the original languages in this anthology, Zhou shows great respect for the original text and imposes 'invisibility' on himself in the paratext. These are all signs that indicate, according to the dominant conception of modernity in the existing scholarship on Chinese translation history, a move towards a modern, source-oriented conception of translation. However, as I have shown, his translation practice in the years from 1914 to 1917 was in fact eclectic and in a state of flux. Not only did Zhou deal with the paratext and the text differently when revising earlier publications for inclusion in the *Collection*, but he also haphazardly provided factual and personal paratexts in the journal versions of the short stories included in the *Collection*. It is by juxtaposing the paratext and the translated text in the *Collection* as well as juxtaposing the *Collection* versions and the previous periodical versions that we have been able to see Zhou's mixed ideas about translation in those years. The result of such a juxtaposition not only shows that Zhou might have considered the paratext as an integral part of the text of his translation but also problematizes the

tendency in the recent revisionist scholarship to present Zhou's translation career as a simple linear development from a 'traditional' stage to a 'modern' stage.

My examination of Lu Xun's review of the *Collection* focuses on decentralizing the critical authority it has accrued within the previous scholarship. By contextualizing this review with reference to Lu Xun's own experience of translating, I have shown that the views expressed in it are closely related to Lu Xun's particular understanding of translation at the time. Moreover, it should be emphasized that Zhou had already been practicing some of the 'modern' ideas verbalized by Lu Xun in this review, i.e., translating literature from lesser known European countries and providing information about the original text. Therefore, Lu Xun's review should be viewed as only one of many strands in the conceptualizations of translation in early Republican China rather than a trans-historical standard for judging the modernity of Zhou's translation practice and conception.

It is by zeroing in on such a narrowly delineated case that we can begin to recover, without deterministic reduction, the plurality of voices and complexity of the conceptualizations of translation in the early Republican years. The focus on what has been commonly labelled a traditional 'Butterfly' publication in this case study has offered a vantage point from which to challenge the May Fourth Paradigm on which current constructions of modern Chinese translation history are based. The heterogeneous discursive space surrounding the *Collection* problematizes the existing linear, teleological grand narratives about Chinese translation history from the late 19th century to the early 20th century.

Chapter V. Cultural continuities within changes in the May Fourth period, 1915-1929

In the existing scholarship, Chinese translation history during the May Fourth period has been characterized as a ‘new’ and ‘modern’ era typified by ‘changes’ or even ‘transformations’ in translation norms, practice, and discourse as compared to the late-Qing period (e.g. Chan 2001; Qin 2009; Zhao 2007). The exclusive association of this modernity with the New Culture Movement is an important aspect of what I call the ‘May Fourth paradigm’. The changes in translation practice and discourse during this period, briefly reviewed in 5.1, are undeniable. However, in this chapter, I present a more complex and nuanced picture of the translation scene in the May Fourth era. The transitions were not simple and linear. There were significant cultural continuities within these changes. I focus on the case of Wu Mi 吴宓 (1894-1978), an outspoken opponent of the New Culture Movement, to further challenge the May Fourth paradigm and challenge the simple dichotomies previous scholars have drawn between ‘modern’ and ‘traditional’, ‘progressive’ and ‘conservative’.

Wu Mi was a central figure of *Xueheng pai* 学衡派 (the Xueheng School), a literary society in the 1920s and 1930s that openly opposed the New Culture Movement’s iconoclastic literary and cultural ideologies. Because of its opposition to the New Culture Movement, the Xueheng School had been, until the 1990s, all but excluded from modern Chinese literary and cultural history. While the New Culture Movement itself was enshrined and canonized in ‘modern’ China’s cultural memory, the Xueheng School wallowed in virtual oblivion. The Xueheng School’s translation activities—both translation practice and writing about translation—have also been

long ignored in Chinese translation historiography. Studies that do briefly mention the Xueheng School usually take its translation practice as traditionalistic, “questionable” (*keyi de* 可议的), or even “ridiculous” (*kexiao* 可笑), not least because Xueheng members mainly used classical Chinese to translate Western works (Qin 2009).¹

Perhaps following a re-evaluation of the Xueheng School since the 1990s in Chinese literary and cultural history,² some translation studies scholars have in the recent decade started to turn their attention to the Xueheng School and especially Wu Mi (e.g. Zhou and Xie 2006; Bai and Zhu 2008; Wang 2008; Zhao 2014; Yang and Wang 2015; Bai 2017). Yet studies on the Xueheng School’s translation activities are still scant and lacking in depth. The existing scholarship mostly focuses on its translation strategies—especially what works were chosen for translation—and the motives behind such choices within the context of the May Fourth period (Zhou and Xie 2006; Hon 2008; Wang 2008; Zhao 2014; Yang and Wang 2015). Some studies deal with Wu Mi’s views on translation—mostly based on an examination of his translation practice complemented by quotes from Wu’s writings on translation (Chen 1991; Wang 2008; Zhou 2006; Bai 2017). A more thorough analysis and contextualization of both aspects are needed.

Moreover, though there has been an emerging scholarship that tries to restore the Xueheng School to its due position in modern Chinese translation history (e.g. Wang 2008; Zhao 2014), these efforts have not systematically challenged the May Fourth

¹ In the version published with his real name Zhang Zhongliang (2005) in Taiwan, Qin Gong uses the adjective *kexiao* 可笑 (ridiculous) (23). In the mainland version, however, Qin (2009) changes the adjective to “*keyi* 可议” (problematic, questionable) (18).

² Schneider (2001) discusses the renewed scholarly interest in the Xueheng School in the 1990s as part of a widespread revived interest, among that generation of Chinese intellectuals, in counternarratives to the orthodox cultural memory.

paradigm or questioned the current constructions of modern Chinese translation history. The canonical status of the New Culture Movement still exercises a dominant influence in the emerging revisionist scholarship, leading to conclusions like, “the modernity in Xueheng School’s translation activities was bestowed by the New Culture Movement” (Wang 2008, 140). According to Wang (2008), the Xueheng School’s contributions to modern Chinese literature and culture were “attached to the New Culture Movement” because it introduced the part of Western literature and culture the New Culture Movement overlooked (ibid., 139).

In view of these problems in the existing literature, I focus in this chapter on examining both Wu Mi’s writings on translation and his translation practice to gain a more comprehensive understanding of his conceptualization of translation. In line with New Historicism, I pay equal attention to Wu’s critical discussions about translation and his translation practice on the one hand and to the translated texts and the paratexts that accompany his translations on the other hand. Moreover, I am not merely interested in demonstrating the important role Wu (and the Xueheng School in general) played in modern Chinese translation history, but also use my analysis of Wu’s conceptualization of translation to further problematize and complicate the existing translation historiography on early Republican China.

5.1 The polemics surrounding *fanyi* among literary societies in the May Fourth era (1915-1929)

Though the May Fourth period has been commonly described as the beginning of the modern era in Chinese translation history, previous studies have not offered any explicit explanation of the criteria for determining translational modernity. In this

section, I summarize how the previous scholarship has constructed the May Fourth discursive space about *fanyi* and especially how it differs from late-Qing and early-Republican discourses.

As discussed in Chapter IV, the literary field in Republican China can be characterized by “the strong preference of authors for working in literary societies and their preference for publishing in literary journals” (Hockx 2002, 1). As modern journalism flourished, members of hundreds of Chinese literary collectives were enabled to participate actively in the public discursive space with the aim of shaping public opinion (ibid., 4). It is through these periodicals that May-Fourth cultural actors fought their battles for dominance in the Chinese literary field. Translation issues featured prominently in these battle for discursive power in the public debates. Through both translation and debating about translation issues, these literary groups and cultural actors formed a heterogeneous discursive space about translation that had a formative influence in shaping modern Chinese translation history.

These cultural actors well recognized the strategic importance of their discussions about translation issues within the broader literary and cultural debates. For instance, Guo Moruo 郭沫若 (1892-1978), a founding member of the Creation Society (*Chuangzao she* 创造社), once explicitly claimed that “the discussions on translation is one of the most important things at present in our nation” (Guo 1923, 34). Virtually all the influential 20th century writers, translators, and scholars expressed in this period their views on translation: Guo Moruo, Mao Dun (Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰, 1896-1981), Zheng Zhenduo 郑振铎 (1898-1958), and Lu Xun, just to name a few, all joined in these discussions on translation issues. Previous studies have already established that

May-Fourth cultural actors' debates over translation were densely intertwined with—fueling and fueled by—discussions about other social-political, cultural, and literary issues (see Chan 2001, 2004).³

The May-Fourth discourse on translation was different from that in late Qing in both its content and nature of the discussion. Overall, the May-Fourth discourse on translation was much grander and more extensive in scale, especially in terms of the topics discussed and people involved, and it was much more polemical in style. The sheer volume of writings about translation produced in the May Fourth period—and anthologized and analyzed in the secondary literature—was much larger than that in the late-Qing period (Chen 1996, 357).⁴ Moreover, compared to the late-Qing discourse on translation, more issues about and more aspects of translation were under discussion in the May Fourth period, and even those discussions that were centered on topics already touched upon by the previous generation were far more deeply explored. Issues under heated discussion included but were not limited to translation methods, the proper language for translation, the translation of foreign literature as a systematic project, translators' qualifications, mass readership, fidelity to the original, the translatability of poetry or literature in general, and the relationship between translation and creative writing (see e.g. Chan 2004; Qin 2009; Liao 2010). In particular, the methods for translation—*zhiyi* 直译 (word-for-word translation) versus *yiyi* 意译 (sense-for-sense translation), the language for translation—Europeanized *baihua* (vernacular) versus Sinicized *baihua*, and the relationship between translation

³ Chan (2004) even argues that “what happened behind the theories is more fascinating than the theories themselves” (xiii).

⁴ In the appendix of Chen's (1996) *A Draft History of Chinese Translation Theory*, for instance, there are over 200 writings on translation published between 1915 and 1929 while the miscellaneous writings about translation produced between 1861 and 1911 only amount to 88 entries.

and original writing were hotly contested among May-Fourth cultural actors (see Chan 2001, 2004; Liao 2010, 160-77).

In terms of the nature of the discussion, the May-Fourth discourse on translation was much more focused and polemical compared to the random, impressionistic remarks on translation common in the late Qing. May-Fourth cultural actors published critical essays, translation criticism, and even correspondence in journals to specifically discuss translation issues. Translation criticism emerged and developed in this period as a new type of discussion on translation. Unlike common late-Qing ‘translation reviews’ that did not focus on any translational aspects of the reviewed translation (see Chapter III), cultural actors in the May Fourth period started to actively review and critique published translations with reference to the original texts and were especially keen on pointing out mistakes in translation.⁵ Moreover, as some scholars have pointed out, many of the debates over translation issues were fueled by tensions between competing literary societies that upheld different literary and cultural ideologies (see Chan 2001; Hu 2007a; Xian 2014). That is, the fierceness of some debates was driven more by a desire to compete for a nationwide readership and leadership in the ‘new’ China that they were envisioning than by the differences, if there were any, in their fundamental understandings of translation.

Moreover, the discourse on translation in the May Fourth period was influenced by Western literary theory and translation discourse. This aspect has only been dealt with fleetingly and, when discussed, under-theorized by previous scholars. Many

⁵ See Hu and Zhao (2009) for a discussion on the emergence of this kind of error-spotting translation criticism in the context of the polemics between the Creation Society and the Chinese Literary Association. Also see Zhao (2007) for a more comprehensive study on translation criticism in the May Fourth era.

May-Fourth cultural actors invoked Western theories and examples from Western translation history to support their arguments. For instance, in his famous “On the Three Problems in Translating Literary Works” (*Yi wenxueshu de sange wenti* 译文学书的三个问题), Zheng Zhenduo (1921c) not only introduced Alexander Tytler’s theory of translation to China but also extensively invoked the views of David Watson Rannie (1857-1923), Richard Grenn Moulton (1849-1924), and Ralph Waldo Emerson (1803-1882) on literature and/or translation.⁶ Zheng Zhenduo (1921a) and Jiang Baili 蒋百里 (1921) both wrote articles about Western translation history to support their arguments pertaining to the translation project in China. Therefore, translation was also by this time beginning to be considered as a legitimate subject for research and study. This, together with the emergence of error-spotting translation criticism, suggests that translation in this period was starting to be recognized as a distinctive activity with its own rules and standards.

It seems that the zeitgeist of translation in the May Fourth period was, indeed, as the previous scholarship has suggested, a ‘modern’ conception of translation with a growing critical awareness and respect for the original. The previous scholarship, however, has predominantly focused on the translation activities of the proponents of the New Culture Movement—what I call New Culturalists—to present a homogeneous picture of the May-Fourth translation scene. In the rest of the chapter, I show how the case of Wu Mi challenges and problematizes this homogenous picture of May-Fourth translation history.

⁶ Though some scholars have argued that Yan Fu’s tripartite translation theory was based on Tytler’s *Essay on the Principle of Translation*, Zheng was the first to explicitly and consciously introduce Tytler’s theory to Chinese readers.

5.2 The Neo-traditionalists—Wu Mi (1894-1978) and the Xueheng School⁷

5.2.1 The confluence of old and new, Chinese and Western—Wu's education

Like many May-Fourth cultural actors of his generation, Wu's educational background was a mixture of the old and the new, Chinese and Western. Born into a gentry-class family in the very late Qing, Wu received in his youth a solid classical education. However, due to the late-Qing educational reform, the kind of education Wu received in private school and middle school (from 1906 to 1910) was already a mixture of classical learning and new learning (see Lou 2013; Zhang 2005). At the age of 17, against fierce competition, Wu entered *Qinghua xuetaang* 清华学堂⁸ (Tsinghua School) in Beijing, the official preparatory school for grooming Chinese students for study in America. After graduating from Tsinghua in 1916, Wu was not able to study in America immediately but worked for a year as a translator in Tsinghua School's copy-writing department.

In America, Wu first studied literature at the University of Virginia, but one year later, under the influence of Mei Guangdi 梅光迪⁹ (1890-1945), he transferred to Harvard University. At Harvard, he studied in the Department of Comparative

⁷ The core membership of the Xueheng School has been relatively undisputed, but it was never a monolithic group. According to Schneider (2001), previous studies on the Xueheng School have constructed a three-layered group of intellectuals associated in varying degrees with the journal *Xueheng*.

⁸ Tsinghua School was the predecessor of Tsinghua University. It was established in 1911 by the Qing government and partially funded by the excessive Boxer Indemnity returned by the United States. The name was changed to *Qinghua xuexiao* 清华学校 (Tsinghua College) after the 1911 Revolution and again to *Guoli Qinghua daxue* 国立清华大学 (National Tsinghua University) in 1928. See Bieler (2004), pp. 53-90, for the history of the Tsinghua School.

⁹ Mei studied at Northwestern University (1912-1915) and then Harvard University (1915-1920). He introduced Irving Babbitt's thought to Wu and greatly influenced Wu's literary ideologies as well as his early career choice.

Literature with Professor Irving Babbitt (1865-1933). As extensively examined in previous studies, Babbitt's New Humanism exerted a profound influence on Wu's literary and cultural ideologies (e.g. Ong 1999; Feuerwerker 2008; Hon 2015, 118-22). New Humanism was a body of literary, cultural, and political thought that sought to address the perceived problems of an age of industrialization, materialism, and relativism in the American society by restoring the humanistic moral essences of both classical Eastern and Western civilizations (Hoeverler 1977).¹⁰ Some ideas in New Humanism, especially Babbitt's critique of Romanticism and Naturalism—which were being introduced to China and fervently advocated by different strands of New Culturalists at the time—and his high regard for Confucianism and Buddhism, appealed strongly to Wu and some other Chinese disciples of Babbitt. Wu was himself deeply concerned with China's fate at a crossroads of a heightened tension between tradition and modernity on the one hand and between Chinese and Western values on the other. Babbitt's theory bolstered his confidence in Chinese literary and cultural traditions and offered him an important theoretical weapon for participating in China's 1920s modernity debate.

5.2.2 The journal *Xueheng* (The Critical Review)

While still studying in America, Wu kept abreast of socio-political and cultural affairs in China. He was especially troubled at the time by the anti-traditionalist New Culture Movement that was in full swing. Moreover, many New Culturalists held important positions in educational institutions and held sway over China's younger

¹⁰ Another chief advocate of American New Humanism is Elmer More (1864-1937). Other American scholars associated with New Humanism include George Roy Elliot (1883-1963), Norman Foerster (1887-1972), and Stuart Pratt Sherman (1881-1926). However, Babbitt had the most direct influence on Wu Mi and his other Chinese disciples at Harvard. See Wu (2004) for a transcription of the correspondence between Wu and Babbitt.

generation. Wu expressed his strong opposition to this radical movement taking place back at home not only in his diary but also in an article titled “Old and New in China” (1921) published in the *Chinese Students’ Monthly*¹¹.

After receiving a bachelor’s degree in 1920 and a master’s degree in 1921, Wu returned to China to teach, at Mei’s invitation, at *Guoli dongnan daxue* 国立东南大学 (National Southeastern University) in Nanjing. There, Wu—together with Harvard alumni Mei Guangdi, Hu Xiansu 胡先骕 (1894-1968), and Tang Yongtong 汤用彤 (1893-1964)—established *Xueheng she* 学衡社 (Xueheng society), and began publishing the society’s journal *Xueheng* (Critical Review) in 1922.¹² With the journal as their stronghold, Xueheng members waged polemical battles against the New Culturalists regarding various literary and cultural issues. As the chief editor from its inception, Wu contributed a considerable number of writings to *Xueheng* and developed a very close, personal connection with the journal. Though Wu later taught in several other universities, he managed to continue editing and publishing *Xueheng* despite various difficulties and obstacles until 1933. Though weak sales hampered the journal’s continued publication, *Xueheng* nonetheless exercised some influence on early Republican China’s cultural scene.¹³ When the fledgling journal first entered the

¹¹ The first and largest journal published by Chinese students in the US, *Chinese Students’ Monthly* lasted from 1906 to 1931.

¹² According to Wu’s personal chronology and diary, Mei played the leading role in planning and establishing the Xueheng society and launching the journal, but he later distanced himself from the journal.

¹³ As recorded in Wu’s (1998-1999) diary, the publishing house Zhonghua Book Company threatened several times to discontinue publication of the journal because of its low sales. There are no exact sales numbers from 1922 to 1933, but according to the letter from Zhonghua Book Company quoted in Wu’s diary on November 30 1926, the (monthly?) sales volume of *Xueheng* was on average only a couple of hundreds in the previous five years (Wu 1998-1999, vol.3: 258-9). In that same diary entry, Wu admits the poor sales of the journal, but he goes on to argue that the number provided by the publishing house was not accurate. Other difficulties in running the journal included, as Wu constantly complained, lack of publishable manuscripts, conflicts between founding members of the journal, etc.

discursive space of 1920s China, it even incited attacks from such influential New Culturalists as Lu Xun (1922) and Mao Dun (1922).

The content of *Xueheng* includes critical essays, scholarly essays on both Western learning and Chinese learning, literary (mostly poetry) compositions, translations of Western literature and scholarship, and some miscellaneous writings. The journal *Xueheng* reflects Wu's core literary and cultural ideology—an integration of the quintessence of both traditional Chinese culture and Western civilization. It does not advocate an essentialist dichotomy between old and new, Chinese and Western. In particular, it strongly opposes the New Culturalists' iconoclastic proposals for abandoning the classical Chinese language and Confucian ethics.

Because of its use of classical Chinese and its promotion of traditional Chinese literature and culture, the Xueheng group was painted by its rivals as merely conservative or even reactionary. As mentioned above, this group became marginalized in the cultural memory of modern China once the New Culture Movement became canonized. Yet as recent Chinese studies scholarship has already shown, what the Xueheng group was against was not modernity per se but the specific way in which the New Culturalists constructed this new cultural paradigm for China (see, e.g. Li 2010; Feuerwerker 2008; Kuang 1994). In fact, Xueheng members were just as concerned with the modernity of Chinese literature and culture as the New Culturalists. Moreover, as recent scholarship points out, translation constituted an essential part of the Xueheng members' efforts to appropriate those elements from Western civilization in line with their ideology and to construct their own vision of a modern literature and a modern culture for China (e.g. Zhou and Xie 2006; Hon 2008;

Wang 2008). Because of his position as the chief editor of *Xueheng* and his active involvement in translation activities and pedagogy, Wu's translation practices and discussions have drawn relatively more attention than other *Xueheng* members (Zhou 2006; Fang 2007; Wang 2008; Fu 2015; Bai 2017).¹⁴ This emerging scholarly interest in Wu, however, pays little attention to his conceptualization of translation. Bai Liping's (2017) recent article (in Chinese) is the first published work that focuses on Wu's thinking on translation. Briefly summarizing and examining Wu's views on various translation issues, Bai (2017) points out that Wu's thinking on translation was closely related to his argument with the New Culture Movement. I would like to extend Bai's efforts by focusing particularly on Wu's discussion of the relationship between translation, imitation, and literary creation and by bringing Wu's fiction translation practices under discussion as well. A combined discussion of Wu's writings on translation and his translation practices can contribute to a better understanding of his ideas about translation.

5.3 Wu Mi's writings on translation

Wu did not directly engage in debating translation issues with the New Culturalists. Unlike many of the New Culturalists, he did not publish in *Xueheng* any essay or letter that focused exclusively on translation issues. Yet that does not mean Wu was not concerned with the issue of translation. On the contrary, in *Xueheng*, Wu expressed his views on various aspects of translation that were being actively

¹⁴ Bai and Zhu (2008) argue that Wu's personal views on translation greatly influenced *Xueheng*'s translation policy. Fu Hongxing's (2015) recent research shows that Wu might have been the first person to launch university translation courses in China and that he attached great importance to translation pedagogy throughout his teaching career.

discussed and debated in the May-Fourth discursive space—the function of translation, the appropriate language for translation, the translator’s qualifications, the relationship between translation and original writing, etc. (see Bai 2017). But Wu embedded these views, somewhat sporadically, in his editor’s notes, translator’s notes, or essays on different topics. As the journal’s chief editor, Wu spent much of his time and energy reviewing and editing translation manuscripts and often inserted his views in paratextual forms into other contributors’ translations. As Bai (2017) notes, Wu articulates *Xueheng*’s “extremely careful and rigorous” (*yichang shenzhong* 异常慎重) attitude towards translation in an editor’s note to Chen Jun’s 陈钧¹⁵ (1923) translation of Charles Lamb’s “Dream-Children: A Reverie” (as quoted in Bai 2017, 80). In this paratextual note, Wu lists five principles of translation adopted by *Xueheng* that cover text selection, proofreading, annotation, wording, and style choice. From choosing classics in Western literature for translation to the translator’s serious research on and precise understanding of the original, and from the editor’s rigorous proofreading and editing according to the original to the translator’s choices for proper style and genre, Wu gives brief yet decided opinions in that note about what to translate and how to translate.

Among the various translation issues he considered, Wu paid particular attention to the issue of the relationships between translation, imitation, and creative writing. His views on this issue are most elaborately presented in two articles in *Xueheng*: one is “*Lun Jinri wenxue chuangzao zhi zhengfa* 论今日文学创造之正法” (On the correct methods of literary creation in present times, hereafter, “On Correct Methods”),

¹⁵ Chen Jun (1900-1989) was one of Wu’s students at National Southeastern University.

published in the 15th issue, 1923. The other article is “*Feiliedeli xileige'er shishi bainian jinian* 弗列得力希雷格尔逝世百年纪念” (To mark the centennial anniversary of Friedrich Schlegel’s death; hereafter, “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary”), published in the 67th issue, 1929.¹⁶ Though Bai (2017) notes that this aspect of Wu’s discussions on translation is an important part of his thinking on translation, he does not closely examine these two articles. I would argue that Wu’s views on this issue are rather revealing concerning his conceptualization of translation and entangled with his overall literary and cultural ideologies. By closely analyzing Wu’s discussions on the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation, we can get a better contextualized understanding of how Wu conceptualized translation.

5.3.1 Conceptualizing translation in relation to imitation and literary creation

Wu’s central arguments concerning the relationships between translation, imitation, and creation can be recapitulated as follows: literary creation begins with imitation as the first stage, and translation is a good way of practicing imitation. While “On Correct Methods” lays out his arguments more theoretically, “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary” serves more as a concrete case study where Wu further elaborates the ideas he introduces in “On Correct Methods”.

In “On Correct Methods”, Wu (1923) argues that “to be a writer, one must go through three stages: the first is imitation (*mofang* 摹仿), the second internalization (*ronghua* 融化), and the final stage creation (*chuangzao* 创造)” (8¹⁷). It is important

¹⁶ “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary” was first serialized in the Literary Supplement to *Dagong Bao* 大公报 (Impartial Daily) in the same year. Wu was in charge of this supplement from 1928 to 1934.

¹⁷ Each article in the journal *Xueheng* starts with page 1.

to note that Wu's concept of *mofang* does not have the negative connotations usually associated with the English word *imitation* since the Romantic Age.¹⁸ Wu emphasizes that what he means by *mofang* is not “intentional plagiarism or copying” (ibid., 9). According to him, the object of imitation can be the “theme” (*yi* 意), “techniques” (*fa* 法), or even the particular usage of a word (*ci* 词) in previous masterpieces, and as long as it is not intentional plagiarism or verbatim copying, the writing produced out of such imitation is always “one's own work” (ibid.).

Wu (1923) argues that imitation can lead to the creation of one's own work because of its association with the second stage, internalization (*ronghua*). The word *rong* 融 means ‘to fuse’ or ‘to melt’, which in its extended sense also means ‘thorough understanding’. The word *hua* 化 means ‘to change’, ‘to melt’, or ‘to digest’ in different word combinations. Therefore, *ronghua* in this instance already contains the connotation of ‘fully understanding something and then turning it into something new or different’, which smoothly bridges ‘imitation’ and ‘creation’. In sum, Wu advocates the kind of imitation that involves thorough digestion and internalization of the imitated text's (or author's) style, theme, or techniques, which eventually prepares one for his or her own literary creation.

