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Abstract

This dissertation contends that self-translating authors, who translate their own works into other languages, serve as a locus through which to study the migrations and intersections of literature, language, culture, and identity. Driven by different Skopos, self-translators create a hybrid literature through migration of text, shifts of identity, and transference of culture. To support this hypothesis, I employ the Skopos theory to facilitate my study of historical contexts, language transfers, and employment of translation techniques of self-translations by three prominent authors from China: Lin Yutang (1895-1976), Eileen Chang (1920-1995), and Ha Jin (1956-). Studies of their literary works have been empirically well-grounded and painstakingly detailed. Yet the act of transplanting their texts into a new cultural, linguistic, and literary context has not been adequately addressed. My dissertation speaks to this significant omission. Three chapters will be taken up with the identification, explication, evaluation, and interpretation of self-translation strategies along with bilingual textual analysis of (1) Lin Yutang’s play, 子見南子/Confucius Saw Nancy, two bilingual essays, and the novel Between Tears and Laughter (1943)/啼笑皆非; (2) Eileen Chang’s three bilingual essays and the novel(la) Golden Cangue (1943)/金锁记; and (3) Ha Jin’s short story collection, A Good Fall (2009)/落地. I argue that self-translation works not as a secondary reproduction but rather as a production in its own right, which allows these authors to take more liberties with the texts as compared to regular translators. Self-translators also have more complicated Skopos to fulfill, such as shifts of identities, expansion of literary fame, recovery of a lost audience, and battles against political censorship.
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**Introduction**

Sometimes I confuse myself with my shadow and sometimes don’t.
--Samuel Beckett

This I conceive to be the chemical function of humor: to change the character of our thought.
--Lin Yutang

Between memory and reality there are awkward discrepancies.
--Eileen Chang

It’s hard to uproot yourself and really become yourself in another soil, but it’s also an opportunity, another kind of growth.
--Ha Jin

Deeply rooted in the linguistic and cultural traditions and realities, the practice of literary self-translation has become an increasingly common practice in our globalized world. Although the shift toward national languages and national literary canons in the 19th century forced self-translation to the margins of cultural production, the practice of self-translation attracted in the 20th and 21st centuries renewed critical attention spurred by the systematic theorization of translation as a disciplinary field of inquiry and the emergence on the literary scene of self-translating writers. This dissertation contends that self-translating authors, who translate their own works into other languages, serve as a locus through which to study the migrations and intersections of literature, language, culture, and identity. Driven by different Skopos, self-translators create a hybrid literature through migration of text, shift of identity, and transference of culture. To support this hypothesis, I employ the Skopos theory to facilitate my study of historical contexts, language transfers, and the employment of translation techniques of the self-translations by three prominent authors from China: Lin Yutang (1895-1976), Eileen Chang (1920-1995), and Ha Jin (1956-).¹ Studies of their literary works have been empirically well-

---

¹ According to translation scholar Shaoming Liu, self-translators in China also includes Guangzhong Yu, Weilian Ye, Mu Yang, Jingxian Wang, Cuowai Zhang, and Lu Xun, Lao She, Zhilin Bian, Qian Xiao, Taiyi Lin, Xianyong Bai, and Hualing Nie, a majority of whom are self-translating between Chinese and English, with an exception of Lu Xun who self-translates between Chinese and Japanese.
grounded and painstakingly detailed. Yet the act of transplanting their texts into a new cultural, linguistic, and literary context has not been adequately addressed. My dissertation speaks to this significant omission.

As author/translators, self-translators are often queried about their motivations. Discussions of self-translators distinguish between those who do so for political, historical or cultural reasons and those who state no explicit reason other than their personal choice. The three Chinese writers of my study fall into the first category, all of whom have completed self-translations under distinct political circumstances from Wartime Shanghai, to World War II America, Cold War America, and post-millennium America. Lin Yutang translated *Between Tears and Laughter* (1943) mainly for the purpose of cultural mediation and a bitter plea for the United States to support China during WWII. In a different historical period, Chang’s self-translation was subjected to Cold War politics. Her multiple self-translated works from *The Golden Cangue*, besides being a method of self-criticism, became a form of editorial recycling defined by publication opportunities. Ha Jin chose to self-translate his short story collection, “A Good Fall” (2009) to restore his literary reputation in China. Thus, three chapters will be taken up with the identification, explication, evaluation, and interpretation of self-translation strategies along with bilingual textual analysis respectively of Lin Yutang’s play, *Confucius Saw Nancy*/*子见南子*, two bilingual essays\(^2\) and the novel *Between Tears and Laughter* (1943)/《啼笑皆非》; Eileen Chang’s three bilingual essays and the novella *金锁记* (1943)/*The Rouge of the North*; and Ha Jin’s short story collection, *A Good Fall* (2009)/《落地》. I argue that self-translation allows these authors to take more liberties with the texts as compared to regular

---

\(^2\) Yutang Lin has self-translated more works than were selected here. Suoqiao Qian’s *The Little Critic* (Beijing: Jiuzhou P., 2012) has collected fifty self-translated essays (Chinese/English) Yutang Lin wrote from 1930-1935. The three works I chose here are based not only on achievements in aesthetics but diversity in styles.
translators in that they have more complicated Skopos to fulfill, such as shifts of identities, expansion of literary fame, recovery of a lost audience, and battles against political censorship, other than achieving linguistic transfer and addressing cultural concerns.

Different from regular translators, self-translators seem to care less about linguistic equivalents but more about extension, a new stage, and a daring variation on the original text. Self-translation is a new opportunity to recast and remake one’s work. The original and its translation alternate with each other, so that a sort of dialectics is established between both texts, with the result that the translated text often leads the author to modify and even rewrite the original. In this way, self-translation unsettles the categories of original writing, translation, author, reader, and translator, which raises a number of typological questions. To explore motivations behind the changes self-translators make in the target text, changes that go beyond poetic license, Skopos theory, which states that translation is not simply an act of linguistic transference but rather an application of *purpose*, is especially useful in providing tangible results because an equivalence-based paradigm alone is insufficient. In *Between Tears and Laughter*, for example, I will consider three rules of Skopos (purpose, coherence, fidelity) in analyzing Lin’s employment of various translation strategies both global and local—including literal, semantic, free, and idiomatic translation—to achieve various Skopos. For Eileen Chang’s *The Golden Cangue* which underwent self-translation and rewriting six times between 1943 and 1968, I will explore the Skopos behind Chang’s obsession with multiple self-translations of the same work to deepen our understanding of self-translation as a social and intellectual practice. Ha Jin claims that he has faithfully self-translated his works without any significant changes, a statement that invites exploration.

In this sense, Skopos theory lends important theoretical support for Lin, Chang, and Jin’s various translational activities. While the notion of purpose is not explicitly referred to in Lin,
Chang and Jin’s discussions on translation theory, it serves as a guiding principle underlying their translation criticism and practice. According to Hans Vermeer, “intention, Skopos and function are individually ascribed concepts (by the producer, sender, commissioner, translator and recipient),” and if they coincide, they mean the same seen from different points of view.\(^3\) Skopos theory not only enlarges the concept of translation itself, which includes adaptations, adjustments and rewritings, but also enlarges the concept of the translator’s role. Self-translators can also be editors, recyclers, or creators.

The choice of the three writers for the dissertation lies not only in their practice of self-translation, but also in their contributions to cultural mediations, which means “intercultural transmission that facilitates communication, understanding and action between persons or groups who differ with respect to language and culture.”\(^4\) Within each of the three chapters, along with the discussion of the author’s self-translation strategies, I will focus on three specific instances of cultural mediation: Lin’s reconciliation of languages and identities, Chang’s awkward betweenness and metamorphosis, and Jin’s double belonging and betrayal. The investigation seeks to demonstrate how each of these self-translated texts creates both “identities-in-translation” and “translated identities.”\(^5\) To better understand the three self-translators’ translation practice and translation theory, it is essential to first place them in the larger context of translation studies worldwide and then China in particular.

---

A Brief History of Translation Studies Worldwide

Translation theory was sparse in antiquity and the theories that emerged at the time were mainly situated in the discipline of rhetoric. Two of the pioneers of the field were Horace and Cicero (first century B.C.) whose discussions of translation practice pertained to word-for-word and sense-for-sense translation. Devoted to the translation of Holy Scriptures, St. Jerome (fourth century A.D.) also exerted a big influence upon later translations by negating the word-for-word approach while applying a free translation of Holy Scriptures. Such basic trends from the first century B.C. to the fourth century A.D. dominated later progressions and advances in the field up until the twentieth century, when the study of translation as an academic subject began burgeoning.

The discipline is now generally known as translation studies, thanks to the Dutch-based United States scholar James S. Holmes’ defining paper delivered in 1972. Holmes’ biggest contribution lies in his attempt to draw the map of the “territory” of translation studies. He divided it into two main areas: pure (descriptive translation studies and translation theory) and applied (translation training, translation aids, translation policy, and translation criticism). Although Holmes’ map had been under criticism (Pym, 1998; Vandepitte, 2008), it could be argued that his map indicated the great potentiality of the discipline. Holmes, along with other translators/linguists, including Eugene Nida and J. C. Catford, (A Linguistic Theory of Translation, 1965, the oft-cited classic), hammered out key approaches to a new descriptive study of translation, as opposed to the previous prescriptive approach stressing fidelity to the

---

These scholars/linguists played an important role in the academic legitimization of translation as a discipline at an early stage.

With the development of the studies in the 1980s, the branch of linguistics, known as structural linguistics which featured the work of Roman Jakobson, Eugene Nida, Newmark, and Catford, gave way to functional linguistics, because more scholars began to realize that language was not just about structure – it was also about the way language was used in a given social context. A major exponent of functional linguistic approach to translation, Mona Baker, in the introduction to In Other Words: A Coursebook on Translation (1993), expanded the discussion of linguistic “equivalence” from structural perspective to functional perspective and systematically went through all the different kinds of equivalences. It begins with “word-for-word” equivalence and moves through equivalences beyond word level, including idiomatic, grammatical, textual, thematic, and pragmatic. After this early stage, linguistics continued to contribute to translation studies, but the two disciplines had gradually developed what Peter Fawcett described as a “love-hate relationship,” which referred to the limitations linguistic approaches had upon the study of translation: the exclusions of cultural, social, and creative factors. Thus, translation studies began moving towards its first major turning point, namely, the shift away from linguistics and a purely formalist approach to the broader issues of context, history and culture.

The Cultural Turn

In 1990, Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, two towering translation studies scholars, famously announced what had been under way for some time: the “cultural turn” in translation

---

studies. In brief, they envisaged that “neither the word, nor the text, but the culture becomes the operational ‘unit’ of translation.” The notion of the “cultural turn” in translation studies signifies a move towards a greater awareness of the interaction between translation and culture. Cultural studies had a profound impact on translation studies to the extent that the social effects of translation, as well as the political and ethical implications of this cultural practice, moved to the forefront of scholarly interest. The postcolonial critic Homi K. Bhabha reframed the idea of cultural translation yet again by embedding it in the context of migration and hybridity. In the mid-1990s, then, “translation” had acquired a whole new meaning that was entirely uncoupled from the textual-linguistic approach.

The postcolonial approach to translation has intercultural exchange as its special focus. For example, Vincente Rafael (1988) studies translation practices that are linked to the evangelization of the Philippines; Eric Cheyfitz (1991) investigates western representations of the otherness of indigenous peoples in the Americas; and Tejaswini Niranjana (1992) examines the British colonization of India and the role translation played in the process. Canadian theorist and professor, Annie Brisset points out that the cultural turn that revolutionized translation studies “occurred in the wake of the important historical period of decolonization.” In general, postcolonial translation studies examines the use and abuse of translation by Europeans in empire building. In this context, the term “translation” is often used metaphorically to refer to situations, such as human emigrants from one culture into another. A seminal work in this field is Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Genzler’s Translation and Power (2002).

---

Likewise, feminist translation theory also explores cultural issues in translation. From a feminist perspective, it examines questions, like women’s position as invisible translators, feminine metaphors for the translation process itself, and linguistic issues, such as sexist usage and the different gendering of various languages. Seeing feminist translation theory as part of a larger picture, Sherry Simon’s *Gender in Translation: Cultural Identity* (1996) and Luise von Flotow’s *Translation and Gender: Translating in the “Era of Feminism”* (1997) both provide good introductions to the feminist translation approaches.

Along with the postcolonial and feminist perspective of analyzing translation, the anthropological basis of translation studies came a little later. Bachmann-Medick points out that the problem for anthropology is that the translation of other cultures is always “beset by the danger of distortion posed by interpreting indigenous concepts in a conceptual system that is foreign to them,” and then re-expressing the modes of thought of other cultures in the languages and “conceptual system of a western audience.”¹⁴ Thus, textual alterations often accompany a work’s entry into different contexts. For example, the English translator of Yan Geling’s *Fusang* and its editor agreed to excise or shorten many passages in the Chinese novel, as well as to make the translation read, in the words of Cathy Silber, the translator, more like an “English-language novel.”¹⁵

Translation studies also sees plenty of turns such as “power turn” (Tymoczko & Gentzler, 2002), “ethical turn” (Snell-Hornby, 2006), and “fictional turn” (Gentzler, 2008).¹⁶ The term

---

“power turn” discusses a phenomenon that strong cultures always gain the discourse right in cultural communication and they take translation as a way to express their ideas and to control the weaker cultures. Bassnett and Lefevere argue that English today occupies the same position throughout the world that Latin originally occupied. They write: “Translations into English, particularly from third world languages, are almost invariably slanted toward English: “we are confronted with what we may term the “Holiday Inn Syndrome,” where everything foreign and exotic is standardized, to a great extent.” Such power relationships between powerful cultures and weaker cultures and their impacts on translation have attracted much critical attention in the past decade. In his 2008 book, Translation and Identity in the Americas, Edwin Gentzler proposes a “fictional turn” to refer to translation in connection with the construction of identity in the Americas. He argues that translation is not so much about rendering an existing text into a different language, but about opening and, to some extent, creating new worlds for new audiences.