After establishing this relationship between imitation and literary creation, Wu then brings up the topic of translation several times. He not only mentions it when

¹⁸ *Mofang* (or simply *fang*) is commonly translated into English as *imitation/imitate*, but this English word carries connotative baggage, especially the connotation of lacking originality and creativity. Further complicating the situation, in the latter part of his article, Wu invokes John Dryden's use of the English word *imitation* in his famous tripartite classification of translation—metaphrase, paraphrase, and imitation. Wu translates Dryden's *imitation* as *nizuo* 拟作 in Chinese and maintains, following Dryden, that imitation (*nizuo*) is not the proper way of translating. Though Wu's concept of ‘*mofang*’ might be better translated as ‘emulation’, I still choose to render it as ‘imitation’ in order to engage with the discussions about the relationships between translation, writing, and imitation in the Western context.

discussing the importance of imitating and memorizing masterpieces for literary creation, but also specifically deliberates on the “composition methods” (*zhuzuo zhi fa* 著作之法) of translation as one of the five common types of literature, along with poetry, essay, fiction, and drama (ibid., 14).

Overall, the practice of translation, if properly carried out according to Wu’s advice, integrates the three stages of writing—i.e., imitation, internalization, and creation. Wu explicitly states that “translation is a beneficial and worthy way of imitating...and a superb translation can already be considered as creation” (ibid., 9). On the one hand, translation can help one practice the comprehension and internalization of foreign materials. Wu maintains that a translator needs to “have a thorough understanding of the original text” (*shenming yuanyi* 深明原意) based on painstaking research, which is the first key to good translation (ibid., 25). On the other, translation is a good way for a translator to improve his or her command of the domestic language, literary forms, and styles. Wu attaches great importance to the mastery of the Chinese language—both classical Chinese and vernacular Chinese—and different literary genres in the Chinese tradition, which is necessary for making a translation understandable and expressive to the reader and an excellent target-language composition in its own right.

In laying out his strategies for excellence in writing and translating, Wu strongly emphasizes the importance of memorizing and reciting (*beisong* 背诵) masterpieces from Chinese and Western traditions. His main argument is that memorization is one of the best ways to internalize. To substantiate his argument, Wu provides two examples. He first gives an example of how to write a good travelogue poem by closely

reading and memorizing the exemplary poems in this genre and style written by the famous Tang-dynasty poet Du Fu 杜甫 (712-770). Then he gives an example of how memorization can also be useful in translation. Wu argues that if one wants to translate Dickens's or Thackeray's novels into Chinese, he or she should first read studiously and memorize sections of the classical Chinese novel *Shuihu zhuan* 水浒传 (The Water Margin) or *Honglou meng* 红楼梦 (Dream of the Red Chamber) that are similar to the English novel in terms of aesthetic atmosphere or style.¹⁹ Then, he further explains, if one follows closely the meaning of the English original, he or she will be able to naturally produce a fluent Chinese text that is neither a copy of the Chinese novel being imitated nor a stiff word-by-word translation of the English original. Wu concludes this section by stating that he uses these two examples to show “how memorizing classic works benefits *creation*” (ibid., 13; my emphasis). Seen from the way Wu elaborates on how memorizing masterworks can benefit literary creation, he takes translating also as an activity of literary creation. In Wu's conception, both ‘(poetry) writing’ and ‘(fiction) translation’ are subject to the same principles of literary composition. That is, both are derivative, intertextual activities that incorporate such elements as styles, techniques, and idioms from Chinese or Western literary traditions. In this blurring of the boundaries between translating and writing, however, Wu's model of intertextuality differs from Barthes's for Wu, by emphasizing the importance of memorization, stresses the self-consciousness of the reader-writer-translator in anchoring the present literary creation to the tradition(s).

¹⁹ In his preface to his translation of *The Newcomes*, Wu (1922) compares Thackeray's novel to *Honglou meng*, one of his favorite Chinese novels, and compares Dickens's novels to *Shuihu zhuan*.

Wu reiterates most of the above ideas about translation in “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary”. Though written to mark the centennial anniversary of Friedrich Schlegel’s death, this article’s scope is much wider than the life of Friedrich Schlegel.²⁰ Wu devotes an entire section to discussing the translation career of Friedrich Schlegel’s elder brother, August Wilhelm Schlegel (1767-1845). In this section, Wu divides the elder Schlegel’s career into five stages, culminating in his feat of translating Shakespeare’s plays.²¹ In doing so, Wu narrates an exemplary story of the growth of a true translator who, through mistakes and detours, found the right approach to translation and the right examples to imitate.

For Wu, Schlegel’s translations of Shakespeare’s plays are exemplars of good translations which can be considered ‘creation’. Though not qualified to directly judge German literature, Wu (1929) argues that Schlegel’s translations not only capture the true meaning of Shakespeare’s plays but also read smoothly in German (24).²² Moreover, Wu adds, Schlegel’s translations make Shakespeare’s plays—long neglected and misunderstood even in England—appreciated and treasured by the German people (ibid.). In the four stages that lead to Schlegel’s translation of Shakespeare, Wu holds the third stage as the crucial period. In Wu’s narration, Friedrich Schiller introduced Schlegel to Johann Wolfgang von Goethe’s works in this

²⁰ It is a piece of biographical writing in a commentarial style about the Schlegel brothers and their wives. This article is divided into six sections plus a conclusion. The six sections focus on, respectively, 19th-century German Romanticism, a brief biography of the Schlegel brothers, a brief biography of the wives of the Schlegel brothers, Friedrich Schlegel’s novel *Lucinde*, A. W. Schlegel’s literary criticism, and A. W. Schlegel’s translations of Shakespeare.

²¹ The first stage includes Schlegel’s early years studying with G.A. Bürger (1747-1797) at the University of Göttingen. From 1791, the second stage starts when Schlegel studies and tries to imitate Schiller’s poetry. The third stage is when he studies and follows Goethe’s example. In the fourth stage, he is engaged with Romanticism and translates ancient Roman and Greek literature. In the final stage, from 1791 to 1801, he translates 16 Shakespearean plays.

²² Wu’s assessment might be based on the secondary literature he read or the course he took at Harvard, “History of German Literature in Outline”.

period and Schlegel learned the correct methods and principles of translation from carefully reading Goethe's poetry and prose writings:

始知从事创作之艺术家，须能暂时将自己完全忘却，沉溺于所经营之作品中，以全神注之。而其作品之体裁，应不拘一格。惟视其题目材料之性质，适宜而变化。今威廉希雷格尔从事翻译，亦当效法葛德，具有此种忘却自己而俯仰步趋以就原作者之本领。

[Schlegel] started to realize that *creation* requires the artist to forget about himself and be immersed in the work wholeheartedly and that the form of a work should not be fixed but change along with the topic or the content. Wilhelm Schlegel in his *translation* practice also followed the example of Goethe. That is, he forgot about himself and followed the steps of the original author. (ibid., 26; my emphasis)

Immediately after the lines in the above quote, Wu offers his own understanding of the two essential qualities of a good translator: “the feminine sensibility which allows one to comprehend the most nuanced and subtle characteristics in the original” and then “the male, virile creativity which enables one to re-create the complete impression of the original out of his or her own mind” (ibid.). Here again Wu blurs the lines between original writing and translation in his description and analysis of a concrete case of translation in German translation history. That is, according to him, one can learn the proper way to translate from carefully reading original writings, for good translation itself requires the same kind of creativity used in the formation of good writing.

In both articles, Wu's ideas about the relationships between translation, creative writing, and imitation remain the same. Though he explicitly admits that “translation is in itself not creation” (Wu 1923, 26), Wu's arguments and examples in both articles repeatedly blur the lines between (good) translations and (good) original writings, especially in terms of the composition rules to which they are subject. In other words, despite the general conceptual distinction he draws between translation and creation,

Wu's emphasis falls on expanding the correct way of producing good literary works in practice rather than contemplating the conceptual differences between translation and literary creation at a metaphysical level. In arguing that translation is a form of imitation that leads to good writing, Wu exhibits a pedagogical attitude towards translation that focuses on the usefulness of translation for practicing the skills of literary composition. It is in these concerns with translating and writing that the conceptual distinction between translation and original writing becomes insignificant for Wu.

Moreover, Wu's views about the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation echo ideas from both the Chinese and Western traditions. On the one hand, his understanding of the relationship between imitation and literary creation seems to be deeply rooted in the Chinese literary tradition in which creativity was conceptualized as "not creating something out of nothing, ...but deepening one's self-awareness to the extent that its quality is comparable to that of the ancients" (Tu 1976, 14). Moreover, Wu's emphasis on the usefulness of memorization seems to have been inherited from the traditional Chinese pedagogy of reading that greatly valued memory and memorization.²³ "Whatever educators *nowadays* advocate," Wu (1923) insists, "I hope people who aspire to literary creation go ahead memorizing classics on their own" (13; my emphasis). Here Wu might be implying his distrust of the 'modern' pedagogy of reading and writing that were being advocated in China at that time, and instead argues for a return to the traditional practice of memorizing and reciting in learning.

²³ See Li Yu (2003), pp. 48-58, for a discussion of how memorizing and reciting were central to traditional Chinese pedagogy (1000-1800).

Wu might also have drawn inspiration and support from Western thought. For instance, Wu's emphasis on literary creation through imitation of the ancients resonates with what Bimberg (1998/99) calls Dryden's "creative concept of imitation" (305). That is, Dryden believed "[i]t was precisely the amount of invention in the process of imitation which ... made all the difference between a servile copy and a creative new product" (ibid., 308). Dryden also "considered a verse translator to be a creative poet who transferred the old or foreign author into his own time and language" (ibid., 312). Since Wu was familiar with Dryden's preface to *Ovid's Epistles* (see footnote 18 in this chapter) and took a course called "Literary Criticism since the 16th Century" at Harvard, he might well have read Dryden's writings about imitation, poetic composition, and translation. Moreover, Wu's sympathy with such neoclassical ideas about literature, imitation, and creativity might also be attributed again to Babbitt's influence. Apart from his overall affinity with New Humanism, Wu must have read Babbitt's (1908) "On Being Original", where he specifically criticizes the Romantic concept of originality as *creatio ex nihilo* and argues that "[g]enuine originality...is a hardy growth, and usually gains more than it loses by striking deep roots into the literature of the past" (230).²⁴

I am not trying here to determine or uncover a precise genealogy of the sources that influenced Wu's understanding of translation in relation to imitation and creation but merely to suggest how both Chinese and Western ideas might have worked in tandem to contribute to his conceptualization of translation. More likely, I would argue, Wu might have integrated what resonated with his own experience of writing and

²⁴ This article is included in Babbitt's book *Literature and the American College*, which first gave a definite form to New Humanism. Since Wu had read this book, it can be presumed that he had read this article. Chapters from this book into Chinese for publication in *Xueheng*.

translating in his extensive reading of both Chinese and Western learning to form his own conception of translation that was to an extent contingent on China's contemporary cultural context. Neither of the two aforementioned articles were written merely to theorize about translation. Rather, both are polemical essays that address larger issues and are part of Wu's contention with the New Culturalists in the May-Fourth discursive space. Therefore, it is necessary to contextualize Wu's discussion of the relationship between translation, imitation, and literary creation in this broader discourse to acquire a better understanding of Wu's conception of translation.

5.3.2 Wu Mi's discussions of the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation as an intervention in the May-Fourth modernity debate

As mentioned earlier, Bai (2017) makes the general comment that Wu's ideas about translation were closely related to his positions against the New Culture Movement. In this section, I expand on Bai's comment in analysing Wu's thinking on the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation in light of his affiliation with the Xueheng School and his engagement with May-Fourth cultural debates.

The debate over 'translation versus literary creation' was, in fact, one of the fiercest polemics among the New Culturalists in the May-Fourth discursive space. This debate featured especially prominently in the rivalry between the Chinese Literary Association and the Creation Society in the 1920s (see e.g. Chen 1987; Xian 2010). The polemics started from Guo's complaints, in 1921, about the preference for

translation over literary creation in the Chinese literary field at the time.²⁵ Guo (1921) likens translation to a ‘match-maker’ (*meipo* 媒婆) and literary creation to a ‘virgin’ (*chuzi* 处子), for he argues that translation can only serve the function of *jieshao* 介绍 (‘introducing’ or ‘matchmaking’) in bringing foreign literature to China.²⁶ He argues that original writing in Chinese should be respected—to be desired like a virgin—and given priority over translation. Directly aimed at Guo, Zheng (1921b) argues that translation is as important as creative writing and serves more crucial functions than simply ‘matchmaking’. Guo ([1921]1992) in his reply to Zheng further lays out the problems he perceives in the flourishing New Culture Movement apart from its lopsided emphasis on translating. Guo also expresses his concerns with Chinese translators’ poor qualifications and their lack of serious research in Western literature and theory. Their debate stimulated wider discussions on this issue which continued even into the 1930s (see Chan 2004, 249-69; Xian 2010, 102-3).

When Zheng (on behalf of the Chinese Literary Society) and Guo (on behalf of the Creation Society) were debating this issue of ‘translation versus literary creation’, the bone of contention between them was the respective roles of translation and original writing in pushing forward the New Culture Movement. From the beginning, their respective arguments were not merely differing scholarly speculations about the

²⁵ This was a letter from Guo to the editor of the literary supplement of *Shishi xinbao* 时世新报 (Current Affairs Newspaper), *Xuedeng* 学灯 (Lamp of Learning), on December 20th 1920. According to the secondary literature, Guo’s letter was published in this literary supplement on January 15th, 1921 (pages unknown). It was also in *Minduo* 民铎杂志 (The People’s Tocsin), 1921, volume 2, issue 5, pp. 1-4. (Pagination in this magazine starts anew in each section.) As the previous scholarship has pointed out, Guo’s complaint has much to do with the fact that his own original writings had not been placed before other cultural actors’ translations and original writings in the journal *Xuedeng* (Chen 1987).

²⁶ Guo (1921) himself does not explicate how this metaphor works. Zheng (1921b) spells out in his reply that translating is like matchmaking because they both ‘*jieshao*’. Both Guo (1921) and Zheng Zhenguo (1921b) hint that literary creation might be similar to a virgin in the sense that they both deserve respect. The reason both original writing and virgins deserve respect, I would argue, is their ‘purity’. That is, the virgin represents writing prior to the introduction of something foreign.

nature of translation in relation to creative writing. Both Guo and Zheng were equally concerned with the question as to which activity should be the focus of their efforts in the overall project of building a new literature, new culture, and ultimately new China. By assuming different positions in this debate over ‘translation versus original writing’, Guo and Zheng—on behalf of their respective literary organizations—were competing for a leading role in the New Culture Movement.

Wu’s point of entry into this bitter debate and his motivation for discussing the issue were different from the New Culturalists. Wu was not interested in identifying how much effort and human resources should be allocated to translation and original writing respectively in the Chinese literary field. Rather, his discussions on the relationships between translation, imitation, and creation served to contest the New Culturalists’ linguistic, literary, and cultural agendas. Wu’s discussions on translation are always interwoven with his consistent criticism of the New Culture Movement, especially its language reform and iconoclastic literary ideologies. The entire article “On Correct Methods”, as the title indicates, was Wu’s effort to expound what he believed “the correct methods of literary creation”. In his opinion, the leaders of the New Culture Movement and the young students had lost touch with these correct methods and that was the problem.

Instead of focusing solely on the relationship between translation and literary creation, Wu entangles the issue of translation in his discussions about imitation and literary creation. The aspect of imitation does not feature in the ‘translation versus literary creation’ debate among the New Culturalists, but it does occupy an important position in Wu’s arguments. By introducing the issue of imitation into the discussion,

Wu not only highlights the pedagogical aspect of translation but also introduces a temporal dimension—imitation as the continuation of the past—to the May-Fourth discourse on translation. In both articles, as analyzed earlier, the type of ‘imitation’ Wu recommends is specifically imitation of the classics within one’s own tradition or from other cultural traditions. For instance, in “On Correct Methods”, the examples Wu gives are all imitations of what are accepted as previous masterworks: the Tang-dynasty poets Du Fu and Li Bai 李白 (701-762) in the Chinese tradition or Lord Byron and Elizabeth Browning in the Western tradition (see Wu 1923, 9). In “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary”, Wu (1929) singles out A. W. Schlegel’s translations of Homer, Dante, and Indian Sanskrit poetry for praise, because they not only enriched German literature but also helped Schlegel hone his own literary skills (26-7). In arguing that imitation is a necessary stage in learning how to write and that translation is an effective way to practice imitating one’s predecessors, Wu once again argues for the importance of tradition for the present generation: Tradition cannot be completely abandoned for it provides both literary masters and masterpieces for later generations to imitate. For Wu, it is meaningless to talk about creating a new Chinese literature or culture without appropriating and reworking the tradition—or, to be more exact, different traditions. Hence, Wu’s discussions on the relationship between translation, imitation, and literary creation offered him a nuanced angle from which to critique the iconoclasm of the New Culture Movement. When Wu puts the issue of ‘tradition’ in the spotlight, he shifts the bone of contention from the respective functions of translation and original writing in the cause of New Culture Movement to the attitudes towards tradition and modernity in China’s literary field at the time.

Furthermore, related to his emphasis on tradition, Wu's discussion on translation in relation to imitation and creation also helped to augment his argument against language reform. As mentioned earlier, one agenda of the New Culture Movement was to create a modern Chinese vernacular as a unified national language, especially a modern written vernacular sufficient for the writing of 'New Literature' (*xin wenxue* 新文学). Yet there were different proposals as to how to realize this agenda within the New Culturalist camp: they ranged from creating a new written vernacular on the basis of the existing spoken Chinese languages to inventing a new Chinese language based on European languages. As pointed out in the previous scholarship, the issue of translation enjoyed a crucial position in New Culturalists' debates over reforming the Chinese language (see Nolla 1992; Chan 2001, 204-11; Li 2012). This was especially so for such New Culturalists as Fu Sinian 傅斯年 (1896-1950), Lu Xun, and Qu Qiubai 瞿秋白 (1899-1935) who considered the existing Chinese vernacular inadequate for modern expressions. These cultural actors believed that translating Western literature and following the syntax of European languages could help create a modern Chinese language. In other words, the debate over the proper language for translation was closely associated with the agenda of language reform and the overarching agenda of the New Culture Movement.

Wu (1929) also reiterates his views on language reform when discussing the relationships between translation, imitation, and creation. That is, he argues that the Chinese language, classical or vernacular, is adequate for expressing either modern or foreign ideas if one has mastered the language. Woven into his narration of Schlegel's translation path are Wu's remarks on the Chinese reality. He observes that Goethe's

writing explored and demonstrated the potential of the German language, which had previously been known to be rather insufficient for artistic expression. Under Goethe's influence, Schlegel further exploited the potential of the German language when he was translating Shakespeare's plays. That is, through hard work, Schlegel was finally able to achieve a unity of beauty in form and content, i.e., expressing the meaning of the original in as concise a language as the original language had done.

After tracing how Schlegel found the right method for translating Shakespeare, Wu explicitly links Schlegel's story to the contemporary Chinese translation scene, especially the debates about translation and language. He expresses his dissatisfaction with all the irresponsible, hasty translations that are being published in China's booming translation market and advises Chinese translators to follow Schlegel as a model:

今人每谓吾中国文字繁难，不能表示西来思想及感情，遂主废弃，或务为变革。殊不知文字之效用实系于作者之才力。是在作者、译者不惮辛苦，勉强试验，久之自可满足一己而造福后人。彼葛德与威廉西雷格尔之发挥运用文字，可为榜样也。

People nowadays constantly complain that the written Chinese language is too cumbersome and difficult to express Western thoughts and emotions. Hence, some advocate discarding it altogether and others argue for a reform [of the Chinese language]. They have not realized that the expressiveness of a language in fact lies in the proficiency and talent of the language user. It is after arduous trial by writers and translators for a long time that a language can satisfy their own needs [in artistic expression] and also benefit posterity. How Goethe and Wilhelm used and exploited the potential of the [German] language is an example. (Wu 1929, 29)

The polemical nature of Wu's discussions on translation issues is conspicuous in this excerpt. Wu uses the story of Schlegel's translation career as an exemplary tale to demonstrate that a nation does not need to abandon its own language in order to import

ideas and literature from another culture. Wu believes that translating and writing would help his contemporaries to develop the potential of the Chinese language for expressing modern or Western ideas and feelings. Moreover, he is critical of what he considers the New Culturalists' lack of devotion to research and practice as well as their substandard language proficiency and talent to put the Chinese language to good use in either translation or original writing. He implies that, if the New Culturalists are as talented and industrious as Goethe and Schlegel, they would have no cause to blame the Chinese language for the problems they encounter in translation and original writing.

Seen from the above analysis, Wu's discussions on translation in relation to imitation and creation form an integral part of his (and the Xueheng School's) polemical contention with the New Culturalists. Though different cultural actors were basically discussing the same topic, they were concerned with different issues and were advancing different agendas. If we shift the focus away from the polemical and partisan factors of the debate, however, it becomes more apparent that there are significant underlying similarities in Wu's and the New Culturalists' understandings of the role and value of translation.

Like the New Culturalists, Wu recognized the importance of translation in the Chinese literary field. He and Zheng both stressed the strategic role translation plays in fostering creative writing and in developing a nation's literature. Though Guo intentionally used pejorative phrases and metaphors to describe translation in order to draw more attention to (arguably his own) creative writing, he was also as an active translator and acknowledged the importance of translation and the involvement of

creativity in translation on other occasions (see Gu 2003, 359).²⁷ Moreover, Wu expressed the same kind of reservations about translators' poor qualifications as Guo and many other May-Fourth cultural actors did, arguing that translators should make a greater effort to study the original text and original author.²⁸

Furthermore, in terms of the nature of the discussion, Wu saw translation as a distinctive subject for theoretical debates and research like many of the New Culturalists. In Wu's two articles analyzed above, he not only invokes Western discourses on translation—e.g. discussions about translation by Benjamin Jowett²⁹ (1817-1893), John Dryden, and Sir Thomas North³⁰ (1535-1604)—in “On Correct Methods”, but he also provides a more detailed study of A. W. Schlegel's translation career in “To Mark the Centennial Anniversary”. Here too, Wu points toward the West to justify and buttress his arguments, as do Zheng and Jiang when they invoke Western literary theory or use examples from Western translation history (see 5.1).

Therefore, Wu actually had much in common with the New Culturalists, in terms of both the translation issues they were concerned with and the more critical, focused nature of the discussion. These aspects, according to the existing scholarship, seem to be what made the May-Fourth translation discourse ‘modern’ as compared to the late-

²⁷ According to Guo's own revelation later in the 1930s, he wrote his famous letter about ‘matchmaker versus virgin’ to the editor of the literary supplement *Xuedeng* after a piece of his original writing was published after a translation in that journal (see Chen 1996, 257-8). As Chen (1996) points out, many of Guo's writings on translation in the 1920s were focused on attacking and criticizing with exaggeration and even unjustified verbal abuse. Qi (2012) also points out that Guo's own ‘original’ writing was much indebted to his reading and translation of Western literature (72-4).

²⁸ See, for instance, Mao Dun's (1921) “*Yi wenxueshu fangfa de taolun* 译文学书方法的讨论” (Discussion on methods of translating literary works) and Guo Moruo's (1923) “*Taolun zhuyi yundong ji qita* 讨论注译运动及其他” (On the movement of annotation-translation and others). Especially in Guo's 1923 article, the four standards he lists for translators are similar to Wu's expectations for a good translator.

²⁹ A British theologian and translator of Plato and Thucydides.

³⁰ A British translator of Plutarch's *Parallel Lives*.

Qing translation discourse (see 5.1). It follows that if modernity in Chinese discourse on translation is thus defined, then Wu's understanding of translation is no less modern than the New Culturalists'. Yet there has been no agreed clear definition of and little critical reflection on what constitutes 'modernity' in modern Chinese discourse on translation. Hence, before simply elevating Wu to the realm of the 'modern', the prevailing construction of 'translational modernity' in the scholarship on Chinese translation history needs to be critically scrutinized.

I will further explore how the issue of translational modernity has been superficially dealt with in previous scholarship after I examine Wu's translation *practice*, especially his use of *pingdian* commentaries in his fiction translations. At face value, the adoption of the traditional *pingdian* commentary practice might seem to further associate Wu with a conservative bias, but in my final analysis, I present a more compelling alternative reading of Wu's stance.

5.4 Wu's adoption and adaptation of *pingdian* commentaries in his fiction translations

The *Xueheng* journal retains the layout of traditional Chinese writing. That is, whether in original writings or translations, Chinese characters are aligned in vertical lines and read from top to bottom and right to left.³¹ Some parts of the lines are closely accompanied by a stretch of dots or circles on the right. There are also lines of textual commentary in double columns and in a smaller type interpolated here and there into the text. (The particularities of this writing system will be explored in detail,

³¹ When English words are inserted in the text, they are also printed vertically. Readers might have to either tilt the neck to the right or rotate the page by 90 degrees counter-clockwise.

accompanied by a visual aid, below.) In the 1920s, many publications of the New Culturalist camp were westernized to varying degrees in terms of their layout. Some journals like *Kexue* 科学³² (Science, 1915-1949) and *Creation Weekly* (1923-1924) were already using a westernized horizontal arrangement. Publications that were still arranged vertically, like *Xin Qingnian* 新青年³³ (New Youth) from the 4th volume on and the reformed *Short-Story Monthly* (1921-1932), had discarded the thickly interpolated circles and dots in favour of Western punctuation.

The insertion of such dots, circles, and notes in the margin in *Xueheng* has not gone unnoticed in previous studies. For example, Bai and Zhu (2008) mention in passing Wu's use of dots and circles as marks of emphasis in his writings. Zhou and Xie (2006) take the extensive prefaces, notes, and comments that Wu—either as translator or editor-in-chief—added to the translations published in *Xueheng* as instances of his strong subjective presence. Wang (2008) has closely examined such notes and comments in Wu's fiction translations from the perspective of his complicated narrative voice. Yet these studies have not specifically associated the addition of these paratextual elements with the Chinese *pingdian* commentary tradition.