The “power turn” is tied to a rather new, underexplored paradigm in translation studies—translation ethics. Although translation theorists like Anthony Pym (1997), Andrew Chesterman (1997) and Lawrence Venuti (1998) made valuable contributions towards a framework of translation ethics already in the late 1990s, Mary Snell-Hornby maintained in 2006 “that the ‘ethical turn’ in Translation Studies has yet to be taken.” The ethical turn shifted the interests of translation theorists to the ideological aspects of translation and, in particular, to the moral problems of “misconstruing” a foreign culture and the problem of “misreading” the cultural...

---

18 Ibid.
baggage that comes with translation. To understand what is foreign, and to accept “the foreign” with all its idiosyncrasies, is in today’s globalized world of the utmost importance.\textsuperscript{20}

Recently, globalization turn or transnational turn has gained broad attention and presented itself in a variety of works. Translation scholars from the world over are now increasingly and legitimately questioning whether the well-known translation models fit in the West would also be applicable to the rest of the world. Some are speaking of an “international turn” in the discipline to refer to such efforts toward a more inclusive, truly global and culturally balanced approach to translation.\textsuperscript{21} Important exponents of this growing movement include Theo Hermans’s \textit{Translation Other} (2006), Maria Tymoczko’s \textit{Enlarging Translation, Empowering Translations} (2007), and Edwin Gentzler’s \textit{Translation and Identity in Americas} (2008). Like Hermans and Tymoczko, Gentzler challenges the “Eurocentric” model. He replaces it with a “pan-American” one, including various practices and theories that are associated with different geographical regions, such as multiculturalism in the United States, feminism in Quebec, cannibalism in Brazil, and border writing in the Caribbean. Translation studies in China, no doubt, is an indispensable part of such a movement.

\textbf{A Brief History of Translation Studies in China}

Chinese translation theory was born out of contact with vassal states during the Zhou Dynasty (1044–256 BC). Documents of the time indicated that translation was carried out by government clerks, who were concerned primarily with the transmission of ideologies. Later on, translation theory developed through translations of Buddhist scripture into Chinese. A Chinese

\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
Buddhist layman, Zhi Qian (222-252 AD), who translated a wide range of Indian Buddhist scriptures into Chinese, discusses two strategies in translating scriptures, that is, “Zhi (质)” and “Wen (文).” The school of “Zhi” used Confucian theory and advocated a simple style of the translated version, which was easy to understand and did not lose any meaning (literal translation); whereas the school of “Wen” advocated an elegant style with native Chinese expressions, and preferred more freedom, using deletions, omissions and simplifications to achieve rich rhetoric and stylistic fluency (free translation). Chinese translation theory was closely related to its philosophical counterpart in antiquity. In the Tang Dynasty (618-907AD), the famous Buddhist scripture translator, Xuan Zang, exemplified choices of translation strategies. He used both free translation and literal translation methods in practice by employing “new devices” such as addition, omission, conversion, and replacement (such as noun for pronoun), to keep the meaning and spirit of the original. He translated not only Buddhist manuscripts into Chinese but philosopher Lao Zi’s works into Sanskrit. With the translation of Buddhist scriptures came the first crest of the translation practice in China.

Contemporary researchers have customarily divided translation practices into four peaks, the first of which is mentioned above, that is, Buddhist scriptural translations from around the Donghan Dynasty (25–220 AD) to the Song Dynasty (960-1279). The second peak is Jesuitical-Protestant translations from the late Ming Dynasty (16th century) to early Qing Dynasty (17th century), followed by a third peak of “Western learning” translations from after the Opium Wars

---

(1839-1842; 1856-1960) to the May 4th Movement (1915-1921), and the fourth peak of the current translation of Western sciences starting in the 1980s.24

Of the four peaks, the one that most influences Lin, Chang, and Ha Jin is the third climax. After China’s humiliating loss in the Opium Wars, intellectuals resorted to translation as a transformative force in the making of a modern China. Among many were two leading translators—Yan Fu (1854-1921) and Lin Shu (1852-1924). Yan Fu’s “Preface to Tianyanlun (Huxley’s Evolution and Ethics)” was exceedingly well-timed to inaugurate twentieth-century translation theory in China. Yan’s ideas about xin (“faithfulness,” “fidelity”), da (“fluency,” “comprehensibility”) and ya (“elegance,” “polish”) had assumed a prominence in translation theories unequaled by any other theoretical work in the twentieth century. Yan Fu applied traditional Chinese into his translation, making foreign works resemble Chinese. He stood at the watershed between translations of missionaries and early modern translation schools—carried out between 1840 and 1895—and the wave of scientific translations from Japanese sources which dominated the period from 1900 to the May Fourth Movement.25 He played a direct role in the process of standardization of scientific terminology in China as the Head of the State Terminology Bureau between 1908-1911.

In the same historical period, Lin Shu became a central force in literary translation. Although Lin knew no foreign languages, he completed over 180 translations of Western literary works into classical Chinese. He overcame his ignorance of foreign languages by collaborating with twenty different assistants trained in various languages. Each of these assistants acted as an

---

oral interpreter, sentence by sentence, while Lin produced the written translation.\textsuperscript{26} Although he introduced Chinese readers to major works from Daniel Defoe’s \textit{Robinson Crusoe} to Harriet Beecher Stowe’s \textit{Uncle Tom’s Cabin}, he also took the liberty to essentially rewrite, abridge, or embellish the original texts. Furthermore, Lin Shu omitted any references to Western religion or moral norms considered inappropriate for the Chinese ruling class.\textsuperscript{27} Lin Shu’s model of being a monolingual translator did not have many followers. Almost all translators during the May Fourth Movement were bilingual or multilingual.

The May Fourth Movement initiated Chinese modernity and opened a new chapter in the translation history of China. Many of the writers and cultural critics of the period were themselves translators before or while they turned to creative or critical writing, as were Lin Yutang and Eileen Chang. More than one fourth of all the books translated between 1912 and 1940 were Western literary works, of which about ninety percent were fiction, drama, and poetry, and the remainder literary theory and criticism.\textsuperscript{28} Western novels and plays have been influential both as entertainment and in education and propaganda. Millions of Chinese students, academics and politicians were influenced by Chinese translations of Western books. For instance, Liang Qichao (1873-1929), a bold advocate for reforms, had his worldview shaken and his “frog-at-the-bottom-of-a-well vision” of the world liberated after he began to voraciously read translations of Western books.\textsuperscript{29} Liang went further and developed a clear three-pronged strategy to go about saving China via translation: “First, selection of books to translate; second,
standardization of terms and proper names; third, education of translation talents.”

He saw fiction as a vital force in shaping people’s consciousness. Given the enormous moral agency he assigned to fiction in a society, he called for the translation of Western fiction in reshaping the national consciousness and character. Liang was not alone in placing translation on the central stage of revolution. Writers and critics of the May Fourth Movement enthusiastically joined in the discussion of translation theories and practices.

The 1920s and 1930s witnessed translation theory in China entering a distinctly modern phase. Scholars and translators were then engaged in intense debates about the nature and function of translation. Most notably, there were fierce disagreements about the issues of “foreignization” (the method of allowing cultural and linguistic differences to stay intact), the use of Europeanized structures and expressions in translation, and the criterion of fidelity. This brings to mind the arguments of Friedrich Schleiermacher (1768-1834) and Lawrence Venuti. Schleiermacher saw only two possibilities when translating: “Either the translator leaves the writer alone as much as possible and moves the reader toward him [the writer], or he leaves the reader alone as much as possible and moves the writer toward him [the reader].” Echoing this, Venuti introduced the concepts of “domestication” and “foreignization” as translation strategies: domestication entails “a labor of acculturation which domesticates the foreign text, making it intelligible and even familiar to the target-language reader, providing him or her with the narcissistic experience of recognizing his or her own culture in a cultural other”; foreignization is

30 Ibid. 38.
31 Ibid.
“an ethnodeviant pressure on [target-language cultural] values to register the linguistic and cultural difference of the foreign text, sending the reader abroad.”

Of the debate over foreignization and domestication during the May Fourth era, Lu Xun, no doubt, was at the very center of critical attention. Although scholars tend to zero in on Lu Xun’s style of extreme liberalism, there was actually dichotomous contrast between his early and later translations. In 1903, Lu Xun translated two science fiction novels by Jules Verne, *From the Earth to the Moon* and *Journey to the Centre of the Earth*. He adopted a freer, domesticating strategy. Although he did not know French, he translated them from the versions in Japanese (which were in turn based on the English translations), of which he was a fluent speaker. Two decades later when he was translating in the 1920s and 1930s, he switched to an approach of word-for-word translation, also known as *yingyi* (硬译), which can be literally interpreted as “stiff translation” or “hard translation.” Lu Xun’s faithfulness to the original text went down to the level of grammar and syntactic structure, preserving the sentential structure of the source language. Clearly, the language structure of Chinese differs radically from that of Western languages. Lu Xun’s insistence on adhering to the original word order and sentence structure produced grammatically incorrect, abstruse, or chaotic Chinese sentences, difficult even for his fellow scholars to parse. For example, while many Western languages use both pre-modifiers and post-modifiers to modify a headword in a noun phrase (i.e. adjectives can be placed both before and after the nouns), only pre-modifiers are possible in Chinese. To echo the long modifiers otherwise considered acceptable, word-for-word translation into Chinese would result in a confusing, incoherent sentence that introduces a string of modifiers connected by the

---

possessive “的 (de),” before the final headword can be identified by the reader. Lu Xun himself was well aware of the incomprehensibility of his translation, stating that he consciously chose faithfulness over smoothness as the means of preserving the original mood and flavor.\(^\text{35}\) Why then did Lu Xun switch to a linguistically awkward foreignization strategy that would have gone against his usual practice as a renowned literary writer? The radical—almost indigestible—foreignization of Lu Xun’s translations epitomizes his desire to spark domestic change and modernization of the Chinese language and culture. Lu Xun’s “stiff translation” was not a simple matter of linguistic self-colonization, but a stimulating reexamination for Chinese language and culture.

During the May Fourth period, Lu Xun was not alone in advocating foreignization. Liu Yingkai, Qu Qiubai, and Sun Zhili all prefer this method. Lu Xun and Qu Qiubai declared that they would “rather to be faithful (in thought) than smooth (in language).”\(^\text{36}\) Liang Shiqiu and Zhao Jingshen, on the other hand, argued that they would “rather to be smooth (in language) than faithful (in thought).”\(^\text{37}\) Other translators such as Zhang Ruogu, Zhu Shenghao (translator of Shakespeare’s Complete Works), Fu Donghua, Chen Xiying, Mao Dun, and Lin Yutang all advocated domestication. No matter what approach they support, they represent the most prominent intellectuals and politicians of the 19th and early 20th centuries. These were passionate, idealistic young men who were being or had been educated at Euro-American universities, or at least were receiving Westernized education in the newly modernized Japan. For them, translating Western texts was much more than a pure literary act; it was, rather, the forefront of a campaign to wake up and enlighten the Chinese people for national survival.

\(^{36}\) Zhongde Liu, Ten Talks about Literary Translation (Beijing: Beijing Translation P., 1991) 48.
\(^{37}\) Ibid.
critical difference this younger generation had with their immediate predecessors is that they came in such strength, volume, and velocity, and that they were so much fiercer, more iconoclastic, and uncompromising.\textsuperscript{38} It is under such circumstances that Lin Yutang and Eileen Chang began their practice in translation and self-translation.

Situated in a completely different historical era, Ha Jin was much influenced by a cultural movement that was as powerful as the May Fourth Movement once was. After the self-isolated years from the 1950s and 1970s, China welcomed the era of “Cultural Fever” in 1980s. This “Cultural Fever” movement encouraged new ideas and theories and promoted freedom in thinking and research. Translation played an essential role in introducing new concepts and theories. Between 1978 and 1982, over four hundred translations of Western fiction were published, which quickly formed into a publishing movement. Influential book series included the “20\textsuperscript{th} Century Foreign Literature Series,” “Famous Works of Foreign Literature Series,” and “Works of Nobel Literature Prize Winning Authors Collection” won unprecedented readership.\textsuperscript{39} The translation of twentieth century western literary studies, as well as important works in the social sciences and the humanities, such as philosophy, aesthetics, cultural studies, sociology, and psychology, contributed to the further liberalization in academic and cultural life. Inspired by such nationwide passion for literature and translation, Ha Jin selected literature as his life-long pursuit. The movement came to an end in 1989 due to a sudden change of political climate which also changed the literary route of Ha Jin.

\textsuperscript{38} Shouhua Qi, \textit{Western Literature in China and the Translation of a Nation} (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012)
\textsuperscript{49}.

Self-Translation

Before zeroing in on the discussion of Skopos theory, it’s worthwhile to tackle major theoretical issues current scholars have about the unique translation practice of self-translation.

Self-translation, as a literary phenomenon refers to the act of translating one’s own literary work into another language and another text. Contrary to popular belief, self-translation has enjoyed a long and rich history, predating the Middle Ages, but in terms of academic research, the literature on self-translation is relatively new. Roughly up until the 1980s, apart from a few studies on authors such as Giuseppe Ungaretti (Maggi Romano 1974; Sansone 1989) and Vladimir Nabokov (Cummings 1977; Grayson 1977; Holmstrom 1985), most scholarly energy was channeled toward the work of Samuel Beckett (Cohn 1961; Beer 1985; Fitch 1985, 1988; Chamberlain 1987), who up until today continues to be regarded as perhaps the most prototypical of self-translators and continues to receive a good deal of attention (Oustinoff 2001; Sardin-Damestoy 2002; Ackerley 2008; Erik Tonning, 2010; Anthony Uhlmann, 2013; Dirk Van Hulle 2015). Moreover, many more examples of self-translation have been found in Western than in Eastern cultures and similarly, numerous examples of self-translation can be found between languages that are etymologically close, for instance French and English, Portuguese and Spanish, etc. In this regards, this dissertation contributes to the expansion of scholarship on self-translation between etymologically distant languages.