Several translation scholars have only recently started to discuss the additions of the aforementioned kind of notes and symbols in Chinese literary translations as the translators' adoption of the *pingdian* commentary tradition (Pan 2012; Lai 2012; Wang 2013). Lai Tzu-yun (2012) and Wang Xiulu (2013) are two of the few scholars who

³² *Kexue* was a scientific journal established by Ren Hongjun 任鸿隽 (1886-1961) and some other Chinese students at Cornell University in 1914. It was the first Chinese journal that adopted English punctuations and was printed horizontally.

³³ *New Youth* was founded by Chen Duxiu 陈独秀 (1879-1942) in 1915 with its original name as *Qingnian zazhi* 青年杂志 (Youth magazine). It has been viewed as one of most influential journals in the May Fourth period that ushered in the New Culture Movement.

focus on analyzing the uses of *pingdian* commentary in Chinese literary translations from the first part of the 20th century. Lai (2013) studies Wu Guangjian's 伍光建 (1866-1943) insertion of *pingdian* commentaries in his own fiction translations produced in the 1920s and the 1930s and how he gained visibility through his double textual roles. Meanwhile, Wang (2013) analyzes Tian Han's 田汉³⁴ (1898-1968) use of *quandian* 圈点 (emphatic punctuation; see 5.4.1) in his 1921 translation of Oscar Wilde's *Salome* and discusses how the adoption of this traditional practice shows Tian's mixed, complex attitude toward Chinese tradition and Western modernity. Lai's and Wang's studies, by contextualizing the insertion of such paratextual materials within the *pingdian* commentary tradition, both point to the conceptual and theoretical implications of inserting marks of emphasis or paratextual writings in such a close way in translated texts. In the following examination of Wu's translations, I also view the circles and dots alongside lines of a text, the intra-textual comments in double columns, and even the translator's prefaces as integral elements of the long-established Chinese *pingdian* commentary practice. Moreover, by focusing on both the content and materiality of these inserted paratextual elements, I argue, we can see how the lines between translating, writing, and commenting become blurred in Wu's translation practice.

5.4.1 A brief introduction to *pingdian* and its history until the 1920s

Pingdian refers to the general practice of inserting notes, comments, emphatic punctuation, and other types of commentarial material as close as possible on the page

³⁴ Tian Han was a playwright, translator, and poet who emerged during the New Culture Movement. He was a member of the Creation Society and founded *Nanguo she* 南国社 (South China Society), which was specifically devoted to promoting modern drama.

to the text being commented upon. *Pingdian* was most famously associated with vernacular chaptered fiction (*baihua zhanghui xiaoshuo* 白话章回小说) in late imperial China (from the 17th century into the early 20th century). In modern scholarship, it has mostly been understood as a major form of traditional Chinese fiction criticism and theory (see Rolston 1990; Tan 2001; Lin 2012). Before *pingdian* commentaries for fiction developed in the 17th century, however, this practice had been used in various other types of writing. There were *pingdian* commentary editions of poetry, classical prose, Confucian classics, and even collections of civil service examination essays in circulation until the early 20th century. Moreover, for the private reader, adding one's own emphatic punctuation and comments on the pages of a text with a writing brush was the most common way to record personal responses and "enhance his [or her] own mastery of the text" (Rolston 1990, 42). It is beyond the scope of this study to determine the origins of *pingdian* commentary practice. However, based on the existing scholarship on fiction *pingdian* commentary, it is safe to say that this form of commentarial practice was deeply rooted in the traditional Chinese culture of *dushu* 读书 (reading and education) and the communal textual tradition.

Pingdian, in its narrower sense, is a special *form* of (literary) commentary and criticism in the Chinese tradition. The most basic components of *pingdian* commentaries, as the term *pingdian* indicates, are *piping* 批评, which can be translated as 'comments and evaluation', and *quandian* 圈点 which literally means 'dots and circles'. The most common forms of *piping* are marginal comments (*meipi* 眉批), interlinear comments (*jiapi* 夹批), and chapter comments (*huiji* 回批). Marginal comments, usually in smaller type than that of the main text, are written or printed in

the upper margin of a page. Double-column interlinear comments, also in smaller type, are inserted into the text immediately after the lines to which they refer.³⁵ Chapter comments are added at the end of a chapter, usually in normal type but indented a bit further from the top to set them off from the main text. *Quandian* refers to the symbols placed closely on the right side of the lines to which the commentator wants to draw the readers' attention. It is a nonverbal kind of commentary. Common symbols are circles, dots, (open-centered or solid) raindrop shapes, concentric circles, etc. These symbols usually serve two main functions: first, to indicate the separation of words into phrases and sentences, somewhat like commas and periods; and second, more importantly, to emphasize certain parts of the text, like bold, italics, or underlining in current writing/printing practice.³⁶ Though Rolston (2001) distinguishes the symbols which serve each of these two functions from each other and labels them as *regular punctuation* and *emphatic punctuation*, I refer to all of them as *emphatic punctuation* in this study. Since the traditional Chinese writing system did not have punctuation or paragraphing, these dots and circles—serving either the former or the latter function—are added by commentators in order to guide and control the reading of an existing text. They therefore do not simply function as 'regular' *punctuation* in our contemporary understanding of the term. Granted, in most of the modern written languages—even modern Chinese—punctuation is an integral “part of presentation of written language” (Pellatt 2018, 179). Thus, some might argue that “punctuation is not paratextual” (ibid.) and can even be considered as “a linguistic subsystem” (Nunberg

³⁵ There are also single-column interlinear comments, which are added to the right of the section commented on. However, since this form of interlinear comments is not common in printed texts, I will not discuss this in this chapter.

³⁶ Li (2003), pp. 68-75, discusses how and why *quandian* was one of the four basic, interrelated reading skills for children in late imperial China.

1990, 6). However, as just mentioned, punctuation is *not* an essential part of the Chinese text produced in the traditional Chinese writing system. When punctuation marks do appear in traditional Chinese texts they were produced and functioned in a manner similar to the European manuscript tradition before the 12th century, when symbols were added to unpunctuated texts by readers, scribes, correctors, etc. (see Parkes 1992). Therefore, it is not contradictory to term the aforementioned symbols in the *pingdian* commentary tradition *emphatic punctuation* and discuss their paratextual nature. Moreover, as my later analysis shows, the emphatic punctuation in the Chinese *pingdian* commentary practice highlights the communal, collaborative nature of the Chinese textual tradition and challenges our current understanding of ‘text’ and ‘paratext’.

In a broader sense, the practice of *pingdian* was a cultural phenomenon that combined criticism and commentary with textual editing and theorization. Generally, other common types of commentarial material in a *pingdian* edition might include prefaces, postscripts, statements of general principles (凡例 *fanli*, 例言 *liyan*), how-to-read essays (读法 *dufa*), and commemorative poems (题诗 *tishi*, 题词 *tici*). It was also common for *pingdian* commentators to excise, edit, or even rewrite sections of the commented text (see Rolston 1990; Tan 2001). In other words, various kinds of textual interventions could be conducted under the rubric of *pingdian*, which makes it an epitome of the Chinese communal textual tradition—“[a] tradition of composite textual works, multiple authorship and authoritative amateur editing” (Starr 2007, 71). One of the most famous and typical examples is Jin Shengtān’s 金圣叹 (1608-1661) *pingdian* edition of the vernacular novel *Shuihu zhuan*. Apart from adding extensive

interlinear comments, marginal comments, emphatic punctuation, and prefaces, Jin also radically edited, excised, and rewrote the novel. He even rebranded this novel as the *Fifth Book of Genius* (*Diwu caizi shu* 第五才子书) alongside such classical works as *Shiji*.³⁷

Apart from the wide range of textual intervention allowed under the *pingdian* rubric, another important characteristic of the *pingdian* commentary practice is its physical proximity to the text proper. Except for deletions and rewriting, most forms of *pingdian* commentary are added to the text in a structurally inseparable way.³⁸ This physical proximity also translates into visual prominence, which makes it difficult for the reader to ignore the comments and emphatic punctuation when reading a *pingdian* commentary edition as compared to reading a text with footnotes or endnotes. In terms of function, *pingdian* commentaries were not of a supplementary nature. Especially in vernacular fiction, as Rolston (1997) observes, “[c]ommentary editions of famous novels became so popular that earlier editions without commentary or only rudimentary commentary went out of circulation and became rare books” (4). This means that readers in late imperial China enjoyed reading (good) *pingdian* commentaries as much as, if not more than, reading the novel itself. In other words, (good) *pingdian* commentaries became an integral part of the authorship of the novel they commented upon.

³⁷ Jin excised the last 49 chapters of the earlier 120-chapter version he used as the base text for his own commented edition of *Shuihu zhuan*. See Rolston (1997), pp. 25-50, for a detailed examination of Jin’s *pingdian* commentaries on *Shuihu zhuan*. Huang (1994) also discusses the paradoxical role of the Chinese fiction commentator in relation to the author and the reader based on the case of Jin Shengtan. See also Altenburger (2014) for a fascinating analysis of Jin’s commented edition of *Shuihu zhuan* from the perspective of authorship.

³⁸ In fact, some commentators did not make deletions ‘silently’ but crossed out in red ink or noted “*keshan* 可删” (could be deleted) besides the parts they deemed unnecessary or badly written, which also made the deletions visually prominent (Rolston 1990, 50-2).

When foreign novels started to be introduced to China in late Qing, many Chinese translators naturally chose to adapt them into the genre format of vernacular chaptered fiction, with which, as I have just mentioned, the *pingdian* commentary practice was most famously associated. In the Sinicization of foreign novels, the formal *pingdian* features of vernacular chaptered fiction were kept to varying degrees. The extent to which the traditional practice of *pingdian* commentaries was kept and appropriated in each single translation was different, depending perhaps on the individuality of the translator, the journal's editorial policies, or even time constraints. Some retained more features of this tradition while others only adopted one or two features that were sufficient for their purposes. The late-Qing reformist Liang Qichao, for instance, with his strong goal of promulgating his reformist ideas, made good use of *pingdian* practice by interpolating emphatic punctuation, commemorative poems, interlinear comments, and post-chapter comments in his 1902 translation of Jules Verne's *Deux ans de vacances*.³⁹

In the May Fourth era, however, New Culturalists considered the *pingdian* tradition outmoded. They argued for eradicating it along with the classical Chinese language, the literary tradition, and the Confucian ethics that permeated the old language and literary traditions. There were various forms of opposition to or contempt for the *pingdian* commentary practice as well as the literary tradition in which it was rooted. For instance, Hu Shi, a prominent leader of the New Culture Movement,

³⁹ See Hanan (2004) for an analysis of how Liang and Zhou Guisheng 周桂笙 (1863-1926) were constrained and made use of the traditional Chinese model of vernacular fiction in their respective translations of *Deux ans de vacances* and *Margot la balafrée*. In this article, Hanan pays particular attention to the commentaries (though without identifying them specifically as *pingdian* commentaries) added to the translated texts, which in Liang's case were provided by Liang himself and in Zhou's case were mostly added by his friend Wu Jianren 吴趼人 (1867-1910).

criticized traditional *pingdian* practice in order to advance his own *kaozheng* 考证 (evidential research) reading of classical vernacular novels as part of the vernacular movement agenda.⁴⁰ In his preface to the first ‘modern’ edition of *Shuihu zhuan* (with English punctuation and free of *pingdian* commentaries)⁴¹, Hu ([1920]1953) argues that Jin Shengtian’s *pingdian* commentary on *Shuihu zhuan* is mechanical, pedantic textual criticism in the style of the eight-legged essay (see Chapter III for an explanation of the eight-legged essay). He also accuses Jin of applying Confucian ideals of history writing—or in Hu’s words, the “*liudu* 流毒” (lingering poison) of Confucianism—to the reading of *Shuihu zhuan* (Hu [1920]1953, 501, 502).⁴²

The New Culturalists also attacked the use of *quandian*, another component of *pingdian*. In 1916, as an integral part of the language reform movement, Hu Shi started demanding the reform—or rather, establishment—of the Chinese punctuation system. In “*Lun judou ji wenzi fuhao* 论句读及文字符号” (On punctuations and marks in the written language), Hu (1916) complains about the lack of a complete, standardized punctuation system in Chinese from the earliest days, which has constituted a serious problem in the Chinese language and China’s education system.⁴³ Without a standardized, efficient punctuation system, Hu (1916) argues, not only is the Chinese

⁴⁰ Saussy (2003) argues that Hu’s *kaozheng* reading of classical vernacular novels, especially his ‘discovery’ of the authors of these vernacular texts, “was part and parcel of their design of establishing a new canon of great works of Chinese fiction” (131).

⁴¹ This ‘modern’ edition of *Shuihu zhuan* was punctuated and paragraphed by Wang Yuanfang 汪原放 (1897-1980). See Hu (2007) for a brief study of Wang and his relationship with Hu Shi.

⁴² It should be pointed out the Hu Shi in this preface does not completely deprecate Jin’s *pingdian* edition of *Shuihu zhuan*. Hu acknowledges Jin’s courage and ingenuity in his commentary for Jin’s own times.

⁴³ Interestingly, this article, together with another two articles written by Hu Shi about the reform of the punctuation system, was published in the scientific journal, *Science*. See Wang (2006), pp. 90-6, for a discussion of how the scientific discourse and scientific community played a fundamental role in the vernacular movement in the 1910s and 1920s.

language itself not expressive and precise enough but it also presents an enormous obstacle in the popularization of literacy and education among the Chinese people. As to the traditional practice of *quandian*, Hu thinks it is not as advanced or as helpful as Western punctuation systems, for the dots and circles could, at best, only indicate pauses in reading but not the syntactic structure (ibid.).

This idea of introducing the Western punctuation system was gradually put into practice in individual endeavors around the time Hu Shi made his reform proposals. In 1919, Hu Shi, Zhou Zuoren, and several other colleagues submitted a proposal to the Ministry of Education, demanding the regulation of the punctuation system based on the English punctuation system. The bill, passed in 1920, required the adoption of 12 new punctuation marks in schools throughout the nation. The year 1920, as mentioned earlier, also witnessed the publication of the first ‘modern’ edition of an ancient Chinese novel using new punctuation marks and without *pingdian* commentaries. From 1922 to 1928, more than ten classical literary works were published in such ‘modern’ editions. In a word, when the journal *Xueheng* was founded in 1922, the *pingdian* commentary practice was already declining in popularity in the public domain while the New Culturalists’ language reform had achieved official status.

Despite the New Culturalists’ categorical criticism of *pingdian*, as Qin Gong (2009) argues, the *pingdian* tradition was not instantly or completely abandoned in actual practice even among the New Culturalists.⁴⁴ Though there were few instances

⁴⁴ In a brief overview of translators in the May Fourth era, Qin (2009) maintains that the practice of *pingdian* as a traditional form of literary criticism did not die out then, but went through a formal change and evolved into extensive prefaces, afterwords, footnotes, endnotes, and notes in brackets in translations (21-2). However, as I argue later in my analysis of Wu Mi’s adaptation of the *pingdian* practice, this was not a mere formal change but complicated the nature of these adaptive uses of the *pingdian* practice.

in which the formal features of the *pingdian* practice were fully retained, the use of emphatic punctuation and some adaptive use of other elements of *pingdian* practice can still be found in New Culturalist publications. For example, as mentioned earlier, Wang's (2013) article shows that Tian Han added emphatic punctuation in his 1921 translation of *Salome*. What Wang did not notice or examine is that Tian's translation is also prefaced by a commemorative poem—a common element of *pingdian* commentary (Rolston 1990, 64)—by another New Culturalist, Guo Moruo. Though Guo's poem was written in the new vernacular Chinese, the tradition of adding commemorative poems to the beginning of friends' works seemed to have persisted.

5.4.2 Wu's adaptation of *pingdian* practice in fiction translation

Wu's only fiction translations in the journal *Xueheng* are his translations of William Thackeray's (1811-1863) *The Newcomes* (1922) and *Vanity Fair* (1926). Both are incomplete translations. Wu's *Niukangshi jiazhuan* 钮康氏家传 (Biography of the Newcomes) is a translation of the first six chapters of *The Newcomes*, serialized in the 1st to 4th, 7th, and 8th issues.⁴⁵ His *Mingli chang* 名利场 (Fair of fame and wealth) is a translation of "Before the Curtain" and the first chapter of *Vanity Fair*, which were published in the 55th issue. Wu translated both novels into the genre format of vernacular chaptered fiction. In these translations, he mainly used *quandian*, double-column interlineal comments, and chapter comments and appended a long translator's preface to each translation.

Since Wu chose the genre format of vernacular chaptered fiction, it should not seem unexpected for him to also adopt the *pingdian* commentary practice. Yet there

⁴⁵ Since this translation is serialized, the in-text references to this translation in this chapter will be provided with the issue number as well. In the reference list, there is only one entry for this translation.

were other interesting factors at play here, especially in the context of China's 1920s cultural scene. Wu's adoption of the *pingdian* commentary practice was his way of making a strong statement against the avowed principles and values of the New Culture Movement. This choice was not only itself an overt objection to many of New Culturalists' propositions about language and literature, but also provided Wu with the formal flexibility to insert his opinions into the text and remold the text to serve his own purposes.

Wu himself was rather candid about his pedagogical and polemical intentions in continuing the *pingdian* practice. In terms of using *quandian*, it can be said that Wu was putting into practice the Xueheng principle "to follow the customary usage and idioms of the Chinese language, not to use foreign punctuations" (CR 1923, 3).⁴⁶ In terms of adding notes and comments, Wu was more self-reflective. He explains in the post-chapter comment at the end of the 6th chapter of *Niukangshi jiazhuan* that he does so to explain and make extremely clear the meaning of the original text to his readers. As Wu (1922) explains it, it is difficult for one to understand such a text without sufficient knowledge of English history and customs, and it is also difficult for one to enjoy the text if he or she cannot perceive the implied meaning and subtlety of the lines (8: 16). Wu even claims, in the editor's note mentioned in 5.2, that he intends all the translations published in the journal—with precise and concise notes and comments—to serve as both a textbook and a reference book (Chen 1923, 1). It is obvious from these notes that Wu saw his role as that of a teacher to his intended audience (mostly young college students) whom, in his opinion, were being led astray

⁴⁶ In *Wu Mi's Self-Compiled Chronology*, Wu (1995) acknowledges that he wrote this English editorial piece (241).

by the New Culturalists and had no interest in either Chinese tradition or gaining any real knowledge of Western culture and literature (see Wu 1923). The very act of providing ‘true’ guidance and instruction to young readers in reading Western novels, for Wu, was also a contention for discursive power in the May-Fourth discursive space.

Wu uses three common symbols as emphatic punctuations: open circles (°), round dots (●), and water-drop shapes (ㄣ). He does not provide any explanation about the specific functions of each symbol, except that in the 3rd chapter of his translation of *The Newcomes* Wu explains in one of the interlineal comments that he uses the round dots to substitute the italics in the original text for emphasis. For readers who were from a young age familiar with the traditional Chinese writing system, there might have been no need for Wu to explain his use of emphatic punctuation. But it is difficult for us, almost a century later, to try to decipher what Wu meant exactly by each symbol. Nonetheless, some general observations can be made: he seems to use open circles to draw attention to character portrayal and details important for character development; round dots (from the 3rd chapter on) are used as a substitute for italics in the original text; water-drop shapes are to emphasize parts important for plot development. This is only my speculative attempt at distinguishing the functions of his different emphatic punctuation marks. The differences among them are subtle and slippery. After all, details important for character development are generally also important for plot development.

Regardless of Wu’s specific intentions behind his use of emphatic punctuation markers, in most cases, they work in collaboration with the interlinear comments to guide the reader’s reading and understanding of the text. For instance, in the 4th chapter

of *Niukangshi jiazhuan*, Wu adds water-drop shapes to the right of a sentence which describes Clive Newcome, one of the novel's main characters, attentively reading an album of William Hogarth (1697-1764)'s paintings. This sentence is immediately followed by an interlinear comment that points out that this sentence foreshadows a plot development in which Clive becomes a painter. The function of this string of water-drop dots thus becomes clearer.

As to the verbal forms of *pingdian* commentary, Wu makes good use of the formal flexibility of this long-established tradition to interweave his opinions into the text and appropriate the text to serve his own purposes. In his translation of the first six chapters of *The Newcomes*, besides a three-page preface, there are altogether 232 double-column interlinear comments and 2 post-chapter comments. In his translation of *Vanity Fair*, his own preface takes almost 3 pages (out of 13 pages) and there are 25 interlinear comments and 1 post-chapter comment. Visually, the entire space of each translated novel is not only encompassed by the extensive preface at the beginning and the post-chapter comment(s) at the end, but also densely interpolated with Wu's interlinear comments.

First, Wu re-packages and re-presents Thackeray's novels to his Chinese readers with his prefaces. Though Wu does not add various types of prefatory writings, each of his prefaces covers more content than what readers nowadays usually encounter when reading a contemporary translator's preface—an introduction to the original novel and the original author, and the translator's reflections on his/her own translation process, strategies or problems.

Wu's preface to his translation of *The Newcomes*, though framed to explain why he chose to translate Thackeray's work, also serves pedagogical and polemical purposes. The preface opens by comparing Thackeray and Charles Dickens. Wu explicitly ranks Thackeray, at the time unknown in China, higher than Dickens in terms of scholarly attainment, style, and skill. Then he introduces Sentimentalism (where he categorizes Dickens) and Realism (where he categorizes Thackeray) in the history of English novels. Then almost a third of the preface is devoted to introducing and comparing Samuel Richardson (1689-1761) and Henry Fielding (1707-1745), the respective "originators" (*kaiduan liji zhe* 开端立极者) of the sentimentalist and the realistic novel in the English literary tradition (Wu 1922, 1: 2).

Wu's detailed comparison of Thackeray and Dickens, and of Realism and Sentimentalism does more than simply explain the greatness of Thackeray in justifying his choice of translating Thackeray's novel. The pedagogical aspect of the preface is obvious. After introducing Thackeray, Dickens, Richardson, and Fielding, the "four most important novelists in English history", he laments that "people in this country only know of one of them [i.e., Dickens]" (ibid., 3). In this sense, Wu's preface provides an introductory lesson regarding this unknown part of English literary history to his readers. It is also evident that Wu believes it is his responsibility to educate his readers in how to critically study and receive Western literature. Without the few sentences that remind us that we are reading a translator's preface, the bulk of this piece could easily stand as either a piece of literary criticism or teaching material for an introductory English literature course. Interestingly, in 1922, when this translation was serialized, Wu was teaching 'History of English Literature' and 'English Novels',

among other courses, at Southeastern University (see Wu 1995). It is probable that the boundaries between his roles as teacher and translator intersected when he was translating this novel.

Wu's preface to his translation of *Vanity Fair* also demonstrates the multiple roles he took upon himself in the process of translating. This preface is not distinguished from the main text by a section title such as 'the translator's notes' or 'the translator's preface'. The font size of the preface is smaller than that of the text proper but still larger than that of the interlinear comments. There are even interlinear comments within the preface itself. The preface's main content verges on a scholarly study of the proper nouns in the original novel, including the title and the names of the main characters. Wu starts by explaining how difficult it is to translate book titles in general and then traces the allusions in the title, *Vanity Fair*, to the Old Testament's Ecclesiastes and John Bunyan's *Pilgrim's Progress*. He also analyzes the implied meanings in the main characters' names:

凡大小说之作者，其书中人物之姓名，咸有寓意。或本古书，或造新典，以示其人之身份性行，而著褒贬抑扬之旨。

The characters' names in works of great novelists all have implied meanings, which either allude to previous works or become the source for future allusions, in order to show the social status and personalities of the characters and pass on value judgments (Wu 1926, 2).

The way he explains the connotations of the characters' names is rather didactic, as if he were teaching his readers how to properly read or write novels. According to a former student's recollection, Wu did use a copy of *Vanity Fair* annotated with his own comments and notes for teaching (Jiang 2001, 79-80).

Since young students constituted the main audience for whose attention the various literary groups were competing, the pedagogical was necessarily associated with the polemical. By complaining there had been no translation of Thackeray's works in Chinese, Wu was also implying a criticism of the New Culturalists whose claimed goal was to systematically introduce Western literature. By presenting a rigorous study of the proper names in *Vanity Fair*, Wu was also, in a sense, criticizing the New Culturalists' slipshod study and research in the translating process. As Wu repeatedly complained in other writings, the New Culturalists did not have a sufficient, profound knowledge of Western literature and civilization and limited their translation projects to such writers as Émile Zola, Henrik Ibsen, Bernard Shaw, and Leo Tolstoy as if they represented the essence of Western literature (e.g. Wu 1921; CR 1923). Hence, these two prefaces were also Wu's attempts to establish his (and the Xueheng School's) legitimacy in leading cultural affairs in the May Fourth era.

Second, Wu used interlinear comments to add various types of annotations, notes, and comments in his translations. The interlinear comment is an even more intrusive commentarial form than the preface. In his post-chapter note to the 6th chapter of *Niukangshi jiazhuan*, Wu (1922) himself categorizes his interlinear comments into two general types. The informative annotations are to help the reader "understand the meaning of sentences" (*liaojie juzhong zhi yi* 了解句中之义), while the evaluative comments are to enable the reader to enjoy the text (Wu 1922, 8:16).⁴⁷ The informative notes range from basic explications of expressions referring to a certain character to

⁴⁷ Wang (2008) further divides Wu's evaluative comments into three subcategories according to their functions: 1) to pass on value judgements and hence to point out the moral lessons drawn from certain characters or the plot; 2) to directly control the reader's emotions and attitudes; 3) to comment on current social affairs and problems (109-12).

annotations of events, figures, and customs in English and French history, and to explanations of literary and religious references. These notes account for a large proportion of all the interlinear comments in *Niukangshi jiazhuan*.⁴⁸ In more subjective comments, Wu elucidates the sarcasm in a character's spoken line or the irony in Thackeray's writing, comments on the conduct of a certain character, explains and remarks on literary devices, and even gives Western-Chinese comparative observations. But the lines of demarcation between informative notes and evaluative comments can be fuzzy. Especially in the longer comments, Wu's voice as a teacher comes across strong and the annotations are much more detailed than annotations would commonly be. Sometimes, his interlinear comments take up so much more space on a page than the text proper that even the lines between the text *proper* and the *paratext* become blurred. As with Wu's prefaces, both his seemingly informative annotations and more subjective comments almost always cloak hidden pedagogical and polemical agendas. I will examine in detail one example to show how Wu used interlinear comments to achieve his purposes.

As shown in Figure 1, a page taken from the 1st chapter of *Niukangshi jiazhuan*, the interlinear comments (highlighted in yellow and orange) take up even more space on the page than the text proper. (Comments in yellow highlight are relatively speaking on the evaluative end and comments in orange highlight informative.) The long comment in yellow highlight is inserted after the lines in which the original author—

⁴⁸ *The Newcomes* is known for its rich references and allusions. See McMaster (1991) for a detailed study of the various allusions in *The Newcomes*.

可見得貧者不皆能廉。而富人中亦有慷慨好行其德者焉。未必個個房東加重租以逼寓客。未必個個牧師皆飾行以愚黔首。民黨之中亦確有通達愛國者。激進派中亦未必皆心慕權勢祿位者焉。意謂世以憤世嫉俗之旨。為一偏武斷之談。言世中竟無一好人。善者必遭殃。惡者必得志。凡道德感情實圖利已。善言美行。假託欺人。或言凡貧者皆清高廉正。凡富者皆吝嗇刻薄。凡營業者皆重利盤剝。敷衍者皆空言欺世。政界之中更無完人。凡民黨皆暴烈奸險者。而攻擊政府者實皆最想做官者也。如此見解視世太濁。論人過刻。實非正中中和之意。而尤悖於社會實情。今著者此書之內容。即可以證其非而指其誤。故著者存心忠厚。立意正大。讀之不可不察。若逕如前段假設之評書者之見解。則大非著者之所望矣。○按論者或以沙克雷為寫實派小說家。而遂謂其視世太刻。專以諷刺為能事。此實大誤。沙克雷外似刻薄。內實仁厚。且自壯而老。見識工夫。益有進境。故論者嘗以沙克雷所著書。以其先後之次序。分為三類。一曰戲謔時期。Spirit of Burlesque 例如 Barry Lyndon 一書屬之。二曰諷刺時期。Spirit of Satire 例如名利場 Vanity Fair 一書屬之。三曰仁愛時期。Spirit of Love 例如鈕康氏家傳 The Newcomes 一書即屬之。此書之出最晚。故亦最精到。純係仁厚之旨。而少刻薄之意。故吾首譯鈕康氏家傳。非無因也。讀者諒之。且住。寓言向例。總是先叙故事。使小孩子們聽得高興。然後申明正旨。略施教訓。從未有顛倒次序而為之者。今作書人如此喋喋不休。恐讀者索然無味。連書中本文亦不看了。故此速開場說甚麼。狼呀。羊呀。狐呀。獅呀。驢叫呀。票鴿呀。母雞呀。公雞呀。一齊放他們出來罷。以上楔子。此處完結。以下方入本文。話說昔日按此書事實。均在當我年少之時。按沙克雷所作佳小說。有 Pendants 一書。先於一千八百五十年出版。書中主人為 Arthur Pendants 其人乃中上流鄉紳之子。早喪父。為寡母所鍾愛。其戚有孤女。名 Laura Bell 寄養於家。美而賢。與 Arthur 同讀。互相愛悅。母意亦欲聘之為婦。迨 Arthur 稍長。赴倫敦。入大學肄業。Arthur 固風流倜儻。自是為朋輩引誘。荒嬉廣交。不務學業。賭博煙酒。為狹邪遊。日趨浮靡。識一女曰 Emily Blanche 慕其華貴。竟與訂婚。然此女殊無誠信。後竟絕 Arthur 而歸他人。Arthur 始而悲。繼而悔。悟大病。歸母。與 Laura 盡心調護。病愈。一改前非。聘 Laura 為妻。旋即娶之。潛心學業。為文人。居倫敦。主某報 Pall Mall Magazine 筆政。兼為滑稽畫。與沙克雷自身之職業同。此 Pendants 書中事實之大略也。迨沙克雷作鈕康氏家傳。則假設為滑稽畫。與沙克雷者。

文苑 鈕康氏家傳

九

Figure 1 Niukangshi jiazhuān, 1: 9

in the narrator's voice—defends the novel's particular opening.⁴⁹ Specifically, the chapter opens with a presentation of a mixture of familiar animal fables in which none of the animal characters appear to be morally decent. Then the authorial narrator anticipates and defends against some possible criticisms from “the critic” who might

condemn his unoriginal use of old fables or his contemptuously bleak depiction of human nature (Thackeray 1913, 4). After refuting these possible criticisms and mocking the critics, the authorial narrator goes on to present a brief preview, still in the language of animal fable, of the novel's nuanced characterization and complex plot.

Wu's lengthy comment follows these lines:

It does not follow that all men are honest because they are poor; and I have known some who were friendly and generous, although they had plenty of money. There are some great landlords who do not grind down their tenants; there are actually bishops who are not hypocrites; there are liberal men even among the Whigs, and the Radicals themselves are not all aristocrats at heart. (Thackeray 1913, 5)

In his interlinear comment, Wu explains and elaborates in detail on this idea. First, he further elucidates the meaning of these lines by laying out the opposite saying that the author aims to refute or correct. In this way, Wu alludes emphatically to the general tendency, especially among the belligerent New Culturalists, of making “cynical” (*fenshi jisù* 愤世嫉俗) and “arbitrary” (*wuduan* 武断) overgeneralizations about people in the May-Fourth discursive space (Wu 1922, 1: 9). Then Wu reminds the reader that this novel by Thackeray does not represent characters in such a simplistic way. He cautions the reader against missing or misinterpreting the profound morals of the story. In the second part of the comment, Wu provides more information about Thackeray's writing career to further emphasize the novel's exquisitely tuned style and narrates how Thackeray's writing evolved and improved continuously in three stages, i.e., from the “Spirit of Burlesque” to the “Spirit of Satire” and to the “Spirit of

⁴⁹ The narrator of the novel is Arthur Pendennis, the protagonist of Thackeray's earlier novel, *Pendennis*, and Pendennis is also a writer in the fiction world. Therefore, the opening of the novel should be considered as being narrated by Pendennis. However, this fable-like opening of the novel is more of a meta-narrative piece does not fit in the time frame of the novel's narrative, and the voice of 'I' can also be read as Thackeray's own authorial voice.

Love”.⁵⁰ Finally, Wu concludes this comment by saying that the reason why he translated this novel first is exactly because it was written in the last period and therefore shows Thackeray’s finest writing and spirit of love.

Wu’s comment on this passage is quite extensive. Apart from explaining the lines it directly comments on, this comment serves various other purposes—to teach the reader how to read critically, to popularize background knowledge about Thackeray, to justify his choice of translating this particular novel first, and, more interestingly and perhaps more subtly, to present and emphasize in a veiled way the Xueheng School’s core stances and its critical differences with the New Culturalists. Allow me to explain this last point. In this comment, Wu lays special stress on the idea of “fair and placid” (*pingzheng zhonghe* 平正中和) as well as the spirit of love. ‘*Zhonghe*’—being fair, placid, harmonious—is in fact one of the key concepts in the Confucian classic *Doctrine of the Mean* (*zhongyong* 中庸)⁵¹. It is a manifestation of the Doctrine of the Mean in terms of temperament and emotion. In this comment, therefore, Wu connects Thackeray’s spirit of love with the Confucian ideal of fairness and equilibrium, subtly integrating Chinese and Western cultures and values. Along with his pedagogical concern for the reader’s ability to understand the implied meaning of the story, Wu also works his own cultural stances into the implied meaning of Thackeray’s novel.

Wu’s adaptation of the *pingdian* commentary tradition invites us to rethink Genette’s concept of ‘paratext’ (as opposed to ‘text’) and what constitutes the text of

⁵⁰ As seen in Figure 1, Wu provided these English terms together with his Chinese translations.

⁵¹ In “*Wo zhi rensheng guan* 我之人生观” (My view of life), Wu (1923b) argues that adhering to the principle of *zhongyong* 中庸 is one of the three ways to practice humanism (19).

a translation. Wu's extensive prefaces, interlinear comments, and emphatic punctuation marks can be read as the paratexts that serve to guide the Chinese readers' understanding of his translations of Thackeray's novels. However, as can be seen from the above analysis, the boundaries between text and paratext are constantly blurred. In consideration of the extensiveness and visual prominence of these paratextual materials, it is sometimes difficult to tell whether the paratexts are serving the text or the text is serving, as an example, to illustrate the pedagogical and polemical arguments in Wu's paratexts. In any case, the paratexts in the form of *pingdian* commentary are not like Genette's paratexts which are merely presentational, additional, or auxiliary. As mentioned in 5.4.1, *pingdian* commentary can be considered an epitome of the communal textual tradition in which a text is not considered to be a closed entity but an "ever-changeable product of the collaboration between different authors and different commentators through time" (Wong 2000, 407). It seems that, for Wu, a translation would not convey the entirety of its meaning without these paratextual interventions in the form of traditional *pingdian* commentary. It can be argued that the text and the so-called paratext of these two translations were intended by Wu (and were probably read at the time) as equally important (inter)texts that intersected with each other and together produced meaning.

5.4.3 Multiple temporalities in Wu's translation practice

With the translator's preface, interlinear comments, emphatic punctuation, and post-chapter comments that, as a whole, encompass and 'intrude into' the space of the translated fiction, Wu multitasks within this appropriated textual space. Wu plays multiple roles—a translator, a commentator, a teacher, and an opponent of the New

Culture Movement. Furthermore, his saliently composite textual activity also presents us with a case of complex temporalities. That is, it is impossible to precisely position his translation practice and hence his conceptualization of translation in a simple binary of ‘traditional versus modern’.

On the surface, Wu’s adoption of the *pingdian* commentary practice, together with his choice to translate Thackeray’s novels into the genre format of vernacular chaptered fiction, makes his translation practice traditionalist or even conservative. Even the kind of vernacular Wu used in his translations is relatively ‘traditional’ compared to the new vernaculars the New Culturalists were discussing and inventing. In this sense, as Wang (2008) has pointed out, Wu’s translation practice “continued the translation tradition since late Qing” (106). Moreover, Wu’s conscious choice of using the *pingdian* commentary practice shows that he was in favor of the traditional culture of reading and education, that is, that the reading and comprehension of a text as well as learning in general are to be achieved through close, repeated reading guided and compelled by learned commentaries.⁵²

However, if we take a closer look at Wu’s major concerns in his extensive notes and comments, his adoption of the *pingdian* commentary practice is not a simple case of continuing the Chinese tradition. On the one hand, Wu’s adoption of the *pingdian* commentary practice in translating Thackeray’s novels does subject these Victorian novels to the Chinese communal textual tradition that celebrated various types of textual reworking. The Victorian novel became, in Wu’s hands, a Chinese vernacular chaptered fiction with its characteristic dense emphatic punctuation and interlinear

⁵² See Li Yu (2003) for an examination on the socio-cultural history of *dushu* (reading and education) in late imperial China, 1000-1800.

comments. His roles as commentator, teacher, and polemicist are as prominent as—if not more salient than—his role as translator. On the other hand, the detailed notes and comments display Wu’s fastidious concern for accuracy and a strong sense of faithfulness to the original text. Granted, Wu’s subjective, evaluative comments resemble the traditional kinds of *pingdian* commentary; there are several instances where Wu uses such typical phrases as “*quji* 趣极” (extremely interesting) and “*miaoji* 妙极” (extremely brilliant) common in late-imperial fiction commentary. Yet there are also interlinear comments that explain, justify, or even apologize for his specific treatment, as translator, of the original text. For example, Wu did not realize until the 5th chapter of his serialized translation, *Niukangshi jiazhuan*, that he had mistaken the elder brother as the younger one between the twin characters Brian and Hobson Newcome. Therefore, he explains in a long interlinear comment in the 5th chapter why he made such a mistake, how he realized it, and why he decided to continue with his initial inaccurate rendition. In this note, Wu directly refers to himself as the translator and explicitly shows his respect for the original. In this sense, as Wang (2008) has also observed, it seems that Wu’s understanding of translation was different from most other late-Qing translators who dealt freely with the text. Rather, Wu had a strong source-text oriented attitude towards translation.

Moreover, Wu’s informational annotations are very detailed and rigorous. Especially when it comes to a reference to a literary work or literary figure, the kind of information Wu provides—with detailed publication information and the original title or name—is rarely seen in traditional textual practice or translations in and before Wu’s time. Feuerwerker (2008) has briefly noted that Wu’s notes and comments

“depart from convention and point to its foreign source...” (151). What Feuerwerker does not comment on is that the kind of scholarly rigor in Wu’s informative annotations seems to be closer to the Western academic standards of research and methodological rigor he was subject to while studying in America than to the kind of textual research in the Chinese tradition.⁵³ Wu’s informative annotations are rather similar in function to the footnotes he used in his English-language course essays at Harvard.⁵⁴ The difference is that Wu presents this concern for factual accuracy and respect for the original in a ‘traditional’ and distinctively Chinese form. Yet this formal difference paradoxically makes Wu’s presence in the text as translator, teacher, commentator, and scholar, more prominent, which yet again complicates the ‘tradition versus modernity’ issue in his translation practice.

Therefore, it is still simplistic to merely elevate Wu’s practice and conception of translation to the realm of the ‘modern’ or, as Wang (2008) has done, to clearly distinguish the modern and traditional elements in Wu’s translation activities. The case of Wu’s fiction translations has multiple, fluctuating layers of temporalities. The so-called traditional and modern elements, as the existing scholarship on Chinese translation history has insufficiently defined, are intricately entangled and intertwined in Wu’s translation practice. Taking into consideration Wu’s discussions of translation issues, which also question the current scholarly construction of modern Chinese translation history, we need to interrogate and challenge the widely and uncritically

⁵³ Fiction commentary in the early stage derived largely from the tradition of exegesis and were mainly of the annotational or exegetical kind. It was in the late Ming and especially in the Qing dynasty that the content of *pingdian* commentaries became more subjective and commentarial, laden heavily with “the literati’s appreciation and commentaries” (Tan 2001).

⁵⁴ In his course essay “The Political Thought of Confucius and Mencius as Compared with Plato and Aristotle”, the manuscript of which is available in the Harvard University Archives, Wu uses footnotes to give information of referenced materials and related literature.

accepted conviction that the May Fourth era was the modern stage of Chinese translation history.

5.5 Conclusion: translation, power, and temporality

In this chapter, I have examined both Wu Mi's writings on translation and his translation practice. Wu attached great importance to the issue of translation. In his discussions on the relationships between translation, imitation, and literary creation, Wu showed a very practical and pedagogical understanding of translation. For him, there was no insurmountable conceptual hierarchy between translation and original writing. Rather, translation and literary creation are subject to the same principles of literary composition, and translation is a form of imitation that can lead to good writing. In his translation practice, Wu's adoption of the traditional *pingdian* commentary practice also blurred the lines between writing, translating, and commenting. Moreover, as a core member of the Xueheng School whose stated goal was to resist and counter the New Culture Movement, Wu worked his literary and cultural ideologies into his discussions of translation issues and translation practice with strong pedagogical and polemical concerns. It can be said that he seized every opportunity to voice his disagreement with the New Culturalists' iconoclastic propositions about language, literature, and culture.

By situating Wu in the context of the Xueheng School and the polemics between different Republican literary societies, I was able to shed light on a broader picture of the May-Fourth translation scene. Translation, for Wu and many other May-Fourth cultural actors, was both the subject in a discursive struggle for power in the larger

cause of rebuilding the nation and the means by which the struggle was waged. In the May-Fourth discursive space, translation—appropriation of a particular strand of Western knowledge and literature—promised access to power. When the May-Fourth cultural actors were debating about translation issues, criticizing mistakes in others' translations, or themselves translating, they were at the same time working to position themselves as the leader of the nation in literary and cultural affairs.

As my examination has shown, in terms of discussions on translation issues, Wu had much more in common than we might expect with the New Culturalists in terms of his general understanding of translation and the way in which he discussed translation issues. With respect to the issue of 'translation versus creative writing', different cultural actors seemed to have held opposing or even irreconcilable stances but the differences between their fundamental understandings of translation might be exaggerated by their efforts "to distinguish their own intellectual standing" within the May-Fourth discursive space (Li 2008, 63). Moreover, there was undeniably a stronger source-text oriented conception of translation in the May Fourth period. Yet this growing respect for the original still coexisted with a strong sense of the agency of the 'translator', or to be more exact, the cultural actor who translated. These two factors were still considered compatible in this historical period, not least because the 'faithful' re-presentation of the original in Chinese, according to May-Fourth cultural actors, placed high demands on their ability and skills—especially their knowledge of the source language, literature, and culture, and their knowledge of the subject matter.⁵⁵

⁵⁵ See Lee's (2010) discussion of the relationship between faithfulness and power in Republican translation circles (1912-1937).

In terms of translation practice, Wu's case reveals the complex, paradoxical conceptualizations of translation in the May Fourth period. Wu's appropriation of the *pingdian* commentary practice in his fiction translations was not unique. As mentioned in my analysis, New Culturalists, despite their proclaimed iconoclasm, also retained to varying degrees traditional textual practices. Though this generation of cultural actors evidently showed a more critical awareness of translation in their *polemics*, their translation *practices* still present a complex mixture of traditional textual tradition and modern (read Western) academic, methodological standards. Such inconsistency between translation discourse and translation practice in the May Fourth period shows the ambivalence in the cultural actors' conceptions of translation.

Because of his association with the Xueheng School, Wu's translation discourse and practice have been, until recently, ignored in the translation studies scholarship. Granted, there has been an emerging scholarship in the recent decade which has tried to rehabilitate the Xueheng School in modern Chinese translation history. This revisionist scholarship is limited, however, in the sense that it does not question fundamentally the existing construction of modern Chinese translation history which has been centered on the canonical status of the New Culture Movement. In contrast to the previous scholarship, my analysis in this chapter undermines the rigid dichotomy between 'tradition' and 'modernity' and the exclusive association of the 'modern' with the New Culture Movement pervasive in the study of modern Chinese translation history. Instead of trying to identify the 'traditional' or 'modern' elements in Wu's translation activities, I have endeavoured to present a multidimensional picture of Wu's conceptualization of translation in which different temporalities and ideologies

are interwoven into something that is both a sophisticated mixture of modern and traditional but at the same time defies those categories. The difficulty in clearly classifying Wu's conceptualization of translation points to the problematics in the widely accepted yet rarely clearly defined concept(s) of 'modernity' in the existing scholarship on May-Fourth translation history. What has been considered as 'modern' or 'traditional' in existing secondary literature needs to be rethought.

Conclusion

6.1 Recapitulation of the study

This study has set out to critically examine the changes in conceptualizations of translation in China from the 1890s through to the 1920s, especially the pervasive grand narrative that the existing scholarship has constructed about the history of translation during these years. Indeed, this historical period was a transitional era in Chinese translation history in terms of the practice and perception of translation. The ubiquitous grand narrative found in the scholarly discourse on this period, however, presents this ‘transition’ teleologically as a linear progression from ‘traditional’ practices and perceptions of translation to ‘modern’ ones. From reviewing the previous scholarship, I have identified a ‘May Fourth paradigm’ which underlies this grand narrative. This paradigm not only constructs an essential ‘modern versus traditional’ dichotomy between the May Fourth period and the period that preceded it, but also attributes a ‘modern’ label exclusively and narrowly to the New Culture Movement which occurred during the May Fourth period. Such a representation of the history of translation from the late 19th to the early 20th centuries is simplistic. My study has told a more complex and nuanced story.

By focusing on the conceptual boundaries between ‘translation’ and ‘writing’, my three case studies work to re-imagine the relationship between the ‘traditional’ and the ‘modern’ enshrined in the canonical grand narrative. My first case study has demonstrated that, in late Qing, translation had not been completely differentiated from other common types of textual activities such as writing, editing, commenting, and compiling. Though particular Chinese terms for ‘translation’ had long been

designated by that time, no essential conceptual hierarchy yet existed between translating, writing, commenting, compiling, and editing as different activities of textual transmission. As Zhong Junwen's 'non-discussion' of the two Chinese translations of *Joan Haste* has shown, the Chinese cultural actors who widely engaged in these different textual activities identified themselves and others as generalist Confucian scholars rather than 'translators', 'writers', 'commentators', or 'editors'. The way they saw fit to deal with pre-existing textual materials in translation conformed to the ingrained Confucian ideal of fine writing. The conceptual blurring between translating and writing common in this period was not an unenlightened conception of translation but was deeply grounded in the Chinese textual and intellectual traditions.

In the early years of Republican China, as my second case study has demonstrated, this kind of conceptual blurring continued, yet, at the same time, one can also identify manifestations of an attitude toward translation that distinguished translating from such activities as writing and commenting. This is evident in the changes Zhou Shoujuan made to the immediate paratexts accompanying his translations in the *Collection*. That is, he deliberately excised those paratextual materials that highlighted his own feelings, views, and comments and instead added more objective, factual information about the original authors. Moreover, my analysis has displayed that, in Zhou's case, the changes in practices and perceptions of translation did not occur in a simple, linear transition from the 'traditional' to the 'modern'. Rather, different ideas and practices of translation were in flux at that time. The juxtaposed analysis of the

three prefaces as well as Lu Xun's contemporaneous review of the *Collection* has also demonstrated the diverse understandings of translation in early Republican China.

My third case study has further challenged the May Fourth paradigm by showing that the May Fourth period did not constitute a complete break from the previous periods in terms of translation practice and perception. As my examination of Wu Mi's writings about and practices of translation has shown, the conceptual blurring between translation, 'original' writing, and commenting continued despite a strong concern with faithfulness to the original. In Wu's practical and pedagogical understanding, translation is a form of imitation that leads to good original writing. Wu's adaption of the traditional *pingdian* commentary practice in his fiction translations also shows how the lines between translating, commenting, and writing were blurred in the materiality of textual forms. That is, in his prefaces, interlinear comments, and emphatic punctuation that surround and even 'intrude into' the space of the translated text, we can see the concrete manifestations of the collapse of the boundaries between 'text' and 'paratext' and those among his multiple roles as translator, teacher, commentator, and polemicist.

6.2 Contributions

6.2.1 Chinese translation history

My study adds to current knowledge about Chinese translation history from the late 19th century to the early 20th century. Previous translation studies scholarship has focused mainly on either the practice of translation or theories of translation from this period, yet few scholars have directly addressed the issue of how translation might

have been conceptualized by different cultural actors. Two scholars, however, provided foreground for my work. Martha Cheung (2003, 2005, 2006, 2011) examined, in a methodologically self-reflexive manner, conceptualizations of translation for the period in Chinese history that precedes the one that I explored. Meanwhile, Eva Hung (2005a, b, 2006), by drawing attention to collaborative translation and relay translation in China prior to the 20th century, showed that an uncritical subscription to contemporary, Western understandings of translation has led many contemporary Chinese scholars to misrepresent Chinese translation history. Cheung's and Hung's studies have highlighted the importance of the issue of self-representation of Chinese translation history on the international scene. Building on their pioneering work, this dissertation has investigated conceptualizations of translation in the wave of literary translation activities that emerged in China in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the period following the ones on which Cheung's and Hung's research primarily focused.

This was a critical period in Chinese translation history. During this period, as Hung (2005b) suggests, educated Chinese started to participate in translation activities and wholesale changes in the practices and perceptions of translation occurred. Taking up where Hung left off, I have examined and provided, compared to previous translation historiography, a more nuanced, complex picture of the changing conceptualizations of translation during this transitional period. As we see concretely from the three case studies, the unfolding of the shifts and changes in the practice and perception of translation in China was heterogeneous, haphazard, and complex and begs to be further disentangled. There were significant cultural continuities inextricably entangled within and interacting with the changes as they both evolved. It

is simplistic to argue that the May Fourth era—the so-called ‘modern’ phase of Chinese translation history—was characterized by a complete rupture with the previous periods in terms of translation practice, discourse, and conceptualization.

My research has pointed out the problematics of the widely accepted yet rarely clearly defined concept of ‘translational modernity’ in existing scholarship. That is, in Chinese translation historiography, the crucial issue of what makes translation practice and discourse ‘modern’ has not been explicitly addressed, but rather assumed based on an uncritical acceptance of the May Fourth paradigm. In a sense, underlying the May Fourth paradigm is an implicit or explicit subscription, among Chinese translation studies scholars, to contemporary, Eurocentric ideas, assumptions, and definitions of ‘translation’ in the representation and assessment of China’s translation history. Therefore, the practices, discussions, and conceptualizations of translation in China’s long, rich translation tradition have been generally considered merely ‘traditional’ or ‘outmoded’ while the May Fourth period, commended for the proximity of its dominant practices and ideas of translation to current, Western definitions of translation, has been considered as the beginning of the ‘modern’ phase of Chinese translation history.

Based on my analysis and assessment in this dissertation, I argue that it is important to rethink what we are willing to accept as characteristic of ‘modernity’ when applied to Chinese translation history. The rethinking of the definition of ‘translational modernity’ in Chinese translation history and the further challenging of the May Fourth paradigm should be a major concern to Chinese translation studies scholars. This is not only important for calibrating the historiographical construction

of Chinese translation history, but it also concerns the issue of cultural self-representation and intercultural dialogue in the international discourse on translation. Only with a better knowledge of Chinese historical practices, discussions, and conceptualizations of translation can we actively engage in meaningful cross-cultural dialogue and critically engage with contemporary translation theory that has been principally based on Eurocentric traditions of translation and conceptualizations of translation.