---

41 Self-translators have included the medieval philosopher Raimundus Lullius, the humanist Leonardo Bruni, Thomas More, Etienne Dolet, Du Bellay, Jean Bodin, John Cakvin, pietro Bembo, the poet Andrew Marveil, the philosopher Spinoza, the Italian playwright Carlo Goldoni, the French poet Mallarme, James Joyce, and the Nobel Prize recipients (see endnote 43), plus Julien Green, Romain Gary, and Elsa Triolet in France, Karen Federman, Nancy Huston, and a long list of authors, particularly within the world of literature. For more information, refer to Georges L. Bastin and Paul F. Bandia, eds. Charting the Future of Translation History (Ottava, U of Ottawa P., 2006) 24.
With the steady increase of journal articles and conferences devoted to self-translation since the turn of the millennium, it suggests the Zeitgeist potential of self-translation. Beyond what is mentioned before, more works continued to be devoted to stars of self-translation, such as Rabindranath Tagore, Geoffrey Chaucer and Thomas More. Among a handful of book-length studies on self-translation, the most representative ones are Jan Hokenson and Marcella Munson’s pioneering work, *The Bilingual Text* (2006), which provides a comprehensive history of self-translation from the Middle Ages to the present, and Anthony Cordingley’s edited book *Self-Translation: Brokering Originality in Hybrid Culture* (2013), which provides critical, historical and interdisciplinary analyses of self-translators and their works; canonical self-translators (as is mentioned above) are discussed in the previously overlooked contexts from Japan to South Africa.

A leading question that fascinates self-translation scholars is how self-translation deconstructs the full range of Translation Studies’ core concepts: author and translator, original and target text, equivalences, the target reader, etc. Where they were once grounded in the movement between singular languages and cultural spaces, these concepts “become increasingly dynamic, challenging a binary conceptualization of translation, inviting hybrid categories, such as, auctorial translation or hybrid text.”

---

43 Even a cursory glance at the number of Nobel Prize–winning authors who were at one point or another active self-translators – the names of Samuel Beckett, Joseph Brodsky, Czesław Miłosz, Frédéric Mistral, Luigi Pirandello, Isaac Bashevis Singer, Rabindranath Tagore, and Gao Xingjian spring to mind – reveals that self-translation is far more common and perhaps more paradigmatic than is sometimes supposed.


languages. When seen from this perspective, the binaries of source/target and original/translation become superfluous. What emerges beyond these dualities is a more holistic perception of a writer’s work and the writing process itself, which has no fixed point of origin.

In this sense, self-translators benefit from a unique form of freedom. Self-translators, Anthony Cordingley argues, “bestow upon themselves liberties of which regular translators would never dream.”47 As a result self-translation typically produces another version or a new “original.” According to Cordingley, it is not only the concept of the original but also the notion of originality itself that is negotiated. Bi-and multilingual writers can create their own artistic originality by changing for instance, the medium of expression. During the process of rewriting the text, the authors are, in fact, given the opportunity to look back at their first creation and – through the means of a different language and the system of cultural significations it implies—to create an enhanced second version (with the process of creative reworking, the resulting text is usually enriched). 48 Sometimes, self-translation can be dangerous, though, since it undermines the status of the original work. When a book is translated by someone else, the translation in no way diminishes the stature of the original, but when a writer self-translates, it may happen that the translation is not merely a facsimile, a replica, or an equivalent but an improvement, even a replacement of the first text. If the translated version is not accepted as canonical, then self-translation threatens the writer’s self-image of his artistic particularity; self-replication can be

---


schizophrenic. 49 Such danger, however, seldom stops writers, especially those who are in
migration, to gain new audiences through translating their own works.

A flowering of scholarly endeavors has begun investigating the intimate connection
between translation and migration over the past few decades, in both cultural and linguistic
terms. Cultural theorists like Homi Bhabha and Salman Rushdie have, for instance, explored
how migrants are “translated men” in various ways and have prompted the need to analyze the
transformations and tensions that arise within the contradictory and ambivalent “Third Space” of
enunciation, where “even the same signs can be appropriated, translated, rehistoricized and read
 anew.”50 As a creative instance that allows an author to consciously produce double texts, self-
translation is, in fact, a useful deconstructive lens which reflects—and through which to reflect
upon—what it means to be a “translated” subject both at a geographical-cultural and textual-
linguistic level. By mirroring the bilingual writer’s deep-rooted urge to give voice to the duality
deriving from the migrating experience, self-translation is, at once, a strategy of resistance
against physical displacement, forgetfulness, and hegemonic cultural and linguistic assimilation,
as well as a strategy of re-appropriation of one’s pluricultural identity. Thus, this dissertation
argues that through self-translation, the three authors achieved migration of texts and shifts of
identities.

Being an exile does not always mean being stuck in the past; it can also mean a full
investment in the present. In this sense, self-translation appears to be a powerful means of
inscribing the self in a new language and environment. The fragmentation of the spatial,
temporal and linguistic unity fuels the imagination that not only makes possible the recuperation

of the pieces of memory from the past in order to preserve a form of unity and coherence between then and now but also provides new strategies with which to inscribe the self in a new setting. What self-translation implies is not a celebration of difference and plurality, not a victorious claim of being or becoming a nomad; on the contrary, it tells the story of becoming the other as a painful, ongoing and fully resistant process. The self-translated text can never provide a perfect replica of the original for the two do not arise from the same context. In each text, a self-translator writes with a different reader in mind, resulting in the creation of dialogic links between different cultures, languages, spaces, countries, people and times. Lin, Chang, and Jin’s recognition of these translation Skopos allows them to anticipate a range of potential readings (or misreadings), and to attempt to influence, preempt, or co-opt them through various self-translation strategies. When conducting case studies, I will employ Skopos theory to decipher the choice of translation strategies, preference for styles and dictions, and adaptations for changed audiences. To clarify, major arguments about Skopos theory are presented in summary as follows.

Skopos Theory

Skopos theory was first proposed by the German translator Hans Vermeer in 1978 and further developed by another German translator Christiane Nord. In this theory, the process of translation is determined by the function of the product, which is specified by the addressee. As one of the functionalist approaches, the theory aims to dethrone the Source Text (ST) by

---

emphasizing the role of the translator as a creator of the Target Text (TT) and giving priority to purpose (Skopos) of producing TT. Translation is considered primarily as a process of intercultural communication whose end product is a text which has the ability to function appropriately in specific situations and context of use. Skopos theory consists of three essential rules: the purpose or Skopos, which must be determined before translation begins; thus, it makes the first rule of the Skopos theory; the second rule of the theory is “coherence rule,” which states that the TT must be sufficiently coherent to allow the intended receivers to comprehend it, given their assumed background knowledge; to avoid accusations of unfaithfulness, the Skopos offers a third rule, the “fidelity rule,” which concerns “intertextual coherence” between TT and ST. Of the three rules, the fidelity rule is considered secondary to the coherence rule, and both are subordinate to the Skopos rule. For instance, an epic like Homer’s *Odyssey* may be translated into a novel; its genre has changed because a particular Skopos may have considered the choice appropriate in the TT. Driven by different Skopos, the act of translation often produces an array of new codifications, textualities, and cultural meanings. In the process of such codifications or renditions, the three writers employed different styles of Chinese or English. To better understand such disparity, we need to examine the changing linguistic trends and historical eras in which they were situated.

---


Linguistic Contexts of the Three Self-Translators

To understand the features of Lin and Chang’s classical vernacular language and Jin’s Standard Mandarin, it is essential to understand the linguistic revolution that occurred along with the New Culture movement (mid 1910s and 1920s) when Lin and Chang began to publish their writings and the standardization movement after the PRC was founded in 1949 which defines how Jin translates in Chinese. At the turn of the twentieth century, Classical Chinese became increasingly viewed by the progressive forces as hindering education and literacy, and many suggested social and national progress. The May Fourth vernacular movement advocates that a new Chinese national literature be written in the vernacular language instead of the classical language. The works of Lu Xun and other writers of fiction and non-fiction did much to advance this view and vernacular Chinese soon came to be viewed as mainstream by most people. Along with the growing popularity of vernacular language was the acceptance of punctuation, modeled after what was used in Western languages (traditional Chinese literature was almost entirely unpunctuated). Since the late 1920s, nearly all Chinese newspapers, books, and official and legal documents have been written in vernacular Chinese. The wide use of vernacular Chinese also replaced Classical Chinese in all types of translation. Hu Shi (1891-1962), the leader of the vernacular movement, argued that the classical language, which had long been divorced from any spoken language, was primarily a visual language; by contrast, vernacular language, with its closer ties to speech, was a written language combining visuality and aurality.58

This May Fourth vernacular movement, however, was also met with criticism. In his famous 1932 article, “The Question of Mass Literature and Art,” Qu Qiubai (1899-1935), an important literary figure and political activist of 20th-century China, criticized the popular
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vernacular language as a “new-style classical” language that was confined to small circles of Westernized bourgeois and intellectual classes and held little appeal for ordinary people. He called for a new literary revolution that should “make sure that the modern vernacular be spoken by living Chinese…especially by the proletariat.” Qu’s support of proletariat language went so overboard that the issue of Latinization was brought up in 1934. Since proletariat language was largely identified as a written language built on the living language spoken by the masses, Latinization was proposed as a way to transcribe the mass language. Lu Xun played an important role in promoting the Latinization movement. He proposed to abolish Chinese characters, which were reserved as the privilege of the ruling class and resulted in a “mute” China for the grass root. He argued that the Latinized New Writing, through its simplicity, facility, and efficiency, would empower and enlighten the vast illiterate masses, enabling the silent majority to have their own voice and allowing the silenced to speak. Obviously, this radical proposal did not go through; otherwise, we would no longer be able to enjoy the beauty of Chinese characters.

Born out of this particular linguistic revolutionary era, the works of Lin and Chang are under the impact of three elements: the traditional vernacular, Europeanization components, and classical Chinese. Lin had already published some of his self-translation when the Vernacular Movement was under way, while Chang’s self-translations were published after the official legitimacy of vernacular took hold. Initially, Lin was an enthusiastic proponent of the vernacular movement but in the 1930s he started to question the role of vernacular Chinese, since, as he believed, it had absorbed many deformed influences. An important one was the

60 Ibid 49.
61 Jin Liu, Signifying the Local: Media Productions Rendered in Local Languages in Mainland China in the New Millennium (Leiden: Koninklijke Brill NV, 2013) 44.
“Europeanization” of the Chinese language, introduced to China through translations of Western literary and scientific texts: adopting stylistic and syntactical peculiarities of Western literature and scientific discourse in the Chinese translations brought up a number of unprecedented stylistic and syntactical variations in the modern Chinese language.\(^\text{62}\) In Lin’s opinion, these influences had made the vernacular Chinese more artificial, divorced from speech. Thus, Lin’s self-translation from English to Chinese presented the language feature of classical vernacular, which means placing vernacular dictions in a traditional Chinese syntax.

At Chang’s time, vernacular Chinese had already taken hold, but she chose not to fully adopt it and her style can still be interpreted as classical vernacular in that her writing undergoes the process of internalizing accumulated cultural treasures as it is deeply rooted in the classical literary tradition. Despite the variety of techniques Chang employs that are traceable to the influence of modern Western fiction, her highly suggestive verbal images clearly evokes the rich intensity of classical Chinese poetry. Instead of living up to the ideals set by the dominant May Fourth literary ethic, Chang chose a reading public that treated literature as entertainment. In a dubious attempt to defend herself against criticism, she sarcastically apologized for the fact that she could only write one kind of literature, that she was incapable of writing in the proletarian style.

Jin is situated in a completely different historical era when China had carried out the Standardization and Simplification movement in the 1950s and the use of Standard Mandarin is predominant nationwide. Jin’s language style distinguishes itself from those of Lin and Chang in that he was educated with simplified and standardized Chinese and there was limited trace of

classical Chinese in his writing and self-translation. His poetry was also exclusively written in standard Modern Chinese.

As masters of two languages, Lin, Chang, and Jin’s self-translations are two-way traffic. When they translated Chinese works into English, their English styles also varied. Lin was often commented upon as being witty and philosophical, Chang being idiosyncratic, and Jin being concise and simple. Given Lin’s professional background as a philologist, and given the fact that his mastery of English earned him much real and cultural capital, one would expect Lin to keep to the standard of something like the King’s English, but Lin held a surprisingly unorthodox and liberal view. He wagered that, given its inherent logical soundness and hybrid nature, by the year 2400, pidgin English will be the “only respectable international language.”  

Lin’s English presents strong features of hybridity. Chang went further with that hybridity. Chang initiated her stylistic smattering of Romanization of Chinese beginning with The Rice-Sprout Song, a habit reaching its peak in Naked Earth and ameliorating somewhat in The Rouge of the North. Routinely, Chang transliterated the Chinese word or idiom and then glossed it in English, without much concern for standard usage in English. She may have felt compelled to be linguistically authentic to the Chinese world she depicted, in that the tight hold onto her native language would remind her of her literary heritage when she was dislodged from Chinese territory in physical, familial, linguistic, and literary terms. The other possibility was that Chang had not made the necessary adjustment to connect with the English-speaking readership, bathed as she was since the 1960s in the resurgence of accolades for her works in Taiwan, Hong
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Kong, and overseas Chinese communities. By contrast, Ha Jin refrains from using any phonetic transcription at all and dismisses the glut of Romanization as out of touch with the American market. Though Jin’s English is often commented upon as a direct translation from Chinese sayings, he has achieved a level that few Chinese writers have done before, that is, the beauty and clarity of hybridity. More discussion of their languages features will be conducted in their own chapters.