Though I have not focused on engaging with scholarship on modern Chinese literature, my study nonetheless adds to the growing Chinese studies scholarship that challenges the canonical status of the May Fourth/New Culture Movement and rethinks the issue of Chinese modernity. These studies have already turned attention to “the counterdiscourse in Chinese modernity” (Doleželová-Velingerová and Wang 2001, 5) and marginalized cultural actors such as the ‘Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School’ and the Xueheng School. My discussions of the three case studies extend this attention and contribute to the existing scholarly knowledge of Zhong Junwen, Zhou Shoujuan, Chen Diexian, Bao Tianxiao, Wang Dungen, and Wu Mi by focusing on their conceptualizations of translation in relation to writing, editing, commenting, and other literary practices. These cultural actors’ translation practices and/or discussions on translation have not yet been contextualized or studied in sufficient depth in previous scholarship. By examining these cultural actors’ conceptualizations of (literary) translation, my study contributes to the on-going rethinking and critical assessment of the May Fourth paradigm in Chinese studies from a new perspective.

6.2.2 Theoretical and methodological interventions

The study of translation history—whether historical translation practices, translation theory, or translators—is based mostly on the often scant and fragmentary textual traces of the past. I have established a theoretical framework and a methodological model for dealing with various forms of texts in their historical contexts, specifically for the investigation of historical conceptualizations of translation.

I have used New Historicism both to historicize Barthes's theory of intertextuality and to challenge the conceptual hierarchy in Genette's framework of paratextuality in order to apply them more effectively in the Chinese context. Few translation studies scholars have explicitly attempted to apply New Historicism to the study of translation history. I have shown that New Historicism's critical capacity to generate new and insightful readings can be revitalized for the study of translation history. In adapting this critical approach, I focused on New Historicism as a negotiation and practical application of the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality that addresses both "the historicity of texts and the textuality of history" (Montrose 1989, 20). In this way, I have used this integrated theoretical framework to examine conceptualizations of translation without presuming *a priori* conceptual boundaries and hierarchies between translating and (original) writing, among other textual activities, in Chinese translation history. Meanwhile, I have also used this approach to de-center the power relations of textual materials previously categorized as 'text', 'paratext', 'extratext', etc. and instead read them all as 'intertexts' of equal discursive status. This approach has allowed me to draw into my analysis the discursive spaces in which these textual

materials were produced and to reveal the underdiscussed and undertheorized aspects of those previously studied primary sources.

The way in which I adopted New Historicism has also offered new avenues for employing the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality and Genette's framework of paratextuality in the study of translation history. In this dissertation, I have not simply applied Barthes's theory of intertextuality and Genette's framework of paratextuality to the reading of Chinese textual materials. Rather, I have also used my examination of Chinese materials and the Chinese tradition of textual production to re-examine and challenge the ways in which these theoretical frameworks have been commonly adopted in translation studies.

The protean concept of intertextuality has been commonly and variously used in translation studies, but few translation studies scholars, while utilizing this concept, have acknowledged the existence of other approaches to intertextuality in the discipline. Still fewer have conducted anything in the way of a self-reflective examination on the different ways of borrowing from the concept of intertextuality. Following Sakellariou's (2014) recent review of the different appropriations of the concept of intertextuality in contemporary Western translation theory, I have offered a more comprehensive categorization and review (in Chapter II) of how this concept has been adapted in translation studies in three major ways and to serve different theoretical agendas. Moreover, as my review shows, the understandings of intertextuality in these pre-existing adoptions of this slippery concept have been limited to the intertextual relationships that exist either between (specific elements of) separate texts or between a text and a larger corpus such as genre and literary tradition.

By using the concept of intertextuality to rethink and refine the concept of paratextuality, my study has in turn expanded the notion of intertextuality to include intertextual relationships between different concrete textual forms and components such as those between texts, paratexts, and extratexts.

More importantly, I have brought a Chinese perspective to a critical assessment of the pitfalls and shortcomings in applying the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality in the Chinese context. Though the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality, as Wang (1992) and Jane Qian Liu (2017) have suggested, provides a critical vocabulary—*intertextuality*—to describe the common phenomenon of the interconnectedness of texts, it is simplistic to take it in its all aspects as universally applicable. In J. Liu's (2017) recent study, the adoption of Barthes's concept of intertextuality allows her to address the derivative nature of all literary texts—'translation', 'creation', or anything in between—in the production of early 20th-century Chinese love fiction, yet Liu missed the opportunity to use her analysis of the mechanism of literary production she studied to reflect on the extent to which the theories and concepts she borrowed are applicable in the Chinese context.¹

I have taken a more critical approach to applying Barthes's theory of intertextuality as a useful tool for addressing the loose conceptual boundaries between translating and other types of textual activities in the Chinese context. I have devoted attention to differentiating how intertextual referentiality functioned and was

¹ Liu (2017) only mentions in passing, when discussing Harold Bloom's theorization of intertextuality as a source of deep anxiety, that "[i]n the particular period of Chinese literary history examined in this book... writers did not seem to be particularly worried about borrowing from their foreign counterparts" (16). However, she does not take the opportunity to elaborate on this and probe the different cultural attitudes toward intertextual referentiality in the Chinese tradition. She still proceeds to state that "in the literary history of all cultures, writers adapt and appropriate pre-existing texts, creating new literary works by means of intertextuality" (*ibid.*).

conceptualized differently in the Chinese textual tradition. As my case studies have shown, the blurred lines between translating, writing, editing, and commenting in both practice and conceptualization in the historical period under study were in fact firmly grounded in the Chinese textual tradition. It was (and perhaps still is) a textual tradition that celebrates textual reworking and a flexible, communal conception of authorship. In such a textual tradition which does not prize the authoritative, originary status of a particular text or a single author, translatorship can be said to have already been included in the traditional conception of authorship. In other words, until the early 20th century, the Chinese translator had not been inferiorized in relation to the author operating in a potentially endless web of textual reshaping and transmission. The findings of my case studies, therefore, suggest that the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality does not apply fully in the Chinese context. The poststructuralist framework of intertextuality is limited because it does not address the historicity and cultural specificities of how the relational and derivative nature of texts are conceptualized in different cultures. Moreover, the indiscriminate application of the poststructuralist theory of intertextuality as universally valid can lead to misrepresentations or the overlooking of indigenous cultural traditions.

Genette's framework of paratextuality, as discussed in Chapter II, has already received some criticism and modification from the point of view of translation studies in previous scholarship. Based on the nature and characteristics of the Chinese textual materials at hand, I have modified and challenged it still further. Though there have been calls for granting the translator an explicit position within the paratextuality framework, my case studies of Chinese cultural actors' multiple textual roles have

challenged such a clear-cut classification. Though the concept of paratext is useful for analysing the previously undertheorized textual materials that accompany translated texts, precise boundaries between text, paratext, and extratext—and especially the implied conceptual hierarchy underlying such a clear distinction between text, paratext, and extratext—are not particularly helpful for probing the intricate relationship between text and paratext in different cultural traditions. Especially, my analysis of Wu Mi's adaptation of the *pingdian* commentary tradition in his fiction translation has challenged the common definition of 'paratext' as merely serving the text in functionality and spatially separable from the text. In the Chinese tradition of *pingdian* commentary, 'paratexts' are an integral part of a text in its production and reception. That is, *pingdian* commentary allows agents other than the author to exercise extensive textual intervention and share the text's authorship. Therefore, my analysis of Wu's use of *pingdian* commentary in his translation practice shows that the concept of paratext needs to be further expanded and refined before it can be used as an appropriate conceptual tool for discussing textual production, including translations, in cultural traditions with different presumptions and conventions from modern Western ones.

I have adopted the method of multiple-case study to encompass an intertextual reading of various textual materials instead of a quantitative, norms-focused approach. While the case-study approach is often criticized for the lack of generalizability of its findings, I have addressed this problem by adapting the methodological principles of Microhistory. Instead of selecting cases based on 'typicality' or 'exceptionality', I have viewed the three cases chosen as 'clues' that provide a key to the comprehension

of the changing conceptualizations of translation in the historical period under study. That is, in my analysis of these cases, I constantly shifted the perspective, scope, and context to explore and connect a wider range of data sources and reach beyond those texts and the marginalized cultural actors with which and whom I started my case studies.

My study thus adds to methodological reflections on the common research method of case study by drawing on the methodological principles of Microhistory. As Wakabayashi (2016) notes, “[r]arely...are studies of translation history informed by the specific principles of approaches in the field of history, and translation historians can only benefit from the insights gained in this sister discipline” (165). The way in which I adopted Microhistory differs from two earlier attempts (Adamo 2006; Munday 2014) at utilizing Microhistory in translation studies. These two translation studies scholars mostly focus on implications of the apparent microscopic aspect of this historiographical approach—i.e., the marginal, previously neglected subjects, issues, and individuals or the daily lives of translators. I hope my approach encourages more discussions about how to borrow useful insights from Microhistory and other approaches from the discipline of history and open up new avenues for the study of translation history.

6.3 Implications and areas for future research

Due to this study’s limited scope, I have only focused on literary translation, and more specifically, fiction translation. Though, as I stated at the beginning of this thesis, the period under study witnessed the first wave of literary translation in Chinese

translation history, there were also a large number of translation activities in the fields of religion, social sciences, natural sciences, etc. The practice of and discourse on these non-literary translations also need to be studied to provide a more comprehensive foundation for understanding the broader issue of Chinese conceptualizations of translation during this period. More research needs to be conducted to examine whether there were also shifts in the attitudes toward the translations of religious, scientific, or political texts and how those changes occurred. It would be illuminating to compare the trajectories of changing conceptualizations of translation in non-literary and literary spheres.

An in-depth study on the way *pingdian* commentary was adapted in fiction translation in Chinese translation history is very much needed. As mentioned in Chapter V, some translation studies scholars have drawn attention to the insertion of notes, comments, and emphatic punctuation in individual translations in the late-Qing and early-Republican period, but they have mostly focused on the *content* of these comments and notes. As my analysis has shown, the use of this *form* of commentary provides important insights into the historical conceptualizations of translation and authorship as well as the mechanisms of literary production in China. I have limited my analysis to Wu Mi's adaptation of the tradition of *pingdian* commentary in his fiction translations, but there are many other cases of Chinese cultural actors using this long-established, rich commentary tradition in translation in the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Though in recent years there have been a couple of articles (in Chinese) on the use of *pingdian* commentary in translation (Lai 2012; Wang 2013), more effort should be made to compare different individuals' adaptations of this commentary

tradition and to study the overall impact this phenomenon had on Chinese translation history. Especially considering that studies on *pingdian* commentary in Chinese studies have rarely investigated its history after the 19th century, this topic well warrants a monograph-length study that focuses on how and why this practice, considered traditional, was used well into what has been defined as the ‘modern’ era.

In my case studies, I have indicated the importance of taking into account the issue of the language used to denote ideas about translation. I have briefly noted that the complex history of the Chinese language(s) and how it has evolved poses challenges to the proper interpretation of the surviving textual traces from the historical period under study. That is, the choice of the linguistic registers or languages—i.e., Classical Chinese, traditional vernacular, Europeanized vernacular—might affect the articulation of ideas about translation for the cultural actors writing about translation during that time and our modern-day interpretation of their articulations. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, the speed at which the Chinese language(s) evolved was extraordinary due to the active intervention of cultural actors who sought to democratize and modernize the language as they saw fit. It is worth studying whether and how the changes in the Chinese language(s) were associated with the changing conceptualizations of translation during this period. Such research would be of great benefit to both Chinese studies and translation studies.

Another important area for further study on conceptualizations of translation in China is the professionalization of translation in this historical period. The professionalization of translation, if understood (among other aspects) as a growing differentiation in the division of labor, is closely related to the conceptual boundaries

between translation and other types of textual activities. The cultural actors I examined all received classical Chinese education, though for different lengths of time, and all experienced the drastic changes in social structure and the transformation of career paths for educated Chinese after the abolition of the imperial civil service examination system. No longer able to reach officialdom from mastering “Confucian classics, history, and literature—areas of knowledge that were closely related and technically undifferentiated”, educated Chinese in the early 20th century had to find new career paths (Xu 2001, 4). The cultural actors examined in my case studies all pursued new career paths made possible by the development of modern printing, publishing, and education in an increasingly professionalized society. Yet they still held onto the ideal of Confucian generalists when discussing and conceptualizing the role of the translator and also engaged in far broader artistic and cultural activities—painting, calligraphy, gardening, etc.—than those from which they earned their living. It would be illuminating to examine how the professionalization of the Chinese translator evolved in relation to the continuance of the model of the generalist Confucian scholar. Further study on this topic will not only yield a more nuanced and intricate picture of historical conceptualizations of translation in modern China. It could also draw attention to the little studied topic of the professionalization of the translator in Chinese translation history and open up for further discussion the criteria for defining translation as a profession in the Chinese context.²

² Volland’s (2014) and Huang’s (2014) recent articles on the emergence of the profession of the translator in China, as far as I know, are two of the few studies that specifically address this issue. Volland (2014) traces the birth of the profession of translators in China to the 1930s, while Huang (2014) traces it to the late 19th and early 20th centuries. Their different conclusions attest to the need of further research on the topic of the professionalization of the Chinese translator.

Bibliography

- Adamo, Sergia. 2006. "Microhistory of Translation." In *Charting the Future of Translation History*, edited by Paul F. Bandia and Georges L. Bastin, 81-100. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Al-Ta'her, Mohammad Anwar. 2008. "The Translation of Intertextual Expressions in Political Articles." PhD diss., University of Salford.
- Allen, Graham. 2000. *Intertextuality*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Altenburger, Roland. 2014. "Appropriating Genius: Jin Shengtian's Construction of Textual Authority and Authorship in his Commented Edition of Shuihu Zhuan (The Water Margin Saga)." In *That Wonderful Composite Called Author: Authorship in East Asian Literatures from the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Christian Schwermann and Raji C. Steineck, 163-94. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Arrojo, Rosemary. 1997. "The 'Death' of the Author and the Limits of the Translator's Visibility." In *Translation as Intercultural Communication: Selected Papers from the EST Congress, Prague 1995*, edited by Mary Snell-Hornby, Zuzana Jettmarová and Klaus Kaindl, 21-32. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 1998. "The Revision of the Traditional Gap Between Theory & Practice & the Empowerment of Translation in Postmodern Times." *The Translator* 4 (1): 25-48.
- Babbitt, Irving. 1908. *Literature and the American College: Essays in Defence of the Humanities*. Boston and New York: Houghton, Mifflin and Company.
- Bai, Liping. 2009. "Anthology Compilation as a Purpose-Driven Activity." *The Translator* 15 (2): 423-9.
- . 白立平. 2017. "'Yi xin cailiao ru jiu gelu': Wu Mi fanyi sixiang yanjiu '以新材料入旧格律': 吴宓翻译思想研究 ['To put new materials in old forms': a study on Wu Mi's ideas on translation]." *Yuyan yu fanyi 语言与翻译* 1: 77-82.
- Bai Liping 白立平, and Zhu Zhiyu 朱志瑜. 2008. "Wu Mi yu 《Xueheng》 zazhi de fanyi 吴宓与《学衡》杂志的翻译 [Wu Mi and the translations in the journal *Critical Review*]." *Translator Quarterly* 49: 40-72.
- Bandia, Paul F. 2014. "Response." *The Translator* 20 (1): 112-8.
- Barry, Peter. 2009. "New Historicism and Cultural Materialism." In *Beginning Theory: An Introduction to Literary and Cultural Theory*, 166-84. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Barthes, Roland. 1975. *The Pleasure of the Text*. New York: Hill and Wang.
- . 1977a. "From Work to Text." In *Image, Music, Text*. Edited by Stephen Heath. 155-64. London: Fontana Press.

- . 1977b. “The Death of the Author.” In *Image, Music, Text*, edited by Stephen Heath, 142-9. London: Fontana Press.
- . 1981. “Theory of the Text.” In *Untying the Text: A Post-Structuralist Reader*, edited by Robert Young, 31-47. Boston and London: Routledge.
- . 1990. *S/Z*. Translated by Richard Howard. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.
- Bassnett, Susan. 1998a. “Transplanting the Seed: Poetry and Translation.” In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 57-76. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- . 1998b. “When is a Translation not a Translation?” In *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literature Translation*, edited by Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, 25-40. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Bastin, Georges L., and Paul F. Bandia, eds. 2006a. *Charting the Future of Translation History*. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- . 2006b. “Introduction.” In *Charting the Future of Translation History*, edited by Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia, 1-9. Ottawa: University of Ottawa Press.
- Benshalom, Yotam. 2012. “Performing Translation: Theatrical Theory and its Relevance to Textual Transfer.” PhD diss., University of Warwick.
- Berg, Daria. 2003. “What the Messenger of Souls Has to Say: New Historicism and the Poetics of Chinese Culture.” In *Reading East Asian Writing: The Limits of Literary Theory*, edited by Michel Hockx and Ivo Smits, 171-203. London: Routledge Curzon.
- Bieler, Stacey. 2004. *“Patriots” or “Traitors”?: A History of American-Educated Chinese Students*. Armonk: M.E. Sharpe.
- Bimberg, Christiane. 1998/99. “Poetry as Procreation: John Dryden’s Creative Concept of Poetry and Imitation.” *Connotations* 8 (3): 304-18.
- Bloom, Harold. 1997. *The Anxiety of Influence*. 2nd ed. New York and Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bonnett, Alastair. 2004. *The Idea of the West: Culture, Politics, and History*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Boyarin, Daniel. 1995. *Carnal Israel: Reading Sex in Talmudic Culture*. Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press.
- Boyden, Michael. 2011. “Beyond ‘Eurocentrism’? The Challenge of Linguistic Justice Theory to Translation Studies.” *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 6 (2): 174-88.
- Britton, Roswell S. 1966. *The Chinese Periodical Press, 1800-1912*. Taipei: Chengwen Publishing.
- Burke, Sean. 1995. *Authorship: From Plato to the Postmodern*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

- Cai Lesu 蔡乐苏, Zhang Yong 张勇, and Wang Xianming 王宪明. 2001. *Wuxu bianfa shi shulungao* 戊戌变法史述论稿 [On the history of the 1898 Reform]. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press.
- Carlson, Marvin. 1985. "Theatrical Performance: Illustration, Translation, Fulfillment, or Supplement?" *Theatre Journal* 37 (1): 5-11.
- Chan, Leo Tak-hung. 2001. "What's Modern in Chinese Translation Theory? Lu Xun and the Debates on Literalism and Foreignization in the May Fourth Period." *TTR: traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 14 (2): 195-223.
- , ed. 2004. *Twentieth-Century Chinese Translation Theory: Modes, Issues and Debates*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Chang, Hao. 1980. "Intellectual Change and the Reform Movement, 1890-8." In *The Cambridge History of China*, edited by John K. Fairbank and Kwang-Ching Liu, 274-338. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Cheetham, Dominic. 2016. "Literary Translation and Conceptual Metaphors: From Movement to Performance." *Translation Studies* 9 (3): 241-55.
- Chen Chen 陈晨, and Zhang Lin 张麟. 2011. "Lun 《Ou-meì mingjia duanpian xiaoshuo congkan》 zhong de chuàngzàoxing panni 论《欧美名家短篇小说丛刊》中的创造性叛逆 [On the creative treason in the *Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers*]." *Xinan shiyou daxue xuebao* 西南石油大学学报 4 (1): 88-91.
- Chen Fukang 陈福康. 1987. "Chuangzào she yu Wenxue yanjiu hui zhi zheng de yuānqǐ yu shìfēi 创造社与文学研究会之争的缘起与是非 [The origins and bones of contention in the disputes between the Creation Society and the Chinese Literary Association]." In *Lu Xun yanjiu ziliao* 鲁迅研究资料 [Research materials on Lu Xun], 154-69. Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe.
- . 1996. *Zhongguo yixue lilun shigao* 中国译学理论史稿 [A draft history of Chinese translation theory]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press. Original edition, 1992.
- Chen, Jianhua. 2002. "A Myth of Violet: Zhou Shoujuan and the Literary Culture of Shanghai, 1911-1927." PhD diss., Harvard University.
- . 2008. "Canon Formation and Linguistic Turn: Literary Debates in Republican China, 1919-1949." In *Beyond the May Fourth Paradigm: In Search of Chinese Modernity*, edited by Kai-wing Chow, 51-67. Lanham and Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- 陈建华. 2014. "Zhou Shoujuan 'yingxi xiaoshuo' yu minguo chuqi wenxue xin jingguan 周瘦鹃“影戏小说”与民国初期文学新景观 [Zhou Shoujuan's 'film fictions' and the new literary landscape in early Republican China]." *Modern Chinese Literature Studies* 2: 19-32.
- Chen Jianzhong 陈建中 1993. "Wu Mi de yishi 吴宓的译诗 [Wu Mi's poetry translation]." *Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu* 外语教学与研究 2: 31-8.

- Chen Jun 陈钧. 1923. "Mengzhong ernü 梦中儿女 [Dream-children: A reverie]." *Xueheng* 学衡 9: 1-6.
- Chen, Ping. 1999. *Modern Chinese: History and Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Cambridge University Press.
- . 2015. "Language Reform in Modern China." In *The Oxford Handbook of Chinese Linguistics*, edited by S. Y. Wang William and Sun Chaofen, 532-40. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chen Pingyuan 陈平原. 1989. *20 shiji Zhongguo xiaoshuo shi* 20 世纪中国小说史 [A history of 20th-century Chinese fiction]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- . 2003. *Zhongguo xiaoshuo xushi moshi de zhuanbian* 中国小说叙事模式的转变 [Changes in the narrative modes in Chinese fiction]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- . 2005. *Zhongguo xiandai xiaoshuo de qidian: Qingmo minchu xiaoshuo yanjiu* 中国现代小说的起点：清末民初小说研究 [The beginning of modern Chinese fiction: A study on fiction in late Qing and early Republican China]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- . 2011. *Touches of History: An Entry into 'May Fourth' China*. Translated by Michel Hockx, Maria af Sandeberg, Uganda Sze Pui Kwan, Christopher Neil Payne and Christopher Rosenmeier. Edited by Michel Hockx. Leiden: Brill.
- Chen Shuyu 陈漱渝. 1977. "Lu Xun yu tongsu jiaoyu yanjiuhui 鲁迅与通俗教育研究会 [Lu Xun and the popular education research committee]." *Shandong shiyuan xuebao* 山东师院学报 5:72-5.
- Chen Yiyuan 陈益源, and Lai Chengjun 赖承俊. 2011. "Yuyue wenren Miao Gen yu Yuenan shijie de yinyuan jihui—cong biji xiaoshuo 《Tushuo》 tanqi 寓粤文人繆良与越南使节的因缘际会——从笔记小说《涂说》谈起 [Friendship between Miao Gen, a sojourner in Guangdong, and diplomats from Vietnam—a probe into the note-form sketch *Tushuo*]." *Mingqing xiaoshuo yanjiu* 明清小说研究 (2): 212-26.
- Chen Zizhan 陈子展. 1929. *Zhongguo jindai wenxue zhi bianqian* 中国近代文学之变迁 [Changes in early modern Chinese literature]. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian.
- Chesterman, Andrew. 2013. "Translation Studies Forum: Universalism in Translation Studies." *Translation Studies* 7 (1): 82-90.
- Cheung, Martha. 1998. "The Discourse of Occidentalism? Wei Yi and Lin Shu's Treatment of Religious Material in Their Translation of *Uncle Tom's Cabin*." In *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840-1918*, edited by David Pollard, 131-49. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2003. "From 'Theory' to 'Discourse': The Making of a Translation Anthology." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 66 (3): 390-401.

- . 2005. “‘To Translate’ Means ‘to Exchange’?: A New Interpretation of the Earliest Chinese Attempts to Define Translation (‘Fanyi’).” *Target* 17 (1): 27-48.
- , ed. 2006. *An Anthology of Chinese Discourse on Translation, Volume 1: From Earliest Times to the Buddhist Project*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2007. “On Thick Translation as a Mode of Cultural Representation.” In *Across Boundaries: International Perspectives on Translation Studies*, edited by Dorothy Kenny and Kyongjoo Ryou, 22-35. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2011. “Reconceptualizing Translation—Some Chinese Endeavours.” *Meta* 56 (1): 1-19.
- . 2012. “The Mediated Nature of Knowledge and the Pushing-Hands Approach to Research on Translation History.” *Translation Studies* 5 (2): 156-71.
- Chiang, Sing-chen Lydia. 2005. *Collecting the Self: Body and Identity in Strange Tale Collections of Late Imperial China*. Leiden: Brill.
- Chow, Kai-wing, Tze-ki Hon, Hung-yok Ip, and Don C. Price, eds. 2008a. *Beyond the May Fourth Paradigm: In Search of Chinese Modernity*. Lanham: Lexington.
- . 2008b. “Introduction.” In *Beyond the May Fourth Paradigm: In Search of Chinese Modernity*, edited by Kai-wing Chow, Tze-ki Hon, Hung-yok Ip and Don C. Price, 1-23. Lanham: Lexington.
- Chow, Rey. 1986. “Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies: Toward a Rewriting of Modern Chinese Literary History.” PhD Diss., Stanford University.
- Chow, Tse-tsung. 1967. *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Chu, Chi Yu. 2011. “Traditional Ideas on Translation in China (3rd to 19th Century).” In *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert and Fritz Paul, 2167-72. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Cohen, Paul A. 1997. *History in Three Keys: The Boxers as Event, Experience, and Myth*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Cohen, Walter. 1990. “Political Criticism of Shakespeare.” In *Shakespeare Reproduced: The Text in History and Ideology*, edited by Jean E. Howard and Marion O’Connor, 18-46. London and New York: Routledge. Original edition, 1987.
- CR (Critical Review). 1923. “A Statement by The Critical Review.” *Xueheng* 学衡 13.
- Crisafulli, Edoardo. 2002. “The Quest for an Eclectic Methodology of Translation Description.” *Crosscultural Transgressions. Research Models in Translation Studies II. Historical and Ideological Issues*: 26-43.