Language hybridity has been a reality despite various language assimilationist policies. Venuti argues that many practicing translators unconsciously participate in a similar exclusion-oriented ideology, arguing that they reduce the foreignness “of the non-English-language texts, absorbing the ‘exotic’ into fluent-sounding, proper English prose.” Since self-translators have more authorial freedom in their language choice, they will be a valuable force to bring promising changes. Self-translators also have personal incentives in creating their own literary language with uniqueness and freshness. In today’s heterotopic world where cultures converge, intersect, and interact in a multitude of ways and places, the three writers’ complex lives and self-translated works present a fascinating study of translation and hybridity across the East and the West. Through the study of self-translation, we hope to find how exhilaration of iconoclasm and culturalism have dictated Skopos and defined translations.

---

Chapter One
Reconciliation of Languages and Cosmopolitan Identities: Lin Yutang’s Self-Translation

Overview

A renowned linguist, inventor, and intellectual, Lin Yutang (1895–1976) is one of the few literary giants of early modern China. As the most influential transcultural writer of the twentieth century, Lin has done more than any other person of his day to popularize and universalize Chinese philosophy and literature. Lin left a formidable legacy of bilingual writings through steadfast translation, self-translation, and literary creation in modern Chinese and Western intellectual history.66 However, despite the historical influence of Lin’s literary and cultural practices and the sustained general interest in Lin’s writings across the Taiwan Strait and around the world, his cross-cultural works and, to be specific, his self-translation are very much understudied. Suoqiao Qian believes that critical studies on Lin were rather difficult to undertake because he figuratively and literally lived in two worlds and a community of scholars from different cultural backgrounds willing to engage in cultural critique on Lin’s cross-cultural practices, his cosmopolitanism, and the reconciliations of languages, had yet to emerge.67 This chapter aims to decipher Lin’s bilingualism and cosmopolitanism under different circumstances, his choice of translation methods, and the Skopos behind the rhetorical choices of his self-translation, in order to further the discourse on dynamic language equivalences and culture-crossing.

Uncommon among Chinese intellectuals of the early twentieth century, Lin traverses easily between East and West. He was born into a small town in Fujian Province which was

66 His works were also translated into many languages, including French, German, Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, Norwegian, Finnish, Swedish, Hebrew, Arabic, Japanese, Korean, and Vietnamese.
historically connected to the West via emigration and commerce. In the 19th century, Protestant missionaries arrived by sea as Xiamen became a treaty port, which made it the birthplace of Chinese Protestantism and gateway for Western books and goods. Such ebullient cultural encounters made the area a breeding bed for translations and quite a few prominent translators were from that region. Following the tradition, Lin later grew into a lauded translator and self-translator. Lin’s father, a Presbyterian minister, gave Lin a forceful link to the West by sending him to missionary schools. Lin describes in his *Memoirs of An Octogenarian* that his childhood home, a pastor’s residence renovated out of an old church, was decorated with an impressive mixture of East and West, with two paintings hanging in the living room: one depicting a Caucasian girl and the other a picture of the last emperor Guang Xu. Upon graduation from St. John University, Lin taught at Qinghua University from 1916 to 1919. The bicultural harmony Lin experienced as a youth gave way to confrontations as he was exposed to more Chinese literature and culture. His was a cultural shock rarely experienced by most native Chinese intellectuals, as he confessed in his autobiography: “Imagine my shame when plunged into Peking, the center of China. It was not only my studies, but the Christian background. I had been forbidden to see Chinese theatres, from which all Chinese learned about Chinese famous men and women. I knew all about the trumpets of Joshua which brought about the fall of Jericho, but I did not know how Meng Jiangnü’s tears washed away a section of the Great Wall.”

Christianity did not come to China alone, but rather “packaged,” together with the opium trade and gunboat. Thus, for a while, the converted Chinese Christians were not only cut apart from
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68 The capital city of Fujian Province where Lin grew up, known as “Amoy” among westerners.
69 To name a few: Lin Shu, Yan Fu, Gu Hongming, Lin Wenqing, Xu Dishan, Lin Yutang, and Bing Xin.
71 Ibid. 31.
ordinary Chinese communities at large, but were forbidden the practice of certain conventions, such as the worship of ancestors or visit of local theatres.

While teaching, Lin began to painstakingly self-study Chinese history, literature, and philosophy. His second daughter Tai-yi Lin once commented that her father bought carts of Chinese classics home and devoured them awestruck. In 1919, while at Qinghua College, Lin received the Boxer Indemnity Scholarship to study comparative literature at Harvard University. With a strong background in western literature, Lin completed his doctoral degree in Chinese philology and linguistics in 1923 at the University of Jena in Leipzig, Germany. Lin’s skills in both languages and linguistics were further honed during his subsequent career. As the first Chinese scholar to have obtained an overseas PhD in linguistics, Lin, now fully accredited, became a professor at Peking National University (1923-1926) and Dean of Women’s Normal College (1926), where he met many writers and scholars with overseas educational backgrounds. Under their influence, Lin became a major critical presence in warlord China. He wrote many poignant essays employing humor and satire criticizing China’s ills. Disillusioned with radical social movements in Beijing, Lin left for Shanghai and lived there between 1929-1935. By then, Shanghai, the largest treaty-port with a blend of native and alien cultures, had become the new center of literary activity, which proved congenial to these new-style intellectuals. First, the foreign concessions, ironically, served as a haven from the warlord scuffles. Second, Shanghai’s publishing establishment, unrivaled anywhere in China, encouraged
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73 Including the leading figures in Chinese modern literature: Lu Xun (1881-1936), who had studied in Japan, and the renowned educator Hu Shi (1891-1962), key contributor to Chinese liberalism and language reform, educated at the Columbia University.
74 Because some of his articles annoyed the warlords, his name was placed on a death list of fifty-four “radical professors” along with Lu Xun.
a wide English readership, consisting of foreign residents as well as Chinese college students. Lin was a regular contributor to *The China Critic* (published 1928-1940, 1945), the first and only Chinese owned and edited English-language weekly newspaper in Republican China, where most of his speeches, essays, and humorous sketches appeared in a column titled “The Little Critic.” Some of these English essays were later translated, footnoted by himself and published in three literary fortnightlies Lin founded between 1929 and 1935: 《论语》 (*Analects*); 《人间世》 (*The Human World*); and 《宇宙风》 (*Cosmic Wind*). Richard Jean So describes Lin’s bilingual practice as “print ambitions” exceeding those of his peers who simply wanted to shape cultural discourse in China. Shuang Shen argues that Lin desired to cultivate a “cosmopolitan” Chinese reading public, one literate in English and attuned to the world beyond China, as well as to prove to Anglophone readers that the Chinese were capable of modern thought. Lin’s bilingual endeavor enabled him to become, in his words, a “world citizen.”

In late 1929, the battle lines were beginning to be drawn in China between the Chinese league of leftist writers led by Lu Xun and the others, like Lin Yutang. Japan’s invasion in the 1930s prompted Chinese leftist writers to embrace an aggressive polemical style in an effort to “weaponize” literature for the purpose of national salvation. By contrast, Lin chose to theorize and practice a style of writing that emphasized a far more flexible and less overt relationship to society, using subjective “experience” as the basis for inspiration and expression. Lin proposed “humor” and “self-expression” as key to his style which alienated him from the dominant leftist-leaning writers who criticized him as being too individualistic as opposed to the literary activism
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77 Ibid.
empowered by left-leaning writers. To leave the unfavorable literary arena, Lin accepted Pearl Buck and her husband Richard Wash’s invitation to the United States. Walsh, editor at John Day, was determined to make Lin a literary star, one the likes of which the United States public had never seen before: a dashing, articulate, charismatic, and authentically Chinese author who could speak without the political overtones. Walsh commissioned a primer on Chinese culture, which appeared as *My Country and My People* (1936), and later two novels, *Moment in Peking* (1937) and its sequel, *A Leaf in the Storm* (1941), all of which functioned within a literary mode of autoethnography and became instant best sellers. By the year of Pearl Harbor, Lin had become a member of the New York intellectual scene, discussing the war with Japan on the radio, offering insight into American culture as a “foreigner” in various magazines, and appearing often on the society page of the *New York Times*. Lin had become a sensation, the most famous Chinese person in America.

In China, Lin witnessed sweeping revolutions in China’s political system and cultural revolution that fundamentally changed the nation and its people; in the United States where he lived from 1935 to 1966, he experienced the Sino-United States coalition during WWII and the contrastive Cold War era. Lin returned to Taiwan in his later years (1966-1976) after China had split into the rival polities of a communist mainland supported by Russia and a nationalist Taiwan supported by the United States.

---

78 Lin Yutang was not the first native Chinese intellectual who let his voice be heard in the West. At the turn of the twentieth century, there were only a few Chinese intellectuals who were able to translate Chinese into foreign languages, such as Su Manshu (1894-1918), Chen Jitong (1851-1907), and Gu Hongming. Gu Hongming and Chen Jitong were the only two who produced works that influenced the West before the 1920s, and Gu was the more influential and widely read in Europe.

79 Lin was awarded three honorary doctorates and celebrated as the great “son of the Orient” and “human man of the world” who had become the universal if unofficial Chinese ambassador. For more details, refer to Richard Jean So, *Transpacific Community: America, China, and the Rise and Fall of a Cultural Network* (New York: Columbia UP, 2016) 122-123; Diran John Sohigian’s Diss. 583.
**Studies on Lin Yutang’s Works**

Critiques on Lin Yutang have largely been focused on his life and English writings. So far, more than ten biographies of Lin have been published in Chinese, the most popular of which is written by Lin’s daughter, Lin Taiyi. Lin’s own autobiography has also gathered much critical attention. Diran John Sohigian’s English biography of Lin (1991) has also been much referenced. The scholarship upon Lin’s works are diverse in subjects, themes, and historical periods: in a span of sixty years, Lin wrote forty books and hundreds of articles in both Chinese and English. Numerous articles, essays, and books in both Chinese and English have discussed Lin’s life during different historical periods (years in China, Europe, or the United States) and his influence among various literary groups (May Fourth intellectuals, overseas students, yusi group, or Chinese Americans). Recent English scholarship on Lin has shifted from looking at Lin’s works in China and those in the U.S. as two distinct periods to a more holistic view of his entire opus. Five such works deserve our special attention.

Qiao Suoqiao’s edited critical volume, *The Cross-Cultural Legacy of Lin Yutang* (2015) is a first attempt at a comprehensive study on the cross-cultural legacy of Lin’s literary practices in and across China and America. It represents the leading international scholarship on Lin Yutang studies to date. Qiao Suoqiao’s *Liberal Cosmopolitan* (2011) sets out to undo an array of stereotypes about Lin that variously dismiss him as a liberal of weak convictions or—during
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his years in North America—a peddler of sanitized images of Chinese culture. Qian argues that Lin’s approach to problems of aesthetics offered a welcoming alternative to the agenda of an “elite intellectual class obsessed with ‘salvation of the nation’” (159).

Richard Jean So’s *Transpacific Community* (2016) analyzes China-Unites States cultural encounters in the first half of the twentieth century, and brings together concepts of open democracy, technology, media, and textual mediation to articulate a new model of the Transpacific. For the Lin Yutang chapter, “Topographic Ethnic Modernism,” So reconnects Lin’s American and Chinese lives by reconstructing an aesthetic and political project started in the 1930s in China and fulfilled in the 1940s in America. Richard Jean So’s essay, “Collaboration and Translation” (2010), strategizes a new method for interpreting Asian American literature by looking into the interactions between editors and writers, as well as marketing strategies. It argues that the quandaries and challenges faced by Lin were not restricted to the late 1940s; they were instrumental in the emergence of novels such as *The Woman Warrior* by Maxine Hong Kingston in the 1970s and *Native Speaker* by Chang-Rae Lee in the late 1990s.

Jing Tsu’s *Sound and Script in Chinese Diaspora* (2010) devotes two chapters to Lin Yutang: Chapter Three traces the history of the invention of the Chinese typewriter by Lin Yutang as an intercultural and transnational endeavor that anticipates the digital globalization of the Chinese written character; Chapter Four brackets the ideological mystique of bilingualism—and its concomitant romanticization of liminality and hybridity—and reframes the idea of the bilingual authors (Lin Yutang, Eileen Chang, and Ha Jin) as an uneasy negotiators between
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different traditions and languages, but as implicated in an impossible process of double translation and inescapable disloyalty.

While Lin’s works earned him worldwide acclaim, few studies consider the bilingual perspective and even fewer look at his self-translations. A handful of articles focusses on one specific work of translation or self-translation. For example, Jing Li and Changbao Li’s “A Comparative Analysis” (2016) compares Lin’s self-translation of *Between Tears and Laughter* with that of Song Biyun from a gender translation perspective and concludes that despite the shared androgynous identity and feminist aggressiveness, Lin’s self-translation appears to be more concise, unrestrained as well as Skopos-driven and emotional-enhanced both in diction and layout of the text by being modified into a political propaganda set to awaken his compatriots of innocence. So far, Li Ping’s “A Critical Study of Lin Yutang” (2012) is the only work that gives a comprehensive descriptive account of Lin’s theoretical views on translation, his translation criticisms and translation practices and a small section of chapter five is devoted to self-translation.

Different from the previous critical works, this study will cover all major periods of Lin’s self-translation by examining the publishing environment into which his self-translated works entered, the historical contexts that drove him to self-translate, various translation methods he adopted for specific situations, and manifold changes he made with the shifts of Skopos. Lin’s self-translations include at least the following works:
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(1) 子見南子(Confucius Saw Nancy), the only drama Lin wrote, which gained him initial fame. The play was first written in Chinese and published in 1928.\textsuperscript{88} The subsequent English translation\textsuperscript{89} was done by the author in response to the request of the Chinese students at Columbia University who performed it at the International House in December, 1931.

(2) Between July 3, 1930 to June 11, 1936, Lin wrote more than 150 short and pithy essays: most were written in English and a few were written in Chinese. Lin self-translated nearly half of them and published respectively in 论语(Lunyu), 人世间(Renjianshi), 宇宙风(Yuzhoufeng) and “The Little Critic.” Of these bilingual essays (around 60 pairs in total), only four were published first in Chinese.\textsuperscript{90} Thus, Lin translated his essays mostly one way: from English to Chinese. What I choose to study here are two representatives: “A Hymn to Shanghai/上海之歌” and “In Defense of Pidgin English/为洋泾浜英语辩解.”