- D'hulst, Lieven. 2001. "Why and How to Write Translation Histories." In *Emerging Views on Translation History in Brazil*, edited by John Milton, 21–32. Sao Paulo: Humanitas FFLCH / USP.
- . 2010. "Translation History." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 397–405. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- De Beaugrande, Robert, and Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler. 1981. *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.
- Deane-Cox, Sharon. 2014. *Retranslation: Translation, Literature and Reinterpretation*. London: Bloomsbury.
- Delisle, Jean, and Judith Woodsworth. 2012. *Translators through History*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Deng Wei 邓伟. 2010. "Guihua yu ouhua: Shi lun qingmo minchu fanyi wenxue yuyan de jiangou qingxiang 归化与欧化：试论清末民初翻译文学语言的建构倾向 [Domestication and foreignization: a tentative discussion about the language in translated literature from late Qing and early Republican China]." *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art* 3: 69–74.
- Dentith, Simon. 1995. *Bakhtinian Thought: An Introductory Reader*. London: Routledge.
- Denton, Kirk A., ed. 1996. *Modern Chinese Literary Thought: Writings on Literature, 1893–1945*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Denton, Kirk A., and Michel Hockx. 2008. "Introduction." In *Literary Societies of Republican China*, edited by Kirk A. Denton and Michel Hockx, 1–14. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Derrida, Jacques. 1982. "Différance." In *Margins of Philosophy*, 3–27. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- . 1985. "Des Tours de Babel." In *Difference in Translation*, edited by Joseph F. Graham, 165–207. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- . 1987. *Positions*. Translated by Alan Bass. London: Athlone Press.
- . 1988. *Limited Inc.* Evanston: Northwestern University Press.
- Dolby, William. 1976. *A History of Chinese Drama*. London: Paul Elek.
- Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena, Oldřich Král, and Graham Sanders, eds. 2001. *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Asia Center.
- Doleželová-Velingerová, Milena, and David Der-wei Wang. 2001. "Introduction." In *The Appropriation of Cultural Capital: China's May Fourth Project*, edited by Milena Doleželová-Velingerová, Oldřich Král and Graham Sanders, 1–27. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

- Dong, Hongyuan. 2014. *A History of the Chinese Language*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Dong Zhiying 董智颖. 2005. “Chen Diexian yanjiu 陈蝶仙研究 [A study on Chen Diexian].” Master thesis, East China Normal University.
- Du Xinyan 杜新艳. 2008. “Wanqing baokan huixie wenxue yu xiequ wenhua chaoliu 晚清报刊诙谐文学与谐趣文化潮流 [Humorous literature and cultural trends in late-Qing journals].” *Wanqing wenxue yanjiu* 晚清文学研究 (5): 56-69.
- Dungen 钝根 [Wang Dungen 王钝根]. (1917) 1931. “Dungen xu 钝根序 [Foreword by Dungen].” In *Ou-mei mingjia duanpianxiaoshuo congke* 欧美名家短篇小说丛刻 [Collection of short stories by famous European and American writers], 1-2. Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju.
- Haitian duxiaozi 海天独啸子 [pseud.]. (1903) 1989. “《Kongzhong feiting》 bianyan 《空中飞艇》弁言 [Preface to *The flying ship of the air*].” In *Ershi shiji zhongguo xiaoshuo lilun zillion* 二十世纪中国小说理论资料 [Theoretical materials of Chinese fiction in the twentieth century], edited by Chen Pingyuan 陈平原 and Xia Xiaohong 夏晓红. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Eagleton, Terry. 1996. *Literary Theory: An Introduction*. 2nd ed. Malden, Oxford and Carlton: Blackwell Publishing.
- Eber, Irene. 1977. “Images of Oppressed Peoples and Modern Chinese Literature.” In *Modern Chinese Literature in the May Fourth Era*, edited by Merle Goldman, 127-42.
- Edwards, Louise. 2001. “New Hongxue and the ‘Birth of the Author:’ Yu Pingbo’s ‘On Qin Keqing’s Death’.” *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 23: 31-54.
- Elman, Benjamin A. 2000. *A Cultural History of Civil Examinations in Late Imperial China*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- . 2013. *Civil Examinations and Meritocracy in Late Imperial China*. Cambridge and London: Harvard University Press.
- Esherick, Joseph, and Mary Backus Rankin, eds. 1990. *Chinese Local Elites and Patterns of Dominance*. Berkeley and Oxford: University of California Press.
- Even-Zohar, Itamar. 1978. *Papers in Historical Poetics*. Tel Aviv: Porter Institute for Poetics and Semiotics.
- . 1990. “Polysystem Studies.” *Poetics Today* 11 (1): 1-269.
- Fairclough, Norman. 1992. *Discourse and Social Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Fan Boqun 范伯群. 1989. *Libailiu de hudie meng—lun yuanyang hudie pai* 礼拜六的蝴蝶梦——论鸳鸯蝴蝶派 [The butterfly dream of Saturday—on the Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School]. Beijing: Renmin wenxue chubanshe.
- . 1996. “Bao Tianxiao, Zhou Shoujuan, Xu Zhuodai de wenxue fanyi dui xiaoshuo chuanguo zhi cujin 包天笑、周瘦鹃、徐卓呆的文学翻译对小说创作之促进 [On how Bao Tianxiao’s, Zhou Shoujuan’s and Xu Zhuodai’s

- literary translation helped their fiction writing].” *Jianghai xuekan* 江海学刊 6: 171-5.
- Fang Kairui 方开瑞. 2007. “Cong Wu Mi de fanyi huodong kan xiaoshuo fanyi zhong de xushu wenti de bianhua 从吴宓的翻译活动看小说翻译中叙述文体的变化 [Narrative and stylistic changes in Wu Mi’s fiction translation].” *Chinese Translators Journal* 1: 32-5.
- Fang, Weigui. 2001. “Yi, Yang, Xi, Wai and Other Terms: The Transition from ‘Barbarian’ to ‘Foreigner’ in Late Imperial China.” In *New Terms for New Ideas: Western Knowledge and Lexical Change in Late Imperial China*, edited by Michael Lackner, Iwo Amelung and Joachim Kurtz, 95-123. Leiden, Boston and Köln: Brill.
- Fengsheng 风声. 1922. “Gu ‘Xueheng’ 估‘学衡’ [Appraising *Critical Review*].” *Chenbao fukan* 晨报副刊, February 9, 3.
- Feuerwerker, Yi-tsi Mei. 2008. “Reconsidering *Xueheng*: Neo-Conservatism in Early Republican China.” In *Literary Societies of Republican China*, edited by Kirk A. Denton and Michel Hockx, 137-69. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- Flynn, Peter. 2011. “How Eurocentric is Europe?” *Translation and Interpreting Studies* 6 (2): 157-73.
- Fong, Gilbert C. F. 1995. “Translated Literature in Pre-Modern China.” In *An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English, English-Chinese*, edited by Sin-wai Chan and David E. Pollard, 580-90. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- Foucault, Michel. 1980. “What is an Author?” In *Textual Strategies: Perspectives in Post-Structuralist Criticism*, edited by Josué V. Harari, 141-60. London: Methuen.
- Fu Hongxing 傅宏星. 2015. “Wu Mi ‘fanyi shu’ kecheng jiaoxue chutan 吴宓‘翻译术’课程教学初探 [A preliminary study on Wu Mi’s pedagogy in his translation courses].” *Waiguo yuwen* 外国语文 31 (6): 118-26.
- Fu Jin 傅谨. 2000. *Zhongguo xiju yishu lun* 中国戏剧艺术论 [A study on the art of traditional Chinese theater]. Taiyuan: Shanxi jiaoyu chubanshe.
- Fu Sinian 傅斯年 1919. “Yi shu ganyan 译书感言 [Thoughts on translation].” *Xinchao* 新潮 1 (3): 178-83.
- Fung, Edmund S. K. 2010. *The Intellectual Foundations of Chinese Modernity: Cultural and Political Thought in the Republican Era*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Galik, Marian. 1980. “The Concept of Creative Personality in Traditional Chinese Literary Criticism.” *Oriens Extremus* 27 (2): 183-202.
- Gallagher, Catherine, and Stephen Greenblatt. 2000. “Introduction.” In *Practicing New Historicism*. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.

- Gamsa, Mark. 2008. *The Chinese Translation of Russian Literature: Three Studies*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Gao Yu 高玉. 2000. "Lun zhongguo jindai fanyi wenxue de 'gudaixing' 论中国近代翻译文学的 '古代性' [On the 'antique feature' of early modern Chinese literary translation]." *Journal of Central China Normal University* 39 (4): 66-72.
- Ge Gongzhen 戈公振. 1927. *Zhongguo baoxue shi* 中国报学史 [A history of the Chinese periodical press]. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.
- Geertz, Clifford. 1988. *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Genette, Gérard. 1997a. *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press.
- . 1997b. *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*. Translated by Jane E. Lewin. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- . 1988. "The Proustian Paratexte." Translated by Amy G. McIntosh. *SubStance* 17 (2): 63-77.
- Gentz, Joachim. 2009. *Keywords Re-Oriented, interKULTUR*. Göttingen: Universitätsverlag Göttingen.
- Gentzler, Edwin. 2004. *Contemporary Translation Theories*. 2nd ed. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Gimpel, Denise. 2001. *Lost Voices of Modernity: A Chinese Popular Fiction Magazine in Context*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Ginzburg, Carlo. 1992. *The Cheese and the Worms: The Cosmos of a Sixteenth-Century Miller*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1993. "Microhistory: Two or Three Things That I Know about it." *Critical Inquiry* 20 (1): 10-35.
- Ginzburg, Carlo, and Carlo Poni. 1991. "The Name and the Game: Unequal Exchange and the Historiographic Marketplace." In *Microhistory and the Lost Peoples of Europe*, 1-10. Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University.
- Greenblatt, Stephen. 1987. "Towards a Poetics of Cultures." *Southern Review* 20 (1): 3-15.
- . 1990. *Learning to Curse: Essays in Early Modern Culture*. London: Routledge.
- Grendi, Edoardo. 1977. "Microanalisi e storia sociale." *Quaderni Storici* 35: 506-20.
- Grieder, Jerome B. 1981. *Intellectuals and the State in Modern China: A Narrative History*. New York and London: Collier Macmillan.
- Gu, Ming Dong. 2006. *Chinese Theories of Fiction: A Non-Western Narrative System*. Albany: SUNY Press.

- Gu Nong 顾农. 2012. "Lu Xun dui yanghupai de kending yu guiquan 鲁迅对鸯蝴派的肯定与规劝 [Lun Xun's recognition of and exhortations for the Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School]." *Zhongshan fengyu* 钟山风雨 2: 61-3.
- Gu Zhengkun 辜正坤. 2003. *Zhongxi shi bijiao jianshang yu fanyi lilun* 中西诗比较鉴赏与翻译理论 [China and West: comparative poetics and translatology]. Beijing: Tsinghua University Press.
- Guldin, Rainer. 2016. *Translation as Metaphor*. New York: Routledge.
- Guo Moruo 郭沫若. 1921. "Tongxun 通讯 [Communication]." *Minduo Zazhi* 民铎杂志, 2 (5), 1-4.
- . (1921) 1992. "Zhi Zheng Zhenduo 致郑振铎 [To Zheng Zhenduo]." In *Guo Moruo shuxin ji* 郭沫若书信集, edited by Huang Chunhao 黄淳浩, 194-7. Beijing: Beijing shehui kexue chubanshe.
- . 1923. "Taolun zhuyi yundong ji qita 讨论注译运动及其他 [On the movement of annotation-translation and others]." *Chuangzao jikan* 创造季刊 2 (1): 33-43.
- Guo Yang 郭杨. 2009. "Lin yi xiaoshuo yanjiu 林译小说研究 [A study of Lin Shu's fiction translations]." PhD diss., Fudan University.
- Guo Yanli 郭延礼. 2000. "Zhongguo jindai fanyi wenxueshi de fenqi ji qi zhuyao tedian 中国近代翻译文学史的分期及其主要特点 [Stages of literary translation history in early modern China and their main features]." In *Fanyi yu chuanguo: Zhongguo jindai fanyi xiaoshuo lun* 翻译与创作: 中国近代翻译小说论 [Translation and creation: on early modern Chinese translation of foreign fiction], edited by Laurence Wong, 56-87. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Hanan, Patrick. 2004. *Chinese Fiction of the Nineteenth and Early Twentieth Centuries*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hatim, Basil, and Ian Mason. 1990. *Discourse and the Translator*. London and New York: Longman.
- Hermans, Theo, ed. 2002. *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II; Historical and Ideological Issues*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2003. "Translation, Equivalence and Intertextuality." *Wasafiri* 18 (40): 39-41.
- , ed. 2006. *Translating Others*. Vol. 1. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2007a. *The Conference of the Tongues*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2007b. "Translation, Irritation and Resonance." In *Constructing a Sociology of Translation*, edited by Michaela Wolf and Alexandra Fukari, 57-75. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2012. "Descriptive Translation Studies." In *The Encyclopedia of Applied Linguistics*, edited by Carol A. Chapelle, 1-5. Blackwell Publishing.

- Hill, Michael. 2013. *Lin Shu, Inc.: Translation and the Making of Modern Chinese Culture*. Oxford and New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hockx, Michel. 2002. *Questions of Style: Literary Societies and Literary Journals in Modern China, 1911-1937*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Hoeveler, J. David. 1977. *The New Humanism: A Critique of Modern America, 1900-1940*: Charlottesville : University Press of Virginia.
- Hon, Tze-ki. 2008. "From Babbitt to 'Bai Bide': Interpretations of New Humanism in *Xueheng*." In *Beyond the May Fourth Paradigm: In Search of Chinese Modernity*, edited by Kai-wing Chow, Tze-ki Hon, Hung-yok Ip and Don C. Price, 253-67. Plymouth: Lexington Books.
- . 2015. *Allure of the Nation: The Cultural and Historical Debates in Late Qing and Republican China*. Leiden: Brill.
- Hsu, Tao-Ching. 1985. *The Chinese Conception of the Theatre*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Hu, Chengye. 2007. "Hu Shi and the First Advocate of the New Punctuation, Wang Yuanfang." *Chinese Studies in History* 40 (4): 86-92.
- Hu Cui'e 胡翠娥. 2007a. "Fanyi yu quanli—Wusi qijian wenhua jijin zhuyi he wenhua shoucheng zhuyi de fanyi lunzheng 翻译与权力——五四期间文化激进主义和文化守成主义的翻译论争 [Translation and power—translation debates between cultural radicalism and cultural conservatism in the May Fourth period]." *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University* 14 (4): 18-24.
- . 2007b. *Wenxue fanyi yu wenhua canyu—wanqing xiaoshuo fanyi de wenhua yanjiu 文学翻译与文化参与——晚清小说翻译的文化研究 [Literary translation and cultural participation: a cultural study on late-Qing fiction translations]*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Hu Cui'e 胡翠娥, and Zhao Weiya 赵为亚. 2009. "Cong Xin qingnian dao Chuangzao kan zhongguo xiandai fanyi piping de fasheng qiyuan 从新青年到创造看中国现代翻译批评的发生起源 [Genesis of modern Chinese translation criticism: from *New Youth* to *Creation*]." *Waiguo yu 外国语* 32 (5): 68-74.
- Hu Shi 胡适. 1916. "Lun judou ji wenzi fuhao 论句读及文字符号 [On punctuation and marks in the written language]." *Kexue 科学* 2 (1): 9-34.
- . (1920) 1953a. "Shuihu zhuan kaozheng 水浒传考证 [Textual research of the *Water Margin*]." In *Hu Shi wencun 胡适文存 [Collected essays of Hu Shi]*, 500-47. Taipei: Yuandong tushu gongsi.
- . (1920) 1953b. "Wushi nian lai zhongguo zhi wenxue 五十年来中国之文学 [Chinese literature in the past fifty years]." In *Hu Shi wencun 胡适文存 [Collected essays of Hu Shi]*, 180-261. Taipei: Yuandong tushu gongsi.
- Hu, Ying. 2000. *Tales of Translation: Composing the New Woman in China, 1899-1918*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Huang, Martin W. 1990. "Dehistoricization and Intertextualization: The Anxiety of Precedents in the Evolution of the Traditional Chinese Novel." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 12: 45-68.
- . 1994. "Author(ity) and Reader in Traditional Chinese Xiaoshuo Commentary." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 16: 41-67.
- Huang, Philip C. C. 1993. "'Public Sphere'/'Civil Society' in China?: The Third Realm between State and Society." *Modern China* 19 (2): 216-40.
- Huang Yanqun 黄艳群. 2014. "Wanqing yizhe zhiyehua qingxiang tanxi 晚清译者职业化倾向探析 [On translators' professionalization in late-Qing China]." *Hangzhou dianzi keji daxue xuebao* 杭州电子科技大学学报 10 (2): 65-9.
- Hung, Eva. 1998. "Sherlock Holmes in Early Twentieth Century China (1896-1916)—Popular Fiction as an Educational Tool." In *Translators' Strategies and Creativity*, edited by Ann Beylard-Ozeroff, Jana Králová and Barbara Moser-Mercer, 71-79. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2005a. *Chongxie fanyishi* 重写翻译史 [Rewriting Chinese translation history]. Hong Kong: Research Centre for Translation, Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- . 2005b. "Translation in China—An Analytical Survey: First Century B.C.E to Early Twentieth Century." In *Asian Translation Traditions*, edited by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi, 67-107. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2006. "'And the Translator is—': Translators in Chinese History." In *Translating Others*, edited by Theo Hermans, 145-60. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2011. "The Buddhist Translation Movement in China (2nd to 11th Century)." In *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert and Fritz Paul, 2178-84. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Hung, Eva, and Judy Wakabayashi, eds. 2005a. *Asian Translation Traditions*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2005b. "Introduction." In *Asian Translation Traditions*, edited by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi, 1-15. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Idema, Wilt L. 2001. "Traditional Dramatic Literature." In *The Columbia History of Chinese Literature*, edited by Victor H. Mair, 785-847. New York: Columbia University Press.
- . 2005. "The Many Shapes of Medieval Chinese Plays: How Texts are Transformed to Meet the Needs of Actors, Spectators, Censors, and Readers." *Oral Tradition* 20 (2): 320-34.
- Jiang Baili 蒋百里 [Baili 百里, pseud.]. 1921. "Fanyi shiye zhi yanjiu: Ouzhou wenyi fuxing shiqi fanyi shiye zhi xianli 翻译事业之研究：欧洲文艺复兴时期翻

- 译事业之先例 [A study on the cause of translation: precedents of translation undertakings in European Renaissance].” *Gaizao* 改造 3 (11): 69-78.
- Jiang Jiajun 江家骏. 2001. Huainian enshi Wu Mi (Yuseng) xiansheng 怀念恩师吴宓(雨僧)先生 [Reminiscing about my respected teacher Wu Mi (Yuseng)]. In *Zhuiyi Wu Mi* 追忆吴宓 [Remembrances of Wu Mi], edited by Li Jikai 李继凯 and Liu Ruichun 刘瑞春. Beijing: Shehui kexue wenxian chubanshe.
- Judge, Joan. 1996. *Print and Politics: “Shibao” and the Culture of Reform in Late Qing China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Juvan, Marko. 2008. *History and Poetics of Intertextuality*. Translated by Timothy Pogačar. West Lafayette: Purdue University Press.
- Kaske, Elisabeth. 2008. *The Politics of Language in Chinese Education, 1895-1919*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Kothari, Rita, and Judy Wakabayashi. 2009. “Introduction.” In *Decentering Translation Studies: India and beyond*, edited by Judy Wakabayashi and Rita Kothari, 1-15. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Kovala, Urpo. 1996. “Translations, Paratextual Mediation, and Ideological Closure.” *Target* 8 (1): 119-47.
- Kristeva, Julia. 1968. *Semeiotikè: recherches pour une sémanalyse*. Paris: Seuil.
- . 1980. *Desire in Language: A Semiotic Approach to Literature and Art*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kuo, Ya-pei. 2017. “The Making of the New Culture Movement: A Discursive History.” *Twentieth-Century China* 42 (1): 52-71.
- Kwan, Uganda Sze Pui 2008. “Cong Lin Shu kan wenxue fanyi guifan you wanqing zhongguo dao wusi de zhuanbian: Xihua, xiandaihua he yi yuanzhu wei zhongxin de guannian 从林纾看文学翻译规范由晚清中国到五四的转变：西化、现代化和以原著为中心的观念 [Westernization, modernization, and the concept of basing on the source text: a study of the transformation of norms in literary translation from late Qing to the May Fourth period with Lin Shu as a case study].” *Journal of Chinese Studies* 48: 343-71.
- LaCapra, Dominick. 1989. *Soundings in Critical Theory*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
- Lai, Chung Hsiung. 2006. “Limits and Beyond: Greenblatt, New Historicism and a Feminist Genealogy.” *Intergrams* 7.1-7.2: 1-29
- Lai, Sharon Tzu-yun. 2012. “Yiyi yipi: Wu Guangjian de yizhe pizhu yu pingdian chuantong 亦译亦批：伍光建的译者批注与评点传统 [Translator as commentator: on the translator’s notes by Woo Kuang Kien].” *Bianyi luncong* 编译论丛 5 (2): 1-29.
- Lambert, José. 1993. “History, Historiography and the Discipline. A Programme.” In *Translation and Knowledge: SSOTT IV (Scandinavian Symposium on*

- Translation Theory, Turku, 4-6.6.1992*), edited by Yves Gambier and Jorma Tammola, 3-25. Turku: University of Turku.
- Lee, Kwok-Kan Gloria. 2010. "Power and the Translator: Joseph Conrad in Chinese Translations during the Republican Era (1912-1937)." PhD diss., University College London.
- Lee, Leo Ou-Fan, and Andrew J. Nathan. 1985. "The Beginnings of Mass Culture: Journalism and Fiction in the Late Ch'ing and Beyond." In *Popular Culture in Late Imperial China*, edited by Christopher Johnson, Andrew J. Nathan and Evelyn Sakakida Rawski. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Lee, Thomas H. C. 2000. *Education in Traditional China: A History*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lefevre, André. 1992. *Translation, Rewriting, and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London: Routledge.
- Levi, Giovanni. 1988. *Inheriting Power: The Story of an Exorcist*. Translated by Lydia Cochrane. Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press.
- . 2001. "On Microhistory." In *New Perspectives on Historical Writing*, edited by Peter Burke, 97-119. Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania State University Press.
- . 2012. "Microhistory and the Recovery of Complexity." In *Historical Knowledge: In Quest of Theory, Method and Evidence*, edited by Susanna Fellman and Marjatta Rahikainen, 121-32. Newcastle-upon-Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- Lewis, Mark Edward. 1999. *Writing and Authority in Early China*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Li Chun 李春. 2012. "'Wenzi shi sixiang di henji'——wenxue fanyi ruhe canyu xinwenxue de yuyan biange '文字是思想底痕迹'——文学翻译如何参与新文学的语言变革 ['Words are traces of thought'—on how literary translation participated in the language reform of the New Culture Movement]." *Hanyuyan wenxue yanjiu* 汉语言文学研究 3 (3): 127-35.
- Li, Dechao. 2006. "A Study of Zhou Shoujuan's Translation of Western Fiction." PhD diss., The Hong Kong Polytechnic University.
- Li Dechao 李德超, and Deng Jing 邓静. 2004. "Jindai fanyi wenxueshi shang bugai yiwang de jiaoluo——yuanyang hudie pai zuojia de fanyi huodong ji qi yingxiang 近代翻译文学史上不该遗忘的角落——鸳鸯蝴蝶派作家的翻译活动及其影响 [An undeserved forgotten corner in the history of modern translated literature of China—the Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School's translation activities and influence]." *Sichuan waiyu xueyuan xuebao* 四川外语学院学报 20 (1): 123-27.
- Li, Tonglu. 2008. "New Humanism." *Modern Language Quarterly* 69 (1): 61-79.
- Li, Wai-yee. 2016. "The Letter to Ren An and Authorship in the Chinese Tradition." In *The Letter to Ren An and Sima Qian's Legacy*, edited by Stephen Durrant, Wai-yee Li, Michael Nylan and Hans van Ess. Seattle: University of Washington Press.

- . 2017. “Concepts of Authorship.” In *The Oxford Handbook of Classical Chinese Literature*, edited by Wiebke Denecke, Wai-ye Li and Xiaofei Tian, 360-76. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Li Yi 李怡. 2010. *Zhongguo wenxue de xiandaixing: Pipan de pipan* 中国文学的现代性: 批判的批判 [Modernity of Chinese literature: a criticism of criticism]. Taipei: Showwe Information.
- Li, Yu. 2003. “A History of Reading in Late Imperial China, 1000-1800.” PhD diss., The Ohio State University.
- Liao Qiyi 廖七一. 2010. *Zhongguo jindai fanyi sixiang de shanbian* 中国近代翻译思想的嬗变 [Transformations in Chinese thinking about translation in early modern China]. Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
- . 2014. “Wanqing piping huayu yu fanyi shijian 晚清批评话语与翻译实践 [Criticism and practice of translation in late Qing China].” *Foreign Language and Literature* 30 (6): 104-9.
- Lin Gang 林岗. 2012. *Mingqing xiaoshuo pingdian* 明清小说评点 [Fiction commentary in Ming and Qing dynasties]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Lin Shu 林纾. (1905) 1913. “Xiao yin 小引 [Preface].” In *Jiayin xiaozhuan* 迦茵小传 [Biography of Joan Haste], 1-2. Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- . (1905) 1989a. “Feizhou yanshui choucheng lu xu 斐洲烟水愁城录序 [Preface to *Allan Quatermain*].” In *Ershi shiji zhongguo xiaoshuo lilun ziliao* 二十世纪中国小说理论资料 [Theoretical materials of Chinese fiction in the twentieth century], edited by Chen Pingyuan 陈平原 and Xia Xiaohong 夏晓虹, 141-2. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- . (1905) 1989b. “Guishan langxia zhuan xu 鬼山狼侠传叙 [Preface to *Nada the Lily*].” In *Ershi shiji zhongguo xiaoshuo lilun ziliao* 二十世纪中国小说理论资料 [Theoretical materials of Chinese fiction in the twentieth century], edited by Chen Pingyuan 陈平原 and Xia Xiaohong 夏晓虹, 142. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- . (1906) 1989. “Honghan nülang zhuan bayu 洪罕女郎传跋语 [Postscript to *Colonel Quaritch, V.C.*].” In *Ershi shiji zhongguo xiaoshuo lilun ziliao* 二十世纪中国小说理论资料 [Theoretical materials of Chinese fiction in the twentieth century], edited by Chen Pingyuan 陈平原 and Xia Xiaohong 夏晓虹, 163. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Link, E. Perry. 1981. *Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies: Popular Fiction in Early Twentieth-Century Chinese Cities*. Berkeley and London: University of California Press.
- Littau, Karin. 1993. “Intertextuality and Translation: *The Waste Land* in French and German.” In *Translation—The Vital Link*, edited by Catriona Picken, 63-9. London: Institute of Translation and Interpreting.
- . 1997. “Translation in the Age of Postmodern Production: From Text to Intertext to Hypertext.” *Forum for Modern Language Studies* 33 (1): 81-96.