(3) 啼笑皆非 (1943), a self-translated work from a best-seller in the United States, Between Tears and Laughter (1943), became proof of his patriotism during WWII. Lin translated the first eleven chapters and Chengbin Xu\textsuperscript{91} did the rest.

The study will also investigate the ways Lin negotiates and reconciles two languages and two cultures, in order to reveal and capture the author’s message in the way the author intends. I argue that Lin’s bilingualism and his cosmopolitanism make this reconciliation possible. He said he was “thinking with the brush in Chinese and the typewriter in English.”\textsuperscript{92}

\textsuperscript{88} Lin Yutang, 子見南子 (Confucius Saw Nancy), P’unliu Monthly, 6. 1 (1928). Also in 大荒集 (The Lone Wayfarer) (Shanghai: shenghuo shudian, 1934).
\textsuperscript{89} Lin Yutang, Confucius Saw Nancy and Essays About Nothing (Shanghai, Commercial P. Limited, 1937).
\textsuperscript{90} The newly published book Selected Bilingual Essays of Lin Yutang (2010) by Qian Suoqiao collected only 25 pairs of them.
\textsuperscript{91} Chengbin Xu (1920-1973) studied at St. John’s University in 1936 and was awarded an MA from Oxford. He was the third bishop (the first Chinese one) of the Hong Kong Catholic diocese (1969-1973).
Lin’s Contribution to the Development of Translation in China

In Chinese translation history, Lin’s contribution can be compared with that of Yan Fu and Lin Shu. Lin participated in the May Fourth Movement and inherited and developed Yan Fu’s theory, serving the work as a link between the past and the future. In translation practice, Lin carried on Lin Shu’s literary translation and produced wide-circulated translation works that outnumbered his self-translation. Lin brought to modern Chinese culture the notion of “humor” from the west and successfully translated Chinese literature for the west. Lin was one of the few people in modern China who were simultaneously translation theorists, translation critics and translation practitioners. Lin translated from Chinese to English and English into Chinese both his own works and those of other. Translation also played an important role in his works written in English. For example, the philosophy book The Importance of Living contains sixty-two translated passages from classical Chinese literature, and in particular, a full translation of Tu Long’s Mingliaozi you 冥寥子遊 (The Travel of Mingliaotse). Lin translated 63 poems of Su Tungpo and presented them in the biography he wrote, The Gay Genius: The Life and Times of Su Tungpo.

An important successor of Yan Fu, Lin’s theories on translation can be organized into pre- and post-1932.

Lin’s Views on Translation Before 1932

Lin’s formal attempt at translating English works into Chinese occurred soon after his efforts in rendering German works. On 23 May 1924, he published a paper titled “Zheng yi

---

93 Lin Yutang, The Importance of Living (New York: John Day Co., 1940) 338-361
95 The earliest translations Lin did were from German (instead of English) into Chinese. Deeply influenced by German philosophy and literature, he introduced some works in these fields to Chinese readers, including one of Heinrich Heine’s poems which was published bilingually in 晨報副刊 (Supplement to Morning News) in 1923 and Nietzsche’s Thus Spake Zarathustra in 1925. Lin also translated 24 sections of Italian philosopher Benedetto
sanwen bing tichang youmo” (“Call for translating essays and promoting humor”), in which he translated ‘humor’ into 幽默(youmo). Lin then published his translation of Bernard Shaw’s Pygmalion in 1929. Lin’s translated works are diverse in nature, among which include two books on Russian literature. In his “The little critic” column of 11 September 1930, Lin offered an account of what had happened to the Chinese intellectual scene:

Anybody who visits the new book shops on Foochow Road [in Shanghai] will see that over 70 per cent of the new books on the market have to do with Russia, Karl Marx, and names ending in a –ov, or a-lev. A list of the literary works of Russian authors which have been translated in the last two years would put to shame any professor of modern Russian literature in Harvard or Columbia…For Russia has conquered Young China and claimed her as her own…Young China has gone red…”

Though Lin tried to stay away from politics, he needed to face the literary reality of its time if he cared about his readership and publications. Lin eventually emerged to lead a literary and cultural movement of humor, which became a formidable alternative to the Leftist dominance in modern Chinese literature and culture. For Lin, the promotion of humor was primarily a means of engaging in sociopolitical critique, the humor of protest.

---

96 Lin Yutang was not the first to attempt to translate the word humor into Chinese, but was the first to translate it as 幽默 (Youmo), which became the current usage and a cross-cultural event. Wang Guowei, for instance, translated humor as 欧穆亚(Oumuya) in 1906. See also Christopher G. Rae, A History of Laughter: Comic Culture in Early Twentieth-Century China, Diss. Columbia U, 2008.
98 Jessica Milner Davis and Jocelyn Chey, Humour in Chinese Life and Letters: Classical and Traditional Approaches (Hong Kong: Hong Kong UP, 2011) 194.
Most of Lin’s English-Chinese translations were done in the late 1920s and early 1930s. Lin translated a series of influential English books into Chinese, such as *New Literary Criticism*, Dora Russell’s *Women and Knowledge*, Bernard Shaw’s *Pygmalion*, and George Brandeis’s *A Biography of Henrik Ibsen*. He also translated several Chinese books into English, such as *Letters of a Chinese Amazon* and *War-Time Essays*, and the translation of his own play, *Confucius Saw Nancy*. In the meantime, he also translated current news and essays into English and published them in newspapers, most of which were later collected in the book entitled *Letters of a Chinese Amazon and War-Time Essays* (1930). Following that, more essays on Chinese culture were collected in the two volumes of “The Little Critic” (1935). In the course of these works, Lin developed his own translation theory.

Lin’s early views on translation appeared in a number of short essays which were mainly concerned with transliteration. According to Ping Li, Lin’s first paper on translation was “對於譯名劃一的一個緊要提議” (“An Urgent Proposal for the Uniformity of Translated Terms”). Writing as a linguist at that time, Lin explained why it was necessary to establish a criterion for standardizing the translation of names and proper terms:

> The Buddhist transliteration since the Han Dynasty has been very serious and normative while today’s transliteration of foreign names in literature and the press is wholly in a

---

99 In the newly established Nanjing government, Cai Yuanpei (1868-1940), the former chancellor of Peking University, re-emerged as the intellectual leader, serving as minister of education, and president of Academia Sinica (Zhongyang yaniuyuan 中央研究院), founded in 1928. Soon after Lin arrived in Shanghai, he was appointed by Cai as a member of Academia Sinica and made its English editor-in-chief.

100 Since the early 17th century, numerous transliteration systems have been developed and used, often reflecting the orthography of the inventor’s mother tongue as much as Chinese phonology. Only in 1913 was a phonetic system using roman letters issued by the Ministry of Education of the Guomindang government. It was based on the phonology of the Beijing dialect (mandarin) which, at that time, was not generally understood throughout the country. Therefore, its geographical expansion and use remained very limited. A few decades later after the New China was founded in 1949, there came a nationwide establishment of the standard language and transliteration system.

101 Lin Yutang, “對於譯名劃一的一個緊要提議” (“An Urgent Proposal for the Uniformity of Translated Terms”), 晨報副刊(*Supplement to the Morning News*) 4 Apr., 1924.
mess. So it is necessary to find a systematic and perfect criterion for it so that we can get unified translated terms for medical and chemical terms (Ping Li’s translation).

Then Lin proposed a criterion:

The suitable criterion for transliteration should be that readers can trace back to the original word according to the translation. For example, it is a refined translation if we can judge from the sound of “阿波羅” (“a po lo” in the Wade-Giles system) that the original word was Apollo. It is a bad translation if we are not sure whether the original word was Apollo, Apple, Apparel, Apolo, Apro, Aporo, Aporol, and so on.102

Lin then explained that it was difficult to reproduce pronunciation of Western names in Chinese because Chinese names did not have as many phonemes as Western names did. He gave a detailed comparison of phonemes between Chinese and English, French and German, and finally provided a list of thirty Chinese characters matching phonemes in English, German and French for translators’ reference.103 The essay was of great significance for early modern China at a time when a comprehensive standard for transliteration was lacking. Therefore, many translation errors were made and some even triggered public debate. A famous anecdote was that Zhao Jingshen translated the English expression “the Milky Way” into 牛奶路 (“the Way of Milk”). Lu Xun regarded it as a wrong translation and a heated discussion over the proper translation of the phrase followed. Now the widely accepted translation in Chinese is 银河 (“the Silver River”).

In another essay, “Jiuwenfa zhi tuifan ji xnwenfazhi jianzao 旧文法之推翻及新文法之建造” (“The Disuse of the Old Grammar Learning System and Adoption of the New Grammar Learning System”), Lin pointed out that Chinese literature had a tradition of using highly specialized literary vocabulary that is rarely used in everyday language.104 Thus, when writers

102 Ibid.
wrote in English they would adopt similar methods: they preferred Latin words to English words; they preferred archaic expressions to modern ones; and they preferred rare words to commonly used words. Lin suggested that they should read Jonathan Swift, the master of English prose, so as to learn how to use simple words beautifully. Lin’s preference for simplicity and conciseness can be detected from his own translations and self-translations.

At that time, the literary scene was also the seat of what may be called étrangerie—foppish imitations of foreign manners and morals, both literary and social. With the massive introduction of foreign literature by the Association for Literary Studies, foreign writers and foreign literary trends were popular: Tolstoy, Tagore, Dostoevsky, Turgenev, Byron, Shelley, Keats, Maupassant, Zola, Hugo, Romain Rolland, classicism, romanticism, neo-romanticism, realism, naturalism, humanism, Tolstoyism, and Marxism. A superficial knowledge of these big names and big “isms” bestowed status. Lin was against the trend and made it a point to avoid the unnecessary foreignization.

Lin’s Post-1932 Views on Translation

In 1933, Lin published a lengthy article “On Translation,” in the journal Philological Discussions. Unlike other articles on translation written at that time, which primarily addressed the translator’s personal experience, or particular aspects of translation, such as how to translate names or poems, Lin’s article analyzed translation from linguistic, literary, psychological, and cross-cultural perspectives. He focused on the essential requirements for a
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106 This essay was the most systematic and comprehensive translation theory to appear in China in the 1930s. His translation theory was based on his knowledge and skills in both languages, as well as on his broad interdisciplinary background in linguistics, psychology, aesthetics, and creative writing. The critics he cites include Croce, Sapir, and Palmer. The essay was reprinted in Yutang Lin, “On Translation,” ed. Chia-Teh Huang, Selected Essays on Translation (Shanghai: Xi Feng Society, 1941): 6-32.
translator and the basic standards for translation. Lin presented his translation principles as 忠实 (Zhongshi) “Faithfulness,” 通顺 (Tongshun) “Smoothness,” and 美 (Mei) “Aesthetic Beauty.” As for faithfulness, Lin raised an important question: ‘how faithful to the original is sufficient to be qualified as being faithful?’ Is a word-for-word translation ‘faithful’? Or a sense-for-sense one, where a translator can flexibly change the original text? According to Lin, there are four levels of “faithfulness”: Zhi Yi 直译 (literal translation), Si Yi 死译 (rigid transliteration), Yi Yi 意译 (free translation) and Hu Yi 胡译 (unbridled translation). Lin gave some examples to illustrate the differences among them and pointed out that unbridled translations were regarded as mistranslations due to the translator’s miscomprehension of the original text. For instance, Lin Shu “translated” Victor Hugo’s novel Notre Dame de Paris into Chinese as 余之巴黎妻 (My Paris Lady), which showed downright misunderstanding of the original text and for this case it could be termed as “unbridled translation.” Lin’s essay has since been frequently quoted and anthologized. ¹⁰⁷ It was written during a special historical period when there was an on-going debate over translation standards.

Lin produced many popular translations from Chinese to English after 1932 through his own literary works and the translation of other’s works. After the essay “On Translation,” Lin expressed his views on translation in papers, prefaces or book sections.¹⁰⁸ For example, both essays— “Three Anecdotes about Translation” (1932) and “The Difficulty of Translation” (1932)— talk about literal and free translation. Lin’s “Introduction” (1972) to his famous

¹⁰⁷ See, for example, Song Qi, ed., 翻译纵横谈 (Problems of Translation: An Anthology) (Hong Kong: Chenchong tushu gongsi, 1969) and Liu Jingzhi, ed. 翻译论集 (Essays on Translation) (Hong Kong: Sanlian shudian, 1981). All of these sang high praise for Lin’s essay. Song Qi considered Lin’s essay to be one of the most important essays on translation while Liu Jingzhi thought Lin’s essay not only developed Yan Fu’s translation theory but also enlightened later translators.
¹⁰⁸ Ping Li, A Critical Study of Lin Yutang as a Translation Theorist, Translation Critic and Translator, Diss. City U of Hong Kong, 2012: 47.
dictionary, allegedly “the first Chinese-English dictionary ever compiled by a Chinese scholar,” is not only an introduction, but also a text on translation theory. It is not a repetition of what he said in 1932, but a modern complement or a conclusion to his views on translation. Lin based his dictionary on what is called “idiomatic equivalence” and “contextual semantics”: both phrases were new at that time but have become popular nowadays. Lin maintained that context and usage were important factors to consider other than mechanical literal translation which we rarely found he would adopt in his own translation practice.

Lin took the readership into first consideration in the process of translating, which could be interpreted as a “Target-Text reader-oriented theory.” Lin repeatedly emphasized the translator’s responsibility to the readers and criticized those translators who were not conscious of the responsibility so that they bombarded the readers with awkward and incomprehensible texts, claiming that the readers would get used to them. Lin’s translator-oriented view is very similar to Vermeer’s Skopos theory, which permits the translator’s freedom to accept or refuse the commission of translation. As translation is in every case about guiding the intended co-operation over cultural barriers, enabling functionally-oriented communication, awareness of his readers often leads to Lin’s adjustment of the explicit or implicit information. This explains why Lin sometimes simplifies the text and changes it to make it easier for target readers. In Schleiermacher’s words, he “leaves the reader in peace, as much as possible, and moved the author toward him.” In Lin’s words, “the relationship between writer and reader should not be one between an austere school master and his pupils, but one between familiar friends. Only in

109 Ibid. 56-57.
111 André Lefevere, Translation History Culture: A Sourcebook (New York: Routledge, 1992) 145.
this way can warmth be generated.” Thus, Lin’s translation variations can be well interpreted by Skopos theory which attempts to explain translation from the perspective of action and brings translation into the dynamic sphere of cross-cultural communication. The Skopos rule stipulates that the integral translation process, including the choice of specific translation strategies, is determined by the purpose, largely constrained by the target reader. Translation should be “adequate” but need not necessarily be equivalent to the original. The original text only serves as a source of information and the translator makes selections in accordance with the purpose of the translation. Such a theory signifies a breakthrough against the fetters imposed by the traditional static, rigid linguistic criterion of equivalence, which takes translation as a process of code-switching. In a sense, Skopos theory has dethroned the original text and enhanced the translator’s subjectivity. Translators are entitled to adopt different flexible means according to different translating purposes.

By presenting a case study of Lin’s self-translation, this chapter aims to demonstrate that Lin’s contribution to translation studies is much greater than is generally believed in academia. The chapter examines not only what he said about translation but also what he self-translated, and why and how he self-translated. The thesis regards self-translation not as a secondary reproduction but rather as a production in its own right, a fundamental creative process which involves adjustments, adaptations, interpretations and paraphrases between ST (source text) and TT (target text) – activities requiring strategies, techniques, and bilingual and bicultural

---

competences on the part of the translator. The study brings to light certain recurring features, e.g. a tendency of self-translators to revise their original during the self-translation process or after completing it, which make self-translators privileged authors who can revise their texts in the light of the insights gained while translating.

Case Study I: 子见南子 / Confucius Saw Nancy

Confucius Saw Nancy is based on a brief, enigmatic passage in The Analects of Confucius about the meeting that took place in 497 BC in the state of Wei: “Confucius saw Nanzi and Zilu was displeased, whereupon Confucius swore an oath, ‘If I have a dishonorable thought, may Heaven strike me! May Heaven strike me!’” (Analects 6:28) Accused of licentious behavior ranging from lewdness to incest, Nanzi is a woman of notoriety in Chinese history. Confucius meeting her has posed a cluster of thorny questions for commentators throughout history. Different from a one-sided censure of Nanzi, Lin’s play gives Nanzi a voice and retrieves Confucius’s humanity which has been shrouded over time in saintliness.

The whole play touches on a wide range of controversial issues: conflicts between modernity and tradition, women’s rights, Confucian cultural legacy, and the degree of literary autonomy. The Chinese play was enacted at the birthplace of Confucius by students of the Second Normal College of Shandong in 1929. With the performance, a storm of controversy arose when the elders of the Confucius clan found the play a blasphemy of Confucius and lodged a formal protest with the Nanjing Government’s Ministry of Education. The opinions concerning the play were divided. Some critics, like Lu Xun, felt the portrayal of Confucius in

---

118 Recognized as the direct lineal descendants of Confucius, a majority of whom still live in his birthplace.
the play was quite sympathetic: “A Sage is only human and human frailty is excusable.”

Others saw the play as the “bloodiest hatchet job on Confucius of the era,” in which “May Fourth reformers” were “delighted to see [Confucianism’s] obscene influence finally exposed” in a work “that derided Confucius as a vulgar hypocrite and social climber.” Provoked by the national debate over the play, Lin found an opportunity to introduce it to an American audience. When conducting the translation, Lin employs not only deletion, addition, and omission, but also adaptation and shift to fulfill specific Skopos. To translate a historical play, Lin is faced with the challenge of translating a number of Culture-Specific Concepts (CSCs), a term defined by Newmark as “concepts and institutions that are specific to the SL culture.” To decrypt CSCs, Newmark puts forward several major techniques:

- **Naturalization**: it adapts the SL word first to the normal pronunciation, then to the normal morphology of the TL.
- **Cultural equivalent**: it means replacing a cultural word in the SL with a TL one. However, “they are not accurate.”
- **Componential analysis**: the meaning of the CSC is explained in several words.
- **Synonymy**: it is a “near TL equivalent.” Here economy trumps accuracy.
- **Through-translation**: the literal translation of common collocations, names of organizations and components of compounds. It can also be called: calque or loan translation.

Lin pays special attention to the translation of CSCs, like proper names, dates, and measurements, which are important cultural markers that often baffle readers from a different cultural background. In practice, Lin converts most of them into their English counterparts so as to recreate a communicable discourse for his readers. In translating the title of the play, Lin employs the technique of “Naturalization”:

---

121 Lin Yutang, *Confucius Saw Nancy and Essays About Nothing* (Shanghai, Commercial P Limited, 1937) v.
Lin adopts the natural pronunciation of “南子”—Nanzi in pinyin, and then adapts to the SL morphology by changing it into Nancy. Lin also employs the technique of “cultural equivalence”:

时期：鲁定公十四年 (Emperor Lu Year 14)
Time: 497 B.C.

Ancient China used Heavenly Stems and Earthly Branches to designate years and hours for formal documents or occasions. For literary works, the recording of a specific time period could be simplified. In this example, the regnal year of the emperor was mentioned to name a specific year, which was common when China entered its dynasties’ era. Instead of footnoting it with a detailed Chinese dynasty chart, Lin converts “Emperor Lu Year 14” as “497 BC” for easy comprehension: Newmark points out that this kind of rendition does not often guarantee accuracy. To compare the Chinese historical calendar with the Gregorian calendar, Emperor Lu Year 14 should actually be 496 B.C. The technique of adaptation is also used in the translation of measurements:

文王武王起于丰镐，地方不过百里
They started out with only a very small city, not bigger than thirty square miles (4).

For historical reasons, China adopted unique units of measurement which are different from the Western ones. Lin translates the measurements into their English counterparts. For instance, “Li” as a distance unit is converted into “mile,” in the process of which accuracy is compromised. The term, “百里(a hundred Li)” is an expression that only vaguely refers to the size of an area.

---

Originally published as 子見南子 (*Confucius Saw Nancy*), 大荒集 (*The Lone Wayfarer*) (Shanghai: shenghuo shudian, 1934).
Thus, the compromise made in the translation won’t actually affect the conveyance of the meaning.

“The cultural equivalence” technique can also be found in the translation of ancient Chinese rankings. Chinese officials were ranked into thirty separate grades according to their prestige and duties. Different dynasties have different systems of noble titles. To avoid confusion, Lin modernizes and simplifies the rankings into modern English counterparts. For example, “大夫” is translated as “Minister” and “王” and “侯” are translated indistinguishably as “King,” while “侯” is actually below “王.” If Lin were to fully explain the ranking system, two full pages of footnotes would hardly be sufficient.

At times when Lin finds certain proper names too specific or loaded with too rich a historical significance, he renders it into a more general term. For example, he translates “丰镐 (Feng Gao)” into “a small city.”

Lin’s adoption of sense-for-sense translation seems to have given him a free rein in translating CSCs. For the translation of passages without the issue of CSCs, Lin still refuses to be confined to all details. At times, he may recast a whole passage. At the beginning of the play, Lin rewrites the setting by expanding the concise description of eleven words into a full description with loaded details.

卫侯延宾客，板凳数条，交椅数把 [King Wei’s sitting room, benches a few, chairs a few (my translation, strict word-for-word translation)] (268)
In the parlor of the King of Wei, richly but austerely furnished with chairs and tea-tables placed against the walls on both sides of the room. Back of the sets of tables and chairs are latticed windows with curtains. In the middle of the wall is a door, with bead curtains (1).

The Chinese sentence is composed of typical paratactic Chinese loose sentences without a grammatical subject. To achieve intratextual coherence, Lin breaks these sentences into several independent ones, adds subjects and connective elements, and applies subordination. Such
semantic changes make his translation logical and clear. Lin makes it a point to furnish his
descriptions with more details so that his English-speaking audience would have a vivid picture
of an Ancient Chinese court.

Lin does more than expansion; he adds interpretations and explanations. When
Confucius’s name is mentioned, he adds more interpreting details: “Behind the cold exterior of
Confucius’ appearance, however, one discerns in him a man of great wisdom, natural dignity,
but above all, an exceptionally keen practical sense.” He also adds a whole paragraph to
interpret the culture of jade:

You see jade has the five virtues of a gentleman. Its soft luster typifies Benevolence. Its
clearness typifies Wisdom. Its hardness typifies Courage. Its cleanliness typifies
Courtesy. And its unyielding nature typifies Righteousness. Because of these five virtues,
jade is lovely (22).

Lin believes that jade culture is communicable and enchanting. It symbolizes beauty, nobility,
and immortality, which echoes the theme of the play—Confucius’s lasting legacy.

Other than addition, omission is also employed to achieve his sense-for-sense translation.

For example:

“这又何苦来？泄冶则是个傻瓜，杀身之祸，出于自取，比干于纣，亲则叔父，官
则少帅，忠款之心，在于存宗庙而已，故以必死争之，冀身死之后，而纣悔悟，
其本情至仁。陈灵公君臣宣淫，泄冶位则下大夫，无骨肉之亲，怀宠不去，一区
区之一身，与拼老命，智者所弗为，其遭杀戮，岂非活该，结果死而无益。难道
我也傻到像泄冶吗? (276)"
“Well, if I displease her, am I not free to quit any time? (18)”

Lin translates the paragraph into one short sentence, omitting many details, like historical
accounts of the danger of serving the king or queen as an advisor. Several emperors and leaders
are mentioned to denote historical happenings between emperors and advisors. To keep a better
flow to the play and to conform to the rule of coherence, Lin does not translate or footnote them;

---

124 Lin Yutang, Confucius Saw Nancy and Essays About Nothing (Shanghai, Commercial P Limited, 1937) 2.
instead, he renders the paragraph into a question that functions as a transition. Another example where Lin applies omission:

讲仁义，修礼乐，祖述尧舜，宪章文武，以道治世 (273)
Great reputation and your beautiful moral and political theories (11)

Lin omits the translation of “仁义, (humanness and righteousness),” “礼乐, (rituals and music),” and “尧舜 (two legendary Chinese emperors reigning around 2333-2184 BCE ); instead, he uses far more general terms such as “beautiful moral” and “political theories” so as not to overwhelm his English-speaking audience with too many ancient Chinese terms used in court.

Lin also applies deletion in his translation. When Confucius and Nanzi finally meet in the play, Confucius is instantly attracted to Nanzi and is impressed by her intelligence and enchanted by her performance of folksongs. At a moment, Confucius is caught up in the magic and mirth of the moment as she sings “Among the Mulberry Trees”:

爱采麦矣，
沫之北矣；
云谁之思？
美孟弋矣！
期我乎桑中，
要我乎上宫，
送我乎淇之上矣！ （287）
(I pick the dodder
In the village of Mei
Of whom do I think?
Of the beautiful eldest daughter Jiang
She met me among the mulberry trees
Invited me to the Upper Palace,
Accompanied me along the river Qi.)\textsuperscript{125}

\textsuperscript{125} The English translation used here is from Haun Saussy, \textit{The Problem of a Chinese Aesthetic} (Stanford: Stanford UP, 1993) 95.
This song is from Book of Odes,\textsuperscript{126} allegedly the oldest anthology of Chinese songs/poems, comprising 305 works dating from the 11\textsuperscript{th} to 7\textsuperscript{th} centuries BCE. It is a popular love song, illustrating a young man’s recollection of courting a girl. Taken out of the context of Odes, the song becomes a challenge for a translator to reproduce in an English context for its unique historical context, distinctive cultural connotation, and specific geographical location. Lin deletes this song in his translation for fear that its rich cultural metaphors would fail his English-speaking audience (the English translation provided above is done by Haun Saussy). Besides, the play Lin translates is to be performed on stage, which makes comprehensibility and universality the top priority rather than fidelity.

As a self-translator, Lin enjoys much greater freedom in his translation. He could trim or chop, add or expand, and shift and reshuffle sentence structures. When Confucius first came to Nanzi’s country, he was told of the land’s prosperity.

卫国民庶物丰, 未尝不是个发样之地(269)。

The country is rich. You could do wonders here (3).

The original is one sentence with one subject, “the country,” but the translation has two sentences with two different subjects, “the country” and “you.” Other than syntactic shift, this example also presents semantic shifts. Two Chinese set phrases, “民庶物丰(The country is rich in natural resources and the people are prosperous with goods)” and “发样之地(the origin place where one began one’s success),” are translated into two adjectives, “rich” and “wonders.” Such compromise of rich cultural connotation is made according to the coherence rule, to communicate the meaning in a more concise and communicable way. More examples can be found of the translation of idiomatic expressions:

\textsuperscript{126} Translated variously as The Classic of Poetry, The Book of Songs, Book of Odes, or Odes or Poetry.
子路：不是这样说。子南夫人生性潇洒，举止言行与夫子所言周公之礼不合者很多，又娇憨恃宠，喜怒无常。夫子与南子晤谈，不谏，则无以正礼作乐，为万民劝，谏而不听，一旦话不投机，闹得双方下不了台，即不步比干、泄治之后尘，也只得悻悻然而去，终不能行以道治国而霸而王的志愿。(276)。

Tselu: [unconvinced] No, you don’t understand me, I’m afraid. You know the queen is not just an ordinary female. She is highly unconventional, pampered, capricious, and very liberal with her charms. Now it will be the Master’s duty to correct her manners, if he stays, but you must remember she is a queen, and a powerful queen at that. All I can see is that if the Master ever attempt to correct her manners, he will be courting the displeasure of a highly temperamental queen, that is all (18). (Emphasis added by me)

This paragraph presents a special discourse genre, that is, four-letter-stock-phrase style prose in paralleled structure with rhythmic arrangement. Since it finds no counterpart in English, Lin transforms it into normal English sentences. In this short paragraphs, there are ten four-letter-stock phrases: “生性潇洒” “举止言行” “周公之礼” “娇憨恃宠” “喜怒无常” “正礼作乐” “谏而不听” “话不投机” “悻然而去” “以道治国,” most of which are translated into a single word or a short phrase.

“生性潇洒” (worry-free in nature, my translation. if not otherwise indicated the following translations are all mine) is translated by Lin as “liberal with her charms.”
“举止言行” (manners, words, and behaviors) is rendered as “manners.”
“周公之礼” (no sex before marriage, a quote from Rites of Duke of Zhou who is credited with the creation of imperial rituals) is rendered as “conventional.”
“娇憨恃宠” (spoiled and overindulged for being lovely and young) is translated as “pampered.”
“喜怒无常” (quick temper and constant change of moods) is rendered as “capricious.”

The last five idiomatic expressions are not translated into English at all, probably because Lin does not want to overwhelm his foreign readers with Chinese etiquette and politics: “正礼作乐 (make rules and carry out rituals, my translation)” “谏而不听 (advice being ignored)” “话不投机 (mistime one’s remarks)” “悻然而去(leave without any achievements)” “以道治国(rule a country with the right way).” Lin has to pay attention to the kind and degree of interpretative resemblance his English-speaking audience expects, that is to say, Lin must take the target
audience’s cognitive environment into account and choose the most applicable approach to guide the audience in achieving optimal relevance. The most effective way to achieve optimal relevance is to maximize contextual effects and minimize the processing effort. When a match-up metaphor or equivalence is not available in the target language, the strategy of substitution should be employed. As an instance of interpretive use, a translation’s success depends on the achievement of optimal relevance. In this sense, Lin is not taking a short cut in distilling Chinese sayings into everyday English. The seemingly simplified translation is to serve the purpose of the Skopos rule to achieve optimal relevance. In the meantime, Lin also takes the fidelity rule into consideration and pays attention to the aesthetics of his translation, especially when he translates poems and couplets. For example,

(7) 蟋蟀在堂，
岁聿其逝！
今我不乐，
日月其迈! (290)
The cricket is on the hearth,
The year is drawing to a close;
Why not make merry to-day
Ere fleeting Time forward flows? (38)

Every Chinese Character is monosyllabic and tonetic, which makes Chinese a rigorous and natural poetic language. Ancient poets composed verses with Chinese characters the same way composers compose music with musical notes. The musicality of Chinese is ensured by the dominance of the vowel in each syllable and the lack of the duplicate consonant. Lexically, the monosyllable morpheme takes a leading position in Chinese word formation. Grammatically, Chinese centers on sentence order and function word, without morphological changes but with much flexibility in the construction of words and sentences. The feature provides vast room for men of letters to make their artistic creations. When the four tones were established in the
Southern and Northern dynasties, writers began to consciously employ this cadence in their poetic experiments.127

The above quote is a four-character regulated verse with four lines, with the first and the third (also the second and the fourth) lines constituting a couplet in which each line corresponds to the other in level or oblique tones. These designs enable the poem to have a cadenced tone with a special musical charm, which gives rise to not only a pleasant sound but also a supremacy in emotional expressions. Though the rhyme and cadence are hard to maintain in the translation, the spirit of the poem is well preserved. Being rendered into Modern English, the translation adds gaiety to the ears of modern-day readers. To further illustrate Lin’s strong capacity in rendering verses, an example is borrowed from his translation of *Six Chapters of a Floating Life*128:

(8) 秋侵人影瘦，
    霜染菊花肥129
    Touched by autumn, one’s figure grows slender;
    Soaked in frost, the chrysanthemum blooms full (19).

To compare with Lin’s poetics, a translation of the same verse by Pratt and Chiang is provided as follows:

   We grow thin in the shadows of autumn, but chrysanthemums grow fat with the dew.

By comparison, Lin does a better job in keeping the aesthetic beauty. In format, Lin reproduces the parallelism, not in a strict sense, though:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(first line)</th>
<th>(second line)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

---

Despite the failure of keeping the perfect parallelism, Lin manages to achieve the rhythmic and picturesque beauty through his translation and provides a vivid picture of the lustrous autumn when the chrysanthemum grows fuller and the lady becomes thinner.

There are cases when Lin quotes some other translator’s rendition in lieu of his own translation:

河水洋洋
北流活活
施罝濊濊
鱣鲔发发
葭菼揭揭
庶姜孽孽
庶士有朅 (289)
The ripe plums are falling,
One-third of them gone;
To my lovers I’m calling,
Tis time to come on!

To ripe plums are falling,
Two thirds are away;
This time to be popping!
To my lovers I say.

Down has dropt every plum;
In baskets they lie.
What, will o lover come?
Now or never! Say I. (37) (By Herbert A. Giles)

These verses are from Book of Odes. The translation Lin quotes is from Harbert A. Giles’s translation, a style that is rarely used among Chinese translators. Giles uses colloquial words

---

131 Herbert Allen Giles (1845 – 1935) was a British diplomat and sinologist who was the professor of Chinese at Cambridge University for 35 years. He modified a Mandarin Chinese romanization system established by Thomas Wade, resulting in the widely known Wade–Giles Chinese romanization system. Among his many works were
and phrases to translates ancient Chinese. Informal expressions, like “come on” and “popping,” mismatch the solemn Chinese ode (even though a love song). Maybe, Lin finds this translation a good match to his own translation which also adopts a conversational and unceremonious style.

In terms of fidelity, Ha Poong Kim’s translation no doubt does a better job in rendering the song:

How vast the water of the *Huang He*,
How forcefully it flows north.
The fish-net swirls,
Carp and sturgeon leap wild.
Tall grow reeds and sedges.
All the Jiang maidens finely coifed,
All her knights waiting valiantly.\(^{132}\)

Lin seems to be quite familiar with the translations of *Odes*. In his book, *Wisdom of China and India*, he discusses the translations of *Odes* and his selection of samples:

I have tried here to give a few representative samples, by two translators who know Chinese thoroughly and one who does not. Of all translations of Chinese poetry, I think Helen Waddell’s is the best…her translations are far from literal. Her method is to catch the essence or spirit of a poem and weave it into an exquisite creation with whatever material from the poem she needs for that particular purpose…Herbert A. Giles’ two poems are quite charming. Dr. Legge’s translations in regard to diction, rhythm and general effect, often fall short of the true poetic level, but he did not mistranslate, and his work gives us the means of getting a glimpse of the scope and variety of the *Book of Poetry*.\(^{133}\)

For other occasions, to quote other people’s translation is not an option. When Confucius is warned of the danger of scandal, he responds:

“妇人之口, 可以出走。
妇人之谒, 可以死败 (272)”
“Beware of a woman’s tongue,
Sooner or later you’ll get stung.
Beware of a woman’s pleasure,
Capricious as a merchant’s measure. (9)”

---


Confucius’s words are abstract in meaning and vague in reference, which could be interpreted and thus translated differently. It would be a challenge for other translators besides Lin to render the verses since Lin knows exactly what those verses mean. He can reify the metaphorical and abstract saying into discernible and humorous text.

Besides the techniques discussed above, Lin also pays attention to the feeling-tone of his translation. When Nanzi first meets Confucius, she expresses her admiration without any reservation:

南子：寡小君渴慕先生令名已久。以不获一睹丰仪为张。今日叨蒙赐顾，寡小君心中欣喜不胜，只恨相见太晚，今奉白璧一双，聊表企慕之忱。(将一对璧递与雍渠。) (278)

Nancia: Oh, I have heard so much about you, Confucius, and have long wished to have the pleasure of meeting you, Confucius. Isn’t it lucky for us and for our people that you have chosen to honor us with your visit? May I present you with a pair of white jade, as a token of our high respect. (She gives the pieces of jade to the servant, who hands them to Confucius.) (21) (Emphasis added with italicizing.)

Lin purposefully translates a statement into a question: “Isn’t it lucky for us and for our people that you have chosen to honor us with your visit?” to emphasize the gratitude and honor she feels to have Confucius’s visit. Lin translates another statement into a question: “May I present you a pair of white jade” to reproduce the politeness Nanzi uses with Confucius in an English context; if Lin translates it into a statement, it would sound more imperative and like a command. Lin’s rendition does a good job transferring the feeling tone of the original.

Any attempt to introduce a foreign literary work into the dominant culture has to make sure that the source text does not clash with the ideology of the target culture.\textsuperscript{134} To make sure that his choice sits well with the needs and ideology of Western readers of his time, Lin

\textsuperscript{134} André Lefevere, \textit{Translating Literature: Practice and Theory in a Comparative Literature Context} (Beijing: Foreign Languages Teaching and Research P., 2006) 87.
intentionally leaves out points which he believes may drive away Western readers. When discussing the history of the court, Confucius is informed of hidden secrets.

子路 太子蒯聩出逃的事，夫子大概知道。
孔丘 唔！
子路 貳赚现在在赵简子家。那天由问夫子：卫君待你为政，你要以什么为第一？夫子说“大概正名吧？名不正则言不顺云云。”现在太子在逃，就是因为与子南夫人不对的缘故。其名固己不正，如果同子南夫人提起蒯聩的事，一定要动起她的气。这倒也叫人为难。
孔丘 貳聩逃亡真因为子南夫人的话吗？
子路 的的确确，千真万真的，顶好还是在夫人前不要提起太子的名字为是。
孔丘 (不动容的)那我自有办法！(276)

This long conversation discusses a bloody court scandal concerning Nanzi and her son-in-law and alludes to other strife and conflict between the two. Lin deletes the whole section, fearing that the unconscionable details would serve no other purpose than burdening his English-speaking audience with accounts of scheming and killing from a remote country. For a similar situation of avoiding supposedly inappropriate content, Chang employs a different technique:

“闺门之内，姑姊妹无别 (274)
There is certain notoriety connected with the court life of this country (15)?

Lin employs the technique of undertone or in Lefevere’s term, “selective” faithfulness.¹³⁵ In the original, notoriety is explicitly explained as incestuous scandal, but in translation, it does not specify. Lin applies self-censorship to his own text by using euphemistic undertone.

The opposite of undertone, overtone, is also used in Lin’s translation. For example, Lin translates two four-word-set phrases “饮食男女 (literally translated as “drinking and eating men and women”)” and “男女关系(relationship between men and women)” (284) as “sex” and further argues:

Sometimes I think that without the element of sex, life would be a horrible, fatuous vacuum. Sex gave rise to all the beauties of life and nature, and our life could be made

¹³⁵ Ibid. 92.
fuller and richer by a more thorough enjoyment of the things that you just refer to as ‘wine, food and women.’ Sex gives rise to literature, our songs and our poetry. Why without sexual misdemeanors, there will be no novel, no drama, no love lyrics and no literature in the world at all! Have you ever heard the fold songs of our country? (34)

Openly discussing sex was a taboo during the first half of the twentieth century in China. Lin turns what is remotely hinted at in the Chinese into an open discussion in English.

Conclusion

In summary, though changes or “inaccuracy” occurs in Lin’s rendition of his own play, his self-translation is intratextually coherent with the target language. From the perspective of Skopos, both in-text factors and extra-text factors have exerted influence on Lin’s translation strategies. In fulfilling his translation Skopos of introducing the play to an American audience, Lin employs the techniques of adaptation, addition, omission, deletion, and shift. Throughout the play, Lin employs only two endnotes to give credits to his quotations. He does not provide any glossary or endnotes. It seems that Lin does not aim to produce a cultural export as he typically does for his novels or essays. Lin domesticates the text by crossing out inconsequent historical allusions, modernizing archaic expressions, and sparing cumbersome explanations or annotations. In order not to hinder intratextual coherence of his translation, Lin applies only in-text explanations to provide the basic cultural background. In Lin’s translation, faithfulness yields to expressiveness and smoothness. Christiane Nord interprets such a choice:

This rule [Skopus] is intended to solve the eternal dilemmas of free vs. faithful translation, dynamic vs. formal equivalence, good interpreters vs. slavish translators, and so on. It means that the Skopus of a particular translation task may require a “free” or a “faithful” translation, or anything between these two extremes, depending on the purpose for which the translation is needed.  

Lin’s self-translation is a testimony to the adequacy of Skopos theory. His self-translation enables his work to cross borders and reach the audience across the Pacific Ocean.

**Self-Translation: Twin Bilingual Essays in the 1930s**

Having served simultaneously as a columnist for both the Shanghai-based English and Chinese journals in the 1930s, Lin established himself as a leading essayist before he left Shanghai for the United States in 1936. Around 120 of the essays published during that time are twin essays in nature, with his English essays anticipating his Chinese ones. As a bilingual writer of bilingual works, Lin has been unprecedented in Chinese literature, and his bilingual twin works present a unique literary phenomenon for the study of self-translation.