- Liu, Alan. 1989. "The Power of Formalism: The New Historicism." *ELH* 56 (4): 721-71.
- Liu Delong 刘德隆. 2006. "Chufang·tangbei·Yinbansheng——dui wanqing yiwei xiaoshuo lilun yanjiuzhe de kaocha yu tantao 出房·堂备·寅半生——对晚清一位小说理论研究者的考察与探讨[A discussion about a late-Qing fiction theorist—Yinbansheng]." *Mingqing xiaoshuo yanjiu* 明清小说研究 (2): 128-38.
- Liu Hongtao 刘洪涛, and Liu Qian 刘倩. 2008. "Lun Lin yi xiaoshuo 《Jiayin xiaozhuan》 zhong de chuangzaoxing panni 论林译小说《迦茵小传》中的创造性叛逆 [On the creative treason in Lin's translation of *Joan Haste*]." *Beijing shifan daxue xuebao* 北京师范大学学报 3: 44-51.
- Liu, Lydia H. 1995. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—China, 1900-1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 1999. "Introduction." In *Tokens of Exchange: The Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, edited by Lydia H. Liu, 1-7. Durham: Duke University Press.
- Liu Qian 刘倩. 2010. "Lun Yang、 Bao yi 《Jiayin xiaozhuan》 de chuangzaoxing panni ji qi xiangguan wenti 论杨、包译《迦茵小传》的创造性叛逆及其相关问题 [On the creative treason in Yang and Bao's translation of *Joan Haste* and related issues]." *Journal of Chuxiong Normal University* 25 (11): 51-61.
- . 2017. *Transcultural Lyricism: Translation, Intertextuality, and the Rise of Emotion in Modern Chinese Love Fiction, 1899-1925*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Liu, Xiaogan. 2011. "Daoism: Laozi and Zhuangzi." In *The Oxford Handbook of World Philosophy*, edited by William Edelglass and Jay L. Garfield. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Liu Xiaogang 刘小刚. 2006. "Chuangzaoxing panni: gainian, lilun yu lishi miaoshu 创造性叛逆：概念、理论与历史描述 [Creative treason: concept, theory, and historical description]." PhD diss., Fudan University.
- Long, Lynne. 2007. "History and Translation." In *The Companion to Translation Studies*, edited by Piotr Kuhiwczak and Karin Littau, 63-76. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.
- Lou Xiaokai 娄晓凯. 2013. *Chongtu yu zhenghe: Lun juyou liuxue beijing de zhongguo xiandai zhongguo zuojia* 冲突与整合：论具有留学背景的中国现代作家 [Clash and integration: on modern Chinese writers with experience of studying abroad]. Taipei: Showwe Information.
- Lu Liangcheng 陆亮成. 1906. "Yueyue xiaoshuo fakanci 月月小说发刊词 [Inaugural words to *All-Story Monthly*]." *Yueyue xiaoshuo* 月月小说 1 (3): 1-10.
- Lu, Sheldon H. 1994. *From Historicity to Fictionality: The Chinese Poetics of Narrative*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

- Lu Xun 鲁迅. 1931. "Shnanghai wenyi zhi yipie 上海文艺之一瞥 [A glance at literature and art in Shanghai]." *Wenyi xinwen* 文艺新闻: 20-1.
- Luo Xinzhang 罗新璋, ed. 1984. *Fanyi lunji* 翻译论集 [An anthology of essays on translation]. Beijing: Commercial Press.
- Luo, Xuanmin. 2005. "Ideology and Literary Translation: Liang Qichao." *Perspectives* 13 (3): 178-87.
- . 2006. "Huwenxing yu fanyi 互文性与翻译 [Intertextuality and translation]." PhD diss., Lingnan University.
- Luo, Zhitian. 2015. *Inheritance Within Rupture: Culture and Scholarship in Early Twentieth Century China*. Translated by Lane Harris and Mei Chun. Leiden: Brill.
- Ma Zuyi 马祖毅. 1998. *Zhongguo fanyi jianshi (Wusi yiqian bufen)* 中国翻译简史(五四以前部分) [A brief history of translation in China (before the May Fourth period)]. 2nd ed. Beijing: Beijing duiwai fanyi chuban gongsi.
- Mackerras, Colin. 2016. "Traditional Chinese Theatre." In *Routledge Handbook of Asian Theatre*, edited by Siyuan Liu. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Macksey, Richard. 1997. "Foreword." In *Paratexts: Thresholds of Interpretation*, xi-xxiv. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mair, Victor H. 1983. "The Narrative Revolution in Chinese Literature: Ontological Presuppositions." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 5 (1/2): 1-27.
- Mao Dun 茅盾[Shen Yanbing 沈雁冰]. 1921. "Yi wenxueshu fangfa de taolun 译文学书方法的讨论 [Discussion on methods of translating literary works]." *Xiaoshuo yuebao* 小说月报 12 (4): 8-12.
- [Bing 冰, pseud]. 1922. "Xieshi xiaoshuo zhi liubi 写实小说之流弊 [The pitfalls of realistic novels]." *Wenxue xunkan* 文学旬刊 54.
- McComiskey, Bruce. 2016. "Introduction." In *Microhistories of Composition*, edited by Bruce McComiskey, 3-38. Logan: Utah State University Press.
- McDougall, Bonnie S. 2003. *Fictional Authors, Imaginary Audiences: Modern Chinese Literature in the Twentieth Century*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- McMaster, Rowland. 1991. *Thackeray's Cultural Frame of Reference: Allusion in The Newcomes*. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Miyajima, Darja. 2014. "Linguistic Awareness and Language Use: The Chinese Literati at the Beginning of the Twentieth Century." In *Divided Languages?: Diglossia, Translation and the Rise of Modernity in Japan, China, and the Slavic World*, edited by Judit Árokay, Jadranka Gvozdanović and Darja Miyajima, 119-40. Heidelberg: Springer.

- Montrose, Louis A. 1989. "Professing the Renaissance: The Poetics and Politics of Culture." In *The New Historicism*, edited by H. Aram Veenser, 15-36. New York and London: Routledge.
- Moreton, John Evelyn. 2010. "Translating Saddam: Ideology, Intertextuality and Communicative Equivalence in Arabic-English Translation." PhD Diss., University of Leeds.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2014. "Using Primary Sources to Produce a Microhistory of Translation and Translators: Theoretical and Methodological Concerns." *The Translator* 20 (1): 64-80.
- Mur Dueñas, Pilar. 2005. "Intra- and Intertextuality in Literary Translation: The Case of a Non-contemporary Piece of Work." *Across Languages and Cultures* 6 (1): 47-65.
- Murck, Christian F. 1976. "Introduction." In *Artists and Traditions: Uses of the Past in Chinese Culture*, edited by Christian F. Murck, xi-xxi. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Neubert, Albrecht, and Gregory M. Shreve. 1992. *Translation as Text*. Kent and London: Kent State University Press.
- Nienhauser, William H. 2001. "Early Biography." In *The Columbia History of Chinese Literature*, edited by Victor H. Mair, 511-26. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Nolla, Fernando Pérez-Barreiro. 1992. "Lu Xun's Ideas on 'Hard Translation'." *Babel* 38 (2): 79-89.
- Nunberg, Geoffrey. 1990. *The Linguistics of Punctuation*. Stanford: Center for the Study of Language and Information.
- O'Sullivan, Carol. 2012a. "Introduction: Rethinking Methods in Translation History." *Translation Studies* 5 (2): 131-8.
- . (Ed.). 2012b. "Rethinking Methods in Translation History [Special Issue]." *Translation Studies* 5 (2).
- Oksenberg, Michel C. 1993. "The American Study of Modern China: Toward the Twenty-first Century." In *American Studies of Contemporary China*, edited by David L. Shambaugh, 315-44. New York: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.
- Ong, Chang Woei. 1999. "On Wu Mi's Conservatism." *Humanitas* 12 (1): 42-55.
- Orr, Mary. 2003. *Intertextuality: Debates and Contexts*. Cambridge: Blackwell Publishing.
- Pan Shaw-Yu 潘少瑜. 2011. "Xiangxiang xifang: lun Zhou Shoujuan de 'wei fanyi' xiaoshuo 想像西方：论周瘦鹃的'伪翻译'小说 [Imagining the West: Zhou Shoujuan's 'pseudotranslations']." *Compilation and Translation Review* 4 (2): 1-23.
- . 2012. "Weiduoliya honglouloumeng: Wanqing fanyi xiaoshuo hongleiying de wenzue xipu yu wenhua yixie 维多利亚《红楼梦》：晚清翻译小说《红泪

- 影》的文学系谱与文化译写 [Literary geneology and cultural adaptation of the Victorian ‘Dream of the Red Chamber’: late-Qing translated novel ‘Hongleiyang’].” *Taida zhongwen xuebao* 台大中文学报 (39): 247-94.
- Parkes, M.B. 1992. *Pause and Effect: An Introduction to the History of Punctuation in the West*. Aldershot: Scholar Press.
- Parvini, Neema. 2017. *Shakespeare and New Historicist Theory*. London: Bloomsbury Publishing.
- Pechter, Edward. 1987. “The New Historicism and its Discontents: Politicizing Renaissance Drama.” *PMLA* 102 (3): 292-303.
- Pellatt, Valerie, ed. 2013. *Text, Extratext, Metatext and Paratext in Translation*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2018. “Translation of Chinese Paratext and Paratext of Chinese Translation.” In *The Routledge Handbook of Chinese Translation*, edited by Chris Shei and Zhao-Ming Gao, 164-85. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Peltonen, Matti. 2001. “Clues, Margins, and Monads: The Micro–Macro Link in Historical Research.” *History and Theory* 40 (3): 347-359.
- Peng, Hsia-yen, and Isabelle Rabut, eds. 2014. *Modern China and the West: Translation and Cultural Mediation*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Ping Hong 凭洪. 2015. “Jianchi xuqiu daoxiang, jiejian guoji jingyan, tisheng MTI banxue shuiping—quanguo fanyi zhuan yu xuewei yanjiusheng jiaoyu 2015nian nianhui zongshu 坚持需求导向, 借鉴国际经验, 提升 MTI 办学水平——全国翻译专业学位研究生教育 2015 年年会综述 [Guided by demand, learning from experience abroad, and improving the quality of MTI education—overview of the 2015 annual conference of Master in Translation and Interpreting programs].” *Chinese Translators Journal* (5): 71-3.
- Pollard, David. 1998a. “Introduction.” In *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840-1918*, edited by David Pollard, 5-23. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- , ed. 1998b. *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840-1918*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2002. *The True Story of Lu Xun*. Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.
- . 2011. “Jesuit Translation Activities in China (Late 16th to Early 18th Century).” In *Übersetzung, Translation, Traduction. An International Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Harald Kittel, Armin Paul Frank, Norbert Greiner, Theo Hermans, Werner Koller, José Lambert and Fritz Paul, 2184-7. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Pym, Anthony. 1998. *Method in Translation History*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

- Qi, Shouhua. 2012. *Western Literature in China and the Translation of a Nation*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Qian Zhongshu. 2002. "Lun Lin Shu de fanyi 论林纾的翻译 [On Lin Shu's translations]." In *Qi zhui ji* 七缀集, 77-114. Beijing: Sanlian shudian.
- Qiao Chengche 乔澄澈. 2012. "Zhou Shoujuan duanpian xiaoshuo biaoti fanyi celue 周瘦鹃短篇小说标题翻译策略 [Zhou Shoujuan's strategies for translating titles of short stories]." *Yuwen jianshe* 语文建设 22:31-2.
- . 2015. "Minchu fanyi guifan yingxiang xia de Zhou Shoujuan fanyi yanjiu 民初翻译规范影响下的周瘦鹃翻译研究 [Zhou Shoujuan's translation under the influence of translation norms in early Republican China]." *Waiyu xuekan* 外语学刊 (5): 86-90.
- . 2016. "Qingmo minchu waiguo duanpian xiaoshuo zhongyi yanjiu——yi Lu Xun, Hu Shi yu Zhou Shoujuan wei zhongxin de kaocha 清末民初外国短篇小说中译研究——以鲁迅、胡适与周瘦鹃为中心的考察 [A Study of Chinese translations of foreign short stories in late Qing and early Republican China: centering on Lu Xun, Hu Shi, and Zhou Shoujuan]." *Foreign Language Research* 4: 134-8.
- Qin Gong 秦弓. 2009. *Ershi shiji zhongguo fanyiwenxue shi (wusi shiqi juan)* 二十世纪中国翻译文学史(五四时期卷) [A history of 20th-century literature translated into Chinese (the May Fourth Period)]. Tianjin: Baihua wenyi chubanshe.
- Qin Wenhua 秦文华. 2006. *Fanyi yanjiu de huwenxing shijiao* 翻译研究的互文性视角 [An intertextual view of translation studies]. Shanghai: Shanghai Translation Publishing House.
- Ransom, John C. 1937. "Criticism, Inc." *Virginia Quarterly Review* 13: 586-602.
- . 1941. *The New Criticism*. Norfolk: New Directions.
- Reed, Christopher A. 2004. *Gutenberg in Shanghai : Chinese Print Capitalism, 1876-1937*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Ricci, Ronit. 2013. "Response." *Translation Studies* 7 (1): 92-5.
- Ricci, Ronit, and Jan van der Putten, eds. 2011. *Translation in Asia: Theories, Practices, Histories*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Riffaterre, Michael. 1990. "Compulsory Reader Response: The Intertextual Drive." In *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*, edited by Michael Worton and Judith Still, 56-78. Manchester and New York: Manchester University Press.
- Ringmar, Martin. 2012. "Relay Translation." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 141-4. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Robinson, Douglas, ed. 2016. *The Pushing-Hands of Translation and its Theory in Memoriam Martha Cheung, 1953-2013*. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 2017. *Critical Translation Studies*. Oxon and New York: Routledge.

- Rolston, David L., ed. 1990. *How to Read the Chinese Novel*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- . 1997. *Traditional Chinese Fiction and Fiction Commentary: Reading and Writing Between the Lines*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- . 2001. Traditional Fiction Commentary. In *The Columbia History of Chinese Literature*, edited by Victor H. Mair. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Rowe, William T. 1990. "The Public Sphere in Modern China." *Modern China* 16 (3): 309-29.
- Rundle, Christopher. 2012. "Translation as an Approach to History." *Translation Studies* 5 (2): 232-40.
- . 2014. "Theories and Methodologies of Translation History: The Value of an Interdisciplinary Approach." *The Translator* 20 (1): 2-8.
- Saldanha, Gabriela, and Sharon O'Brien. 2013. *Research Methodologies in Translation Studies*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Saussy, Haun. 2003. "The Age of Attribution: or, How the 'Honglou Meng' Finally Acquired an Author." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 25: 119-32.
- Schneider, A. 2001. "Bridging the Gap: Attempts at Constructing a 'New' Historical-Cultural Identity in the People's Republic of China." *East Asian History* (22): 129-44.
- Schwermann, Christian. 2014. "Composite Authorship in Western Zhou Bronze Inscription: The Case of the 'Tianwang gui' 天亡簋 Inscription." In *That Wonderful Composite Called Author: Authorship in East Asian Literatures from the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Christian Schwermann and Raji C. Steineck, 30-57. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Schwermann, Christian, and Raji C. Steineck, eds. 2014. *That Wonderful Composite Called Author: Authorship in East Asian Literatures from the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Schäffner, Christina. 2012. "Intercultural Intertextuality as a Translation Phenomenon." *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology* 20 (3): 345-64.
- Scott, A. C. 1983. "The Performance of Classical Theatre." In *Chinese Theater: From its Origins to the Present Day*, edited by Colin Mackerras, 118-44. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Shen Qinghui 沈庆会. 2006. "Tan 《Jiayin xiaozhuan》 yiben de shanjie wenti 谈《迦因小传》译本的删节问题 [On abridgement in the translation of *Joan Haste*]." *Journal of East China Normal University* 38 (1): 70-3.
- Shen Qinghui 沈庆会, and Kong Xiangli 孔祥立. 2011. "'Ziyou wenbi' xia de 'ziyou fanyi'—Bao Tianxiao fanyi xiaoshuo yanjiu '自由文笔'下的'自由翻译'——包天笑翻译小说研究 ['Liberal translation' under the 'free pen'—A study of

- Bao Tianxiao's translated fiction]." *The Journal of Ming-Qing Fiction Studies* 3: 205-19.
- Shi Long 施龙. 2016. "Beiyang zhengfu de wenhua guanli jigou yu wenhua zhengce 北洋政府的文化管理机构与文化政策 [Cultural administration institutions and policies of the Beiyang government]." *Zhongguo xiandai wenxue yanjiu congkan* 中国现代文学研究丛刊 2: 93-103.
- Shi Zhecun 施蛰存, ed. 1990. *Zhongguo jindai wenxue daxi: fanyi wenxue ji* 中国近代文学大系:翻译文学集 [A treasury of modern Chinese literature: translated literature]. Shanghai: Shanghai shudian.
- Sih, Paul K. T., ed. 1961. *The Hsiao Ching*. Translated by Mary Lelia Marka. New York: St. John's University Press.
- Sima Qian 司马迁. 1959. *Shiji* 史记 [Records of the grand historian]. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.
- St André, James. 2010. "Lessons From Chinese History: Translation as a Collaborative and Multi-Stage Process." *TTR: Traduction, terminologie, rédaction* 23 (1): 71-94.
- . 2011. "Relay." In *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, edited by Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha, 230-2. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- St. André, James, and Xiaoyan Peng. 2012. *China and its Others: Knowledge Transfer through Translation, 1829-2010*. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi.
- Starr, Chloë F. 2007. *Red-Light Novels of the Late Qing*. Leiden: Brill.
- Steineck, Raji C., and Christian Schwermann. 2014. "Introduction." In *That Wonderful Composite Called Author: Authorship in East Asian Literatures from the Beginnings to the Seventeenth Century*, edited by Christian Schwermann and Raji C. Steineck, 1-29. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Sun, Lung-kee. 2008. "The Other May Fourth: Twilight of the Old Order." In *Beyond the May Fourth Paradigm: In Search of Chinese Modernity*, edited by Kai-wing Chow, Tze-ki Hon, Hung-yok Ip and Don C. Price, 271-92. Lanham: Lexington.
- Sun, Yifeng. 2012. "The Shifting Identity of Translation Studies in China." *Intercultural Communication Studies* 21 (2): 32-52.
- Susam-Sarajeva, Şebnem. 2001. "Is One Case Always Enough?" *Perspectives* 9 (3): 167-76.
- . 2002. "A 'Multilingual' and 'International' Translation Studies?" In *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, edited by Theo Hermans, 193-207. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2009. "The Case Study Research Method in Translation Studies." *The Interpreter and Translator Trainer* 3 (1): 37-56.

- Szjártó, István. 2013. "Part I." In *What is Microhistory? Theory and Practice*, edited by G. Magnússon Sigurður and István Szjártó, 1-76. Abingdon and New York: Routledge.
- Tahir-Gürçağlar, Şehnaz. 2002. "What Texts Don't Tell: The Uses of Paratexts in Translation Research." In *Crosscultural Transgressions: Research Models in Translation Studies II: Historical and Ideological Issues*, edited by Theo Hermans, 44-60. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2010. "Paratexts." In *Handbook of Translation Studies*, edited by Yves Gambier and Luc Van Doorslaer, 113-6. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tan Fan 谭帆. 2001. *Zhongguo xiaoshuo pingdian yanjiu* 中国小说评点研究 [A study on Chinese fiction commentaries]. Shanghai: East China Normal University Press.
- Tan, Zaixi. 2006. "Metaphors of Translation." *Perspectives* 14 (1): 40-54.
- Tarumoto Teruo. 1998. "A Statistical Survey of Translated Fiction 1840-1920." In *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840-1918*, edited by David Pollard, 37-42. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Tate, Allen. 1940. "Miss Emily and the Bibliographer." *The American Scholar* 9 (4): 449-60.
- Tianxiao sheng 天笑生 [Bao Tianxiao 包天笑]. (1917) 1931. "Tianxiao sheng xu 天笑生序 [Foreword by Tianxiao sheng]." In *Ou-mei mingjia duanpianxiaoshuo congke* 欧美名家短篇小说丛刻 [Collection of short stories by famous European and American writers], 1-2. Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju.
- Tianxu wo sheng 天虚我生 [Chen Diexian 陈蝶仙]. 1906. "Youxi shijie xu 游戏世界叙 [Preface to *World of Game*]." *Youxi shijie* 游戏世界 1.
- . 1914. "Shengsi yuanyang 生死鸳鸯 [Mandarin ducks in life and death]." *Youxi zazhi* 游戏杂志 8.
- Tie 铁 [pseud.]. (1908)1989. "Tieweng jinyu 铁瓮烬余." In *Ershi shiji zhongguo xiaoshuo lilun ziliao* 二十世纪中国小说理论资料 [Theoretical materials of Chinese fiction in the twentieth century], edited by Chen Pingyuan 陈平原 and Xia Xiaohong 夏晓虹. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Toury, Gideon. 1995. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 2000. "The Nature and Role of Norms in Translation." In *The Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti. London and New York: Routledge. Original edition, 1978.
- Trivedi, Harish. 2006. "In Our Own Time, on Our Own Terms: 'Translation' in India." In *Translating Others*, edited by Theo Hermans, 102-19. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

- Tu, Wei-ming. 1976. "‘Inner Experience’: The Basis of Creativity in Neo-Confucian Thinking." In *Artists and Traditions: Uses of the Past in Chinese Culture*, edited by Christian F. Murck, 9-15. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Tymoczko, Maria. 2006. "Reconceptualizing Translation Theory: Integrating Non-Western Thought about Translation." In *Translating Others*, edited by Theo Hermans, 13-32. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2007. *Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translators*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2010. "Western Metaphorical Discourses Implicit in Translation Studies." In *Thinking Through Translation with Metaphors*, edited by James St. André, 109-43. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2013. "Response." *Translation Studies* 7 (1): 104-7.
- Van Wyke, Ben. 2014. "Reproducing Producers: Kundera, Stravinsky and the Orchestration of Translation." *Translation Studies* 7 (3): 233-48.
- Veenstra, Jan R. 1995. "The New Historicism of Stephen Greenblatt: On Poetics of Culture and the Interpretation of Shakespeare." *History and Theory* 34 (3): 174-98.
- Venuti, Lawrence. 1992. "Introduction." In *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 1-17. London and New York: Routledge.
- . 1995. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation*. London: Routledge.
- . 2005. "Translation, History, Narrative." *Meta* 50 (3): 800-16.
- . 2009. "Translation, Intertextuality, Interpretation." *Romance Studies* 27 (3): 157-73.
- Vittinghoff, Natascha. 2001. "Readers, Publishers and Officials in the Contest for a Public Voice and the Rise of a Modern Press in Late Qing China (1860-1880)." *T'oung Pao* 87 (4/5): 393-455.
- Volland, Nicolai. 2014. "The Birth of a Profession: Translators and Translation in Modern China." In *Modern China and the West*, edited by Hsia-yen Peng and Isabelle Rabut, 126-50. Leiden: Brill.
- Wakabayashi, Judy. 2005. "Translation in the East Asian Cultural Sphere: Shared Roots, Divergent Paths?" In *Asian Translation Traditions*, edited by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi, 17-65. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- . 2007. "Reflections on Theory-Driven and Case-Oriented Approaches to Comparative Historiography." In *Across Boundaries: International Perspectives on Translation Studies*, edited by Dorothy Kenny and Kyongjoo Ryou, 8-21. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.
- . 2013. "Towards a Framework for Comparative Translation Historiography." In *Towards a History of Translating: In Commemoration of the 40th*

- Anniversary of the Research Centre for Translation, CUHK*, edited by Lawrence Wang-Chi Wong, 419-66. Hong Kong: Research Centre for Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- . 2014. “Response.” *Translation Studies* 7 (1): 100-3.
- . 2016. “Applying the ‘Pushing-Hands’ Approach to a Dialogue among Microhistory, Macrohistory and *Histoire Croisée*.” In *The Pushing-Hands of Translation and its Theory: In Memoriam Martha Cheung, 1953-2013*, edited by Douglas Robinson, 153-66. London and New York: Routledge.
- Wakabayashi, Judy, and Rita Kothari, eds. 2009. *Decentering Translation Studies: India and Beyond*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wang Bingqin 王秉钦. 2004. *20 shiji zhongguo fanyi sixiangshi* 20世纪中国翻译思想史 [A history of 20th-century Chinese translation thought]. Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
- Wang Bin 王斌. 2007. “Zhou Shoujuan dui Mobosang zuopin de fanyi yu jiedu 周瘦鹃对莫泊桑作品的翻译与解读 [Zhou Shoujuan’s translation and interpretation of Guy de Maupassant’s work].” *Guangxi shehui kexue* 广西社会科学 9: 151-5.
- Wang, David Der-wei. 1997. *Fin-de-siècle Splendor: Repressed Modernities of Late Qing Fiction, 1849-1911*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Wang Hongyin 王宏印. 2003. *Zhongguo chuantong yilun jingdian quanshi* 中国传统译论经典诠释 [Critique of translation theories in Chinese tradition]. Wuhan: Hubei Education Press.
- Wang, Hui. 2006. “Discursive Community and the Genealogy of Scientific Categories.” In *Everyday Modernity in China*, edited by Madeleine Yue Dong and Joshua L. Goldstein. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Wang, Jing. 1992. *The Story of Stone: Intertextuality, Ancient Chinese Stone Lore, and the Stone Symbolism in Dream of the Red Chamber, Water Margin, and The Journey to the West*. Durham and London: Duke University Press.
- Wang Kefei 王克非. 2002. “Jindai fanyi dui Hanyu de Yingxiang 近代翻译对汉语的影响 [The influence of early modern translations on the Chinese language].” *Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu* 外语教学与研究 34 (6): 458-63.
- Wang, Kefei, and Fan Shouyi. 1999. “Translation in China: A Motivating Force.” *Meta: Translators’ Journal* 44 (1): 7-26.
- Wang Minling 王敏玲. 2015. “Zhou Shoujuan fanyi yanjiu xin chanshi 周瘦鹃翻译研究新阐释 [New interpretations of Zhou Shoujuan’s translations].” PhD diss., Suzhou University.
- Wang Shuhuai 王树槐, and Wang Qun 王群. 2006. “Hatimu de huwenxing fanyi lilun: gongxian yu quexian 哈提姆的互文性翻译理论: 贡献与缺陷 [A review of Hatim’s intertextuality-based translation theory: contributions and defects].” *Journal of PLA University of Foreign Languages* 29 (1): 60-3, 109.