Lin started contributing to *The China Critic* in its inaugural year, but he did not become a columnist until 3 July 1930 when he started “The Little Critic” column, which immediately caught on with the reading public. The weekly pieces Lin wrote and published in this column were all light essays on any imaginable subject, many of which contained the main ideas and attitudes for his later bestselling books, including *My Country and My People* and *The Importance of Living*. The column title aptly captured the social role Lin envisioned for himself in the 1930s—the little critic.\(^{138}\)

Lin once claimed that “a writer is a man who reacts to his period with the whole force of his personality.”\(^ {139}\) In a time of strong censorship and political turmoil, Lin was faced with choices that could sometimes mean a matter of life or death. Lin had to find his own footing:

> My way of writing on current events was to say just enough to intimate my opinions and those of others so as to not just impress readers with hollowness and Confucian bombast, but at the same time say something with concealed and implied meaning, and thus

---


manage to avoid a prison cell. This kind of writing is no different from the tightrope walking one sees in the circus; one should be alert and agile; mind and body must be perfectly coordinated. In this strange and fascinating climate I became what people call a humorist or satirist. Probably it is as people say: when life is too miserable one cannot but be comical; otherwise one will die of sadness . . . In all this glib flippancy and piquant loquacity there are both tears and smiles.¹⁴⁰

In a perilous and convulsive age, it was dangerous to be a critic. Thus, it was much safer to publish in English than Chinese in 1930s’ Shanghai, which explains why most of Lin’s English essays anticipate their Chinese counterparts. Lin managed to publish many politically charged bilingual essays, including “Han Fei as a cure for Modern China,” “What is Face,” “On Political Sickness,” “On Freedom of Speech,” and so on. To avoid the Nationalist government’s tight control of press freedom, Lin adopted a style of urban humorists which was frolicsome, comic caricature that stripped the frightening images of terror.¹⁴¹ In 1932, a group of Western-trained professionals and writers, led by Lin Yutang, assumed an active leading role and launched a literary periodical Lunyu (Analects) to introduce and promote the Western concept of humor into Chinese literature and culture which they believed that China had lacked. Because the journal was an instant success with its inaugural issue, humor suddenly became the talk of the town so that writers of different styles and backgrounds all attempted to try humor. Lin also became the “Mater of Humor.” In most cases, the “humor” Lin employed in socio-political critique was in every sense “black humor.” Such “black humor” is well presented in an essay/poem—“A Hymn to Shanghai” (上海之歌). It was written as an essay, but rendered as a poem in translation, as poetry seemed to be a safer means for social critique because of its abstractness, enigma, and metaphor.

¹⁴⁰ Lin Yutang, “Lin Yutang zizhuan” (part 2), Yijing (Unofficial Text), November 20, 1936, 24
Case Study II: “A Hymn to Shanghai”/“上海之歌”

“A Hymn to Shanghai” and its translation are not only different in genre but in tone. Lin does more than translate, he rewrites and recreates:

Shanghai is terrible, very terrible. Shanghai is terrible in her strange mixture of eastern and western vulgarity, in her superficial refinements, in her naked and unmasked worship of Mammon, in her emptiness, commonness, and bad taste. She is terrible in her denaturalized women, de-humanized coolies, devitalized newspapers, de-capitalized banks, and denationalized creatures. She is terrible in her weakness, terrible in her monstrosities, perversities and inanities, terrible in her joys and follies, and in her tears, bitterness and degradation, terrible in her vast immutable stone edifices that rear their heads high on the Bunds and in the abject huts of creatures subsisting on their discoveries from refuse cans. In fact, one might sing a hymn to the Great Terrible city in the following fashion— (Emphasis added by me).

O Great and Inscrutable City. Thrice praise to thy greatness and to thy inscrutability!

伟大神秘的大城！我歌颂你的伟大与你的神秘！

我歌颂这著名铜臭的大城，歌颂你的铜臭，于你油脸大腹青筋黏指的商贾。

g歌颂这搂的肉与舞的肉的大城，有吃人参汤与燕窝粥的小姐，虽然吃人参汤与燕窝粥，仍旧面黄肌瘦，弱不禁风。

In the English essay, Lin alludes to Shanghai’s reality of colonialism (the state of being deprived of) more directly by using a series of words with the prefixes de- (as is indicated in the text), while the subsequent translation does not record such alliteration. Direct condemnation is replaced by irony and humor. Shanghai for Lin is an ambivalent trope symbolizing a cultural failure to be denigrated by its colonialism. The English essay was written in 1930 when international settlement (chiefly of western countries) had been established for over sixty years and colonialism existed for more than half a century in Shanghai. The Chinese essay was published in 1933, one year after Shanghai was attacked by Japan and would soon be weathered with raids, invasions, and outright occupation by the Japanese till the mid-1940s. The changing

142 Suoqiao Qian, ed. Selected Bilingual Essays of Lin Yutang (Hong Kong: Chinese UP, 2010) 1.
143 Ibid. 4.
political environment forced Lin to change his way of critique: a direct one was replaced by a concealed one disguised under a veil of humor.

Lin uses different stylistic devices to mimic the mixture of nationalities, cultures, and races in Shanghai. He inserts Chinese words into one English sentence: “One thinketh of thy successful, pien-pien-bellied merchants, and forgeteth whether they are Italian, French, Russian, English or Chinese. (2)” “Pien-pien” describes vividly the posture of a pot-bellied and pompous merchant. In translation, Lin deletes the line, since the real interaction between foreigners and common Chinese people was rare as most foreigners lived and worked only in an exclusive area or district. Besides semantic changes, Lin also makes syntactic changes as he satirizes different kinds of opportunists:

One thinketh and wondereth of these things and faileth to comprehend their whence or their whither.
O thou city that surpasseth our understanding! **How impressive are thy emptiness and thy commonness and thy bad taste!**
Thou city of retired brigands, officials and generals and cheats, infested with brigands, officials and generals and cheats who have not yet made their fortunes!
O thou the safest place in China to live in, where even they beggars are dishonest! (3)

我想到你的诗人、墨客、相士、舞女、戏子、蓬头画家、空头作家、滑头商人、尖头掮客，
在夜阑人静之时，我想到这种种的色相，而莫名其熙熙攘攘的所以；
你这伟大玄妙的大城，东西浊流的汇总。你这中国最安全的乐土，连你的乞丐都不老实。
我歌颂你的浮华、愚陋、凡俗与平庸。（5）

Within the stanza, Lin shuffles the order of sentences: the first sentence becomes the second in translation; the second the last; the third the first; and the last the third. Lin makes such changes not only to comply with Chinese lexical semantics but also to conform to a Chinese rhetorical device— **shouwei huying**, the repetition of a sentence or sentences at both the beginning and end of a piece of writing (similar to epanalepsis, only beyond the sentence level). Lin uses the second
line as the finish line in translation in order to echo the beginning where Lin satirically says he is singing a hymn to the city.

Lin’s “A Hymn to Shanghai” reflects the mission of the journal he publishes in: the editors declared that achieving “international understanding” was the lofty objective of this magazine and claimed that the “twain of the East and the West” could be brought together only through “mutual understanding.” In the same article, the editors commented on the language of the magazine – English, emphasizing that English was a means to address not only foreigners, but also Chinese college undergraduates. Thus, a majority of Lin’s articles were later translated/rewritten by him into Chinese since even when at the onset of his writing in English he already had both English and Chinese audiences in mind.

Lin employs sarcasm in the writing of the poem, which does not mean that he does not like Shanghai or he despises China. On the contrary, Lin’s patriotism seems to be no weaker than any other leftist writers. His patriotism is made crystal clear especially when he publishes outside of China. For example, in his earlier essay, “Captive Peiping Holds the Soul,” published in *The New York Times* in 1923, Lin writes about Peiping (today’s Beijing):

Peiping stands for the soul of China…for the good life and good living, and for an arrangement of life in which the maximum comforts of civilization are brought into a perfect, harmonious relationship with the maximum beauty of the rural life…Peiping is one of the jewel cities of the world. Except Paris and (by hearsay) Vienna, there is no city in the world that is quite so nearly ideal, in regard to nature, culture, charm and mode of living as Peiping.

Thus, we can see when Lin writes for the Western audience his depiction of Peiping (at that time the capital city was Nanjing) is positive and laudatory, but when reflecting about Shanghai’s sins and wrongs, Lin critiques powerfully.

---

The sarcasm Lin employs is not to trade the ugliness of the Chinese culture for an appeal to the English-speaking readers. When pertaining to Western imperialism, Lin makes even sharper sarcasm. For example, when Lin indicts American extraterritoriality in China, his nine-page essay titled “An Open Letter to an American Friend” is unsparing. He ironically questions why the Americans are so intent on maintaining extraterritoriality in China when they have no such practices with Poland, Romania, or Russia. He then mocks the Americans for their preference of exercising extraterritoriality rather than exercising civility by saying “pardon me,” “see you again,” and “good morning” to the Chinese.146

Translation sets Lin in dialogue simultaneously with the “West” and with Chinese tradition. Lin repeatedly laments the loss that Chinese people experience in the period of transition (the May Fourth Era): “progress is fun, but progress is painful…the spirit of man in China, throwing overboard all that is best and finest in a mad rush for things Western without the Western tradition, is uglier still to look at.”147 Against the trend for complete westernization, Lin advocates for mutual learning and mutual understanding via bilingual progress.

**Case Study III: “In Defense of Pidgin English” /“为洋泾浜英语辩解”**

Lin Yutang holds strong opinions about bilingualism in its defense and expresses his admiration and support of pidgin which here specifically means the localization of English. He begins with a strong statement in both the original and the translation: “I think pidgin a glorious language. It has tremendous possibilities,”148 which is faithfully translated into Chinese “我想洋泾浜英语(Pidgin English)不但非常佳妙，而且是有远大的前途的.” In translation, Lin keeps

---
the English term “Pidgin English” untranslated in case some readers do not know the English term. Lin emphasizes the charm of pidgin English:

Not only does the Italian professor Croce help us to appreciate the literary value of pidgin English, but even the historical dialect of Karl Marx makes it inevitable that pidgin English shall become the language spoken by all the respectable people of the world in the twenty-fifth century. Advocates of English as an auxiliary international language have often advanced as an argument in its favour the fact that the language is now spoken by over five hundred million people. By this numerical standard, Chinese ought to stand a close second as an international language, since it is spoken by four hundred fifty million, or every fourth human being on earth. The Chinese language has also been considered by philologists like Otto Jespersen and Gabelentz as the simplest, most advanced and most logical language. In fact, the whole trend of the development of the English language teaches us that it has been steadily advancing toward the Chinese type, English common sense has triumphed over grammatical nonsense and refused to see sex in a tea cup or a writing desk, as modern French or German are still doing. It has practically abolished gender, and it has very nearly abolished case. It has now reached a stage where Chinese was perhaps ten thousand years ago.149

Lin puts it in translation as:

我们不但可由克罗遮氏的美学批评而明了洋泾浜英语的文学价值，并且可由马克思的唯物史观辩证法证明它必于五百年后成为世界上流社会的普通话。世界语言学家如 Jespersen, Gabelenz 常称中国话为最简单，最合理，演化程度最高的语言。其实英语在历史上全部演化的趋向，就在告诉我们，英语是在逐渐演变趋近中国语言这一派的。比方现代英语已经不肯承认一只茶杯或是一个写字台，有什么阴阳性别，这是英语与法德文之不同。英语实际上已经淘汰了性别，（本刊第十六期，就有英人投稿的一篇《又发现添新花样的代名词》，取消我们新造的“她”字），而且也几乎废除宾主格位了。所以英语早已走上了中国语的路上，而且已经达到中国语在一万年前所已达到的地步了。洋泾浜英语就是英语与中国语最天然的结合，所以是合于历史的潮流的 (125-126)。

In translation, Lin changes the order of sentences and adds new content to support his argument.

Lin’s praise of the Chinese language comes earlier than the discussion of the English language. Lin adds a discussion of the formation of a new female pronoun during the May Fourth era, which is a significant cultural event in that the imperative to invent a Chinese equivalent to the female pronoun “she” is facilitated by the intensified language and cultural interactions between

149 Ibid. 121-122.
China and the West. In April 1920, Liu Bannong proposed the invention of 她 (She), which is now considered one of the most fascinating new words invented, signifying a way to gender equality after thousands of years of missing a third person feminine pronoun in Chinese language and history. Lin’s self-translation was published in 1932, exactly a decade after the word’s creation. Lin effectively reminds his readers of the surge of reformulated terms and concepts that reinterpret long-standing gender norms and principles in various ways in early twentieth-century China.

Translation strategies are employed not only for intrinsic linguistic differences but also for extrinsic cultural or conventional difference between two cultures. In English, writers are expected to give exact descriptions of time while in Chinese it can be vague and general. Here, “Twenty-fifty century” is translated as “five hundred years later.”

Pidgin English, for Lin, is neither creole nor patois, but a language as retranslation created through a secondary export from Chinese back into English. For Lin, his translation practice seems to be a distinct, and even proud process of retribalization toward anti-institutional language use. Lin proudly talks about the influence of the Chinese language upon English:

Professor C. K. Ogden has invented the Basic English, which consists of a selected list of eight hundred fifty words, supposed to cover all the bare needs of international course. It is claimed that the highly analytic character of the English language makes such a limitation of vocabulary possible. We say in English, for instance, “look up to” instead of “respect” and “look down upon” instead of “despise.” In other words, it is this analytic character, this structural resemblance to Chinese, which enables Professor Ogden to make a list of eight hundred fifty English words cover a field impossible with a language like French or German. The trouble with Basic English is that it is not analytic enough. We find the word “gramophone,” for instance, circumlocutted in Basic English as “a polished black disc with a picture of a dog in front of a horn.” In 2400 A. D., we could call it more simply in real pidgin as “talking box.” Basic English is still at a loss to express “telescope” and “microscope.” In 2400, we shall call it more simply “look-far-glass” and “show-small-glass.” We could dispense with the word “telegraph” and call it “electric report,” and replace “telephone” by pidgin “electric talk.”

---

150 Suoqiao Qian, Selected Bilingual Essays of Lin Yutang (Hongkong: Chinese UP, 2010) 122-123.
The short paragraph is peppered with English terms or phrases (fifteen in total). The majority of the terms are translated into Chinese from either Japanese or European languages first and then translated into English. For instance, “Gramophone,” interpreted as “a polished black disc with a picture of a dog in front of a horn” in Basic\textsuperscript{151}, could be rendered as “talking box (hua xia zi).” Lin defines translation as pidgin which underscores the force of nativist transformation whenever English is absorbed in a foreign tongue. Lin’s notion of pidgin English is also transliterations that might not carry any semantic meaning but serve the purpose of resetting the sound of an utterance, as in “the already popular \textit{tu-se} (‘toast’) in modern Chinese usage. (123)”

Upholding a specific cultural