- Wang, Xiaoming. 1998. "From Petitions to Fiction: Visions of the Future Propogated in Early Modern China." In *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China, 1840-1918*, edited by David Pollard, 43-56. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Wang Xiaoyuan 王晓元. 2006. "Fanyi, yishixingtai yu huayu—Zhongguo 1895-1911 nian wenxue fanyi yanjiu 翻译、意识形态与话语——中国 1895-1911 年文学翻译研究 [Translation, ideology and discourse—a study on literary translation in China from 1895 to 1911]." PhD diss., Lingnan University.
- Wang Xiulu 王岫庐. 2013. "Jiedu hangjian de shenyi: cong quandian jiaodu jiedu Tian Han yiju Shalemei 解读行间的深意：从圈点角度解读田汉译剧《莎乐美》 [Interpreting meaning between lines: reading Tian Han's translation of 'Salome' from the perspective of emphatic punctuation]." *Waiguo yuwen yanjiu* 外国语文研究 1: 165-78.
- Wang Xueming 王雪明. 2008. "Zhiheng·ronghe·zulang—xueheng pai fanyi yanjiu 制衡·融合·阻抗——学衡派翻译研究 [Checking, integration and resistance—a study of translations by the Xueheng School]." PhD diss., Fudan University.
- Wang Yougui 王友贵. 2005. *Fanyijia Lu Xun* 翻译家鲁迅 [Lu Xun as a translator]. Tianjin: Nankai University Press.
- Wang Zhiyi 王智毅, ed. 1993. *Zhou Shoujuan yanjiu ziliao* 周瘦鹃研究资料 [Research materials on Zhou Shoujuan]. Tianjin: Tianjin renmin chubanshe.
- Wang Zijin 王子今. 2010. "'Chongyi': handai minzushi yu waijiaoshi zhong de yizhong wenhua xianxiang '重译': 汉代民族史与外交史中的一种文化现象 [Relay translation: a cultural phenomenon in the histories of ethnicity and diplomacy of Han dynasty]." *Hebei Academic Journal* 30 (4): 52-6.
- Watts, Richard. 2000. "Translating Culture: Reading the Paratexts to Aimé Césaire's *Cahier d'un retour au pays natal*." *TTR: Traduction, Terminologie, Rédaction: Etudes sur le Texte et Ses Transformations* 13 (2): 29-46.
- Wei Shaoshang 魏绍昌, ed. 1962. *Yuanyang hudie pai yanjiu ziliao* 鸳鸯蝴蝶派研究资料 [Research materials on the Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies School]. 2 vols. Shanghai: Shanghai wenyi chubanshe.
- White, Hayden. 1978. *Tropics of Discourse: Essays in Cultural Criticism*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- . 1989. "New Historicism: A Comment." In *The Historicism*, edited by H. Aram Veenser, 293-302. New York and London: Routledge.
- Wong, Laurence Wang-Chi. 1998a. "Lin Shu's Story-Retelling as Shown in his Chinese Translation of *La Dame aux camélias*." *Babel* 44 (3): 207-33.
- . 1998b. "'The Sole Purpose is to Express My Political Views': Liang Qichao and the Translation and Writing of Political Novels in the Late Qing." In *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern*

- China, 1840-1918*, edited by David Pollard, 105-26. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- . 1999. “An Act of Violence: Translation of Western Fiction in the Late Qing and Early Republican Period.” In *The Literary Field of Twentieth-Century China*, edited by Michel Hockx, 21-39. Surrey: Curzon.
- . 2004. “Beyond *Xin Da Ya*: Translation Problems in the Late Qing.” In *Mapping Meanings: The Field of New Learning in Late Qing China*, edited by Michael Lackner and Natascha Vittinghoff, 239-64. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- . 2005. “From ‘Controlling the Barbarians’ to ‘Wholesale Westernization’: Translation and Politics in Late Imperial and Early Republican China, 1840-1919.” In *Asian Translation Traditions*, edited by Eva Hung and Judy Wakabayashi, 109-34. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.
- Wong, Timothy C. 2000. “Commentary and *Xiaoshuo* Fiction.” *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 120 (3): 400-9.
- Worton, Michael, and Judith Still, eds. 1990. *Intertextuality: Theories and Practices*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.
- Wu, Mi. 1921. “Old and New in China.” *The Chinese Students’ Monthly* 16 (3): 198-209.
- . 1921. “The Political Thought of Confucius and Mencius as Compared with Plato and Aristotle.” Harvard University Archives. HUC 8920.334.6.
- 吴宓. 1922. “Niukangshi jiazhuan 钮康氏家传 [The Newcomes].” *Xueheng* 学衡 1-4, 7.
- . 1923a. “Lun Jinri wenxue chuangzao zhi zhengfa 论今日文学创造之正法 [On the correct methods of literary creation in present times].” *Xueheng* 学衡 15.
- . 1923b. “Wo zhi rensheng guan 我之人生观 [My view of life].” *Xueheng* 学衡 16.
- . 1926. “Mingli chang 名利场 [Vanity Fair].” *Xueheng* 学衡 55.
- . 1929. “Feiliedeli xileigeer shishi bainian jinian 弗列得力希雷格尔逝世百年纪念” [To mark the centennial anniversary of Friedrich Schlegel’s death].” *Xueheng* 学衡 67.
- . 1995. *Wu Mi zibian nianpu: 1894-1925* 吴宓自编年谱:1894-1925 [Wu Mi’s self-compiled chronology: 1894-1925]. Beijing: Sanlian shudian.
- . 1998. *Wu Mi riji* 吴宓日记 [Diary of Wu Mi]. Edited by Wu Xuezhao 吴学昭. 10 vols. Beijing: Sanlian shudian.
- Wu, Xuezhao. 2004. “The Birth of a Chinese Cultural Movement: Letters Between Babbitt and Wu Mi.” *Humanitas* 17 (1-2): 6-25.

- Xian Liqiang 咸立强. 2010. *Yitan yijun: chuangzao she fanyi yanjiu* 译坛异军: 创造社翻译研究 [A new force rising in the field of translation: a study on the Creation Society's translation activities]. Beijing: Renmin chubanshe.
- . 2014. "Wenxue changyu shiye li de qianqi chuangzao she fanyi wenxue piping 文学场域视野里的前期创造社翻译文学批评 [On the Creation Society's early translation criticism from the perspective of the literary field]." *Huanan shifandaxue xuebao (shehui kexue ban)* 华南师范大学学报 (社会科学版) 4:131-5.
- Xie Tianzhen 谢天振, and Zha Mingjian 查明建, eds. 2004. *Zhongguo xiandai fanyi wenxue shi* 中国现代翻译文学史: 1898-1949 [A history of modern Chinese translated literature: 1898-1949]. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Xiong Yuezhi 熊月之. 1994. *Xixue dongjian yu wanqing shehui* 西学东渐与晚清社会 [The dissemination of Western learning to the East and the late Qing society]. Shanghai: Renmin chubanshe.
- Xiu Wenqiao 修文乔. 2014. "Yuanyang hudie pai yu minchu tongshu xiaoshuo yijie 鸳鸯蝴蝶派与民初通俗小说译介 [The Mandarin Ducks and Butterflies School and the translation of popular fiction in early Republican China]." *Chinese Translators Journal* 35 (5): 30-4.
- XSSBS (Xiaoshuo shibao she 小说时报社). 1911. "Benbao tonggao si 本报通告四 [Notice four]." *Xiaoshuo Shibao* 小说时报 11.
- Xu Keqian 徐克谦. 1998. "Chuantong rujia zhishi fenzi dui 'buxiu zhi ming' de zhuiqiu 传统儒家知识分子对'不朽之名'的追求 [Traditional Confucian intellectuals' pursuit of 'immortal name']." *Dongfang wenhua* 东方文化 5: 49-52.
- Xu, Xiaoqun. 2001. *Chinese Professionals and the Republican State: The Rise of Professional Associations in Shanghai, 1912-1937*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Xu, Xueqing. 2000. "Short Stories by Bao Tianxiao and Zhou Shoujuan during the early years of the Republic." PhD diss., University of Toronto.
- . 2008. "The Mandarin Duck and Butterfly School." In *Literary Societies of Republican China*, edited by Kirk A. Denton and Michel Hockx, 47-78. Lanham: Lexington Books.
- XXSBS (Xin xiaoshuo baoshe 新小说报社). 1902. "Zhongguo weiyi zhi wenxuebao Xin xiaoshuo 中国唯一之文学报新小说 [They only literary newspaper in China—New Fiction]." *Xinmin congbao* 新民丛报 14.
- Yan Yifei 闫一菲. 2011. "Cong 《Ou-meimingjia duanpian xiaoshuo congkan》 kan Zhou Shoujuan de fanyi fengge 从《欧美名家短篇小说丛刊》看周瘦鹃的翻译风格 [An analysis of Zhou Shoujuan's translation style based on the Collection of Short Stories by Famous European and American Writers]." *Dangdai xiaoshuo* 当代小说 3: 18-9.

- Yang Kai 杨凯. 2006. "Zhongguo jindai baokan zhong de fanyi xiaoshuo yanjiu (1872-1911) 中国近代报刊中的翻译小说研究(1872-1911) [A study of the translated fiction published in modern Chinese newspapers and magazines (1872-1911)]." PhD diss., East China Normal University.
- Yang Lianfen 杨联芬. 2003. *Wanqing zhi wusi: Zhongguo wenxue xiandaixing de fasheng* 晚清至五四: 中国文学现代性的发生 [From the late Qing to the May Fourth period: the birth of Chinese literary modernity]. Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Yang Lixin 杨莉馨, and Wang Wei 王苇. 2015. "Lun 《Xueheng》 de wenxue fanyi yu wenhua jueze 论《学衡》的文学翻译与文化抉择 [On the cultural choices and cultural translation in *Xueheng*]." *Nanjing shifan daxue wenxueyuan xuebao* 南京师范大学文学院学报 3: 156-61.
- Yang Shuda 杨树达, ed. 1934. *Lunyu guyi* 论语古义 [Ancient meaning of the *Analects*]. Shanghai: Commercial Press.
- TSJYYJH (Tongsu jiaoyu yanjiuhui 通俗教育研究会). 1917. "Tongsu jiaoyu jianjiuhui shenhe xiaoshuo baogao 通俗教育研究会审核小说报告 [Examination report on fiction by the popular education research committee]." *Jiaoyu gongbao* 教育公报 15: 29-31.
- Ye, Weili. 2001. *Seeking Modernity in China's Name: Chinese Students in the United States, 1900-1927*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Yeh, Catherine Vance. 2006. *Shanghai Love: Courtesans, Intellectuals, and Entertainment Culture, 1850-1910*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Yinbansheng 寅半生 [Zhong Junwen 钟俊文]. 1906a. "Xiaoshuo xianping xu 小说闲评叙 [Preface to 'ilde remarks on fiction']." *Youxi shijie* 游戏世界 1.
- . 1906b. "Youxi shijie fakanci 游戏世界发刊辞 [Inaugural words on *World of Game*]." *Youxi shijie* 游戏世界 1.
- . 1906c. "Zishu shi 自述诗 [Autobiographical poem]." *Youxi shijie* 游戏世界 1.
- . 1907. "Du Jiayin xiaozhuan liang yiben shuhou 读迦因小传两译本书后 [After reading two translations of *Joan Haste*]." *Youxi shijie* 游戏世界 10.
- Yu, Anthony C. 1988. "History, Fiction and the Reading of Chinese Narrative." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews (CLEAR)* 10 (1/2): 1-19.
- Zhang Hong 张弘. 2005. *Wu Mi: Lixiang de shizhe* 吴宓: 理想的使者 [Wu Mi: A messenger of ideals]. Beijing: Wenjin chubanshe.
- Zhang, Xiantao. 2007. *The Origins of the Modern Chinese Press: The Influence of the Protestant Missionary Press in Late Qing China*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Zhang Yan 章艳. 2006. "Qingmo minchu xiaoshuo fanyi guifan yu yizhe de yingdui 清末民初小说翻译规范与译者的对应 [Norms of fiction translation and

- translators' reaction towards them in late Qing and early Republican China]." PhD diss., Shanghai International Studies University.
- Zhang Zhongliang 张中良. 2005. *Wusi shiqi de fanyi wenxue* 五四时期的翻译文学 [Translated literature in the May Fourth period]. Taipei: Showwe Information.
- Zhao Dongmei 赵冬梅. 2007. "Wusi shiqi de fanyi piping yanjiu 五四时期的翻译批评研究[A study of translation criticism during the May Fourth period]." PhD diss., Shandong University.
- Zhao Xifang 赵稀方. 2013. "Lun 'Wu·si' shiqi de fanyi 论'五·四'时期的翻译 [On translations during the May Fourth period]." *Yuejiang Academic Journal* 5: 120-30.
- . 2014. "Linglei xiandaixing de goujian—cong fanyi kan 《Xueheng pai》 另类现代性的构建——从翻译看《学衡》派 [The construction of alternative modernity—on the Xueheng School from the perspective of translation]." *Anhui daxue xuebao (zhexue shehui kexue ban)* 安徽大学学报 (哲学社会科学版) 3: 46-52.
- Zheng Zhenduo 郑振铎. 1921a. "Eguo wenxueshi zhong de fanyijia 俄国文学史中的翻译家 [Translators in Russian translation history]." *Gaizao* 改造 3 (11): 78-81.
- . [Xi Di 西谛, pseud.]. 1921b. "Chunü yu meipo 处女与媒婆 [Virgin and matchmaker]." *Wenxue xunkan* 文学旬刊 4: 1.
- . 1921c. "Yi wenxueshu de sange wenti 译文学书的三个问题 [On the three problems in translating literary works]." *Xiaoshuo yuebao* 小说月报 12 (3): 5-29.
- . 1924. "Lin Qinnan xiansheng 林琴南先生 [Mr. Lin Qinnan]." *Xiaoshuo yuebao* 小说月报 15 (11): 1-12.
- Zhixi 志希 [pseud.]. 1919. "Jinri zhongguo zhi xiaoshuo jie 今日中国之小说界 [China's present field of fiction]." *Xinchao* 新潮 1 (1): 106-17.
- Zhou Shoujuan 周瘦鹃 [Shoujuan 瘦鹃, pseud.]. 1914a. "A xiong 阿兄 [The brother]." *Libai liu* 礼拜六 24: 11-28.
- . 1914b. "Hong xiao 红笑 [The red laugh]." *Youxi zazhi* 游戏杂志 10: 1-20.
- . 1914c. "Wuke naihe hua luoku 无可奈何花落去 [Corinne]." *Libai liu* 礼拜六 20:17-29.
- . 1915a. "Gong zui 功罪 [The bullet-hole]." *Libai liu* 礼拜六 51: 27-37.
- . 1915b. "Weiying 帷影 [The white old maid]." *Libai liu* 礼拜六 78: 17-29.
- . (1917)1931. *Ou-mei mingjia duanpian xiaoshuo congkan* 欧美名家短篇小说丛刊 [Collection of short stories by famous European and American writers]. 4th ed. 3 vols. Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju.

- . 1995. “Bimo shengya wushi nian 笔墨生涯五十年 [Fifty years of making a living with pen and ink].” In *Gusu shujian* 姑苏书简 [Writings in Suzhou], 52-60. Beijing: Xinhua Publishing House.
- . 2010. “Wo fanyi xifang mingjia duanpian xiaoshuo de huiyi 我翻译西方名家短篇小说的回忆 [My recollections of translating short stories by famous western writers].” In *Zhou Shoujuan wenji* 周瘦鹃文集 [Anthology of Zhou Shoujuan’s essays], edited by Fan Boqun 范伯群, 25-7. Shanghai: Wenhui chuban she.
- Zhou Shumei 周淑媚. 2006. “Lun 《Xueheng》 shiqi Wu Mi de shixue yu fanyi 论《学衡》时期吴宓的诗学与翻译 [On Wu Mi’s poetics and views of translation during the publishing period of *Xueheng*].” *Xingda renwen xuebao* 兴大人文学报 37: 125-64.
- Zhou Shumei 周淑媚, and Xie Jinrong 谢金荣. 2006. “Xueheng pai fanyi yanjiu 学衡派翻译研究 [A study on the Xueheng School’s translation activities].” *Donghai zhongwen xuebao* 东海中文学报 18: 47-78.
- Zhou Zuoren 周作人. 1951. “Jiayin xiaozhuan 迦因小传 [On Joan Haste].” *Yibao* 亦报 March 11.
- [Zhou Xiashou 周遐寿, pseud.]. 1952. “Zhou Shoujuan 周瘦鹃.” In *Lu Xun de gujia* 鲁迅的故家 [Lu Xun’s clan], 308-9. Shanghai: Shanghai chuban gongsi.
- Zhou Zhilian 周志莲. 2013. “Zhongguo yishi shang de chongyi tanjiu 中国译史上的重译探究 [A study on the concepts of ‘chongyi’ in Chinese translation history].” *Social Scientist* 9: 134-7.
- Zhu Yongxiang 朱永香. 2015. “Lun Yinbansheng ji qi 《xiaoshuo xianping》论寅半生及其《小说闲评》 [On Yinbansheng and his ‘comments on fiction’].” *Journal of East China Normal University* 4: 149-52.

Appendix

Notes: The following information about the translated short stories is organized according to the order in the *Collection*. Both the original titles and the names of the original authors are as provided in the *Collection*, but correct or current commonly accepted spellings of certain names are indicated in brackets.

| / | Title in Chinese translation in the <i>Collection</i> | Original title (or title in English translation) | Original author | First publication of the translation |
|---------------|---|--|------------------|--|
| Vol. 1 | “ <i>Sihou zhi xiangjian</i> 死后之相见” | “The Apparition of Mrs. Veal” | Daniel Defoe | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Tan</i> 贪” | “Whang, The Miller” | Oliver Goldsmith | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Gui xinni</i> 鬼新娘” | “The Mysterious Bride” | James Hogg | <i>Libai liu</i> 礼拜六 (Saturday), 1914, issue 18 |
| | “ <i>Gushi guiying</i> 古室鬼影” | “The Tapestry Chamber” | Sir Walter Scott | <i>Youxi zazhi</i> 游戏杂志 (Pastime), 1914, issue 3 |
| | “ <i>Guxiang</i> 故乡” | “The Native Vil’age” [The Native Village] | Charles Lamb | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 66 |
| | “ <i>Yigou labo zhuan</i> 义狗拉勃传” | “Rab and his Friends” | John Brown | <i>Zhonghua xiaoshuojie</i> 中华小说界 (The World of Chinese fiction), 1916, 3(5) |
| | “ <i>Qingchang xiagu</i> 情场侠骨” | “The Sexton’s Hero” | Mrs. Gaskell | <i>Zhonghua xiaoshuojie</i> 1916, 3 (4) |

| | | | | |
|---------------|--|--|-----------------------------|---|
| | “ <i>Qing nu</i> 情奴” | “Dennis Haggartys’ Wife” [Dennis Haggarty’s Wife] | William Makepeace Thackeray | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Xing</i> 星” | “A Child’s Dream of a Star” | Charles Dickens | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 66 |
| | “ <i>Liangshi</i> 良师” | “A Practical Joke” | Charles Reade | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Huishou</i> 回首” | “Benighted Travellers” | Thomas Hardy | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Cimu zhi xin</i> 慈母之心” | “The Halt” | Ouida | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 62 |
| | “ <i>Yiwai yuanyang</i> 意外鸳鸯” | “The Sire de Maletroit’s Door” | R.L.B. Stevenson | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Honglou cuimo</i> 红楼翠幙” | “The Blue Curtains” | Sir H. R. Haggard | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 39 |
| | “ <i>Chanmian</i> 缠绵” | “Sweethearts” | Sir A. Conan Doyle | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 57 |
| | “ <i>Hei bieshu zhi zhuren</i> 黑别墅之主人” | “The Lord of Chateau Noir” | Sir A. Conan Doyle | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 47 |
| | “ <i>Bing gui</i> 病诡” | “The Dying Detective” | Sir A. Conan Doyle | <i>Fu’er Mosi zhentan an quanji</i> 福尔摩斯侦探案全集 (The Complete Collection of Sherlock Holms Stories), <i>Zhonghua shuju</i> , 1916 |
| | “ <i>Sanbainian qian zhi aiqing</i> 三百年前之爱情” | “Old-Fashioned Fidelity” | Marie Corelli | <i>Nüzi shijie</i> 女子世界 (Women’s World), 1915, issue 6 |
| Vol. 2 | “ <i>Yü</i> 欲” | “Memnon, or Human Wisdom” | Voltaire | Unknown |

| | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| “Wuke naihe hua luoqu 无可奈何花落去” | “Corinne” | Madame de Staël | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1914, issue 20 |
| “Nan'er si er 男儿死耳” | El Verdugo | Honoré de Balzac | Unknown |
| “Meiren zhi tou 美人之头” | “Solange” | Alexandre Dumas | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 31 |
| “A xiong 阿兄” | “Le Petit Chose” | Alphonse Daudet | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1914, issue 24 |
| “Shangxin zhi fu 伤心之父” | “The Loyal Zouave” | Alphonse Daudet | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 64 |
| “Hongshui 洪水” | “The Inundation” | Émile Zola | Unknown |
| “Gong...zui 功……罪” | “The Bullet-hole” | François Coppée | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 51 |
| “San 伞” | “The Umbrella” | Guy de Maupassant | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 74 |
| “En yu yuan yu 恩怨” | “A Patch of Nettles” | Paul Bourget | <i>Youxi zazhi</i> , 1915, issue 12 |
| “Zhe yifan hua can yue que 这一番花残月缺” | “The Pride of the Village” | Washington Irving | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 60 |
| “Weiying 帷影” | “The White Old Maid” | Nathaniel Hawthorne | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 78 |
| “Xinsheng 心声” | “The Tell-Tale Heart” | Edgar Allan Poe | Unknown |
| “Cheng jiao 惩骄” | “The History of Tiptop” | Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe | Unknown |
| “Wu guo zhi ren 无国之人” | “The Man Without a Country” | Edward E. Hale | <i>Xiaoshuo daguan</i> 小说大观 (The Grand Magazine), 1915, issue 3 |
| “Qi 妻” | “The Californian's Tale” | Mark Twain | <i>Xiaoshuo daguan</i> , 1915, issue 1 |
| “Yi gui yi 噫归矣” | “The Man of No Account” | Brete Harte [Francis Bret Harte] | Unknown |

| | | | | |
|--------|---------------------------|---|---|--|
| Vol. 3 | “Si 死” | “How the Russian Meet Death” | Ivan Sergeyevich Turgenieff [Ivan Sergeyevich Turgenev] | Unknown |
| | “Ning ren fu wo 宁人负我” | “A Long Exile” | Leo Tolstoi [Leo Tolstoy] | “Heiyu tianliang 黑狱天良”, <i>Libai liu</i> , 1914, issue 4 |
| | “Da yi 大义” | “The Traitor’s Mother” | Maxime Gorky | Unknown |
| | “Hong xiao 红笑” | “The Red Laugh” | Leonid Andreef [Leonid Andreyev] | <i>Youxi zazhi</i> , 1914, issue 10 |
| | “Xun shi 驯狮” | “A Tale” | Johann Wolfgang von Goethe | Unknown |
| | “Poti’er diyizao 破题儿第一遭” | “Max Stolprian” | Johann Heinrich Daniel Zschokke | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 56 |
| | “Beihuan lihe 悲欢离合” | “Separation” | Salvatore Farina | Unknown |
| | “Xiongdi 兄弟” | “The Brother’s Duel” | Mauriece Jókai [Mór Jókai/ Maurus Jokai] | Unknown |
| | “Bishui shuang yuan 碧水双鸳” | “Love by the Ocaan” [Love by the Ocean] | Armando Palacio Valdès [Armando Palacio Valdés] | Unknown |
| | “Shizhe ru si 逝者如斯” | “The Funeral” | Gottfried Keller | Unknown |
| | “Duanfen canjie 断坟残碣” | “The Old Gravestone” | Hans Anderson | <i>Libai liu</i> , 1915, issue 68 |
| | “Fang shi 芳时” | “Phoenix” | August Strindberg | Unknown |

| | | | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------------|---------|
| | “ <i>Chuxi</i> 除夕” | “Our First New Year’s Eve” | Anna Kaubert [Anna Koubert] | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Yi wen zhi daijia</i> 一吻之代价” | “Vengeance” | T. Drakulitch | Unknown |
| | “ <i>Nanfu nanfu</i> 难夫 难妇” | “Pioneers” | Juhani Aho | Unknown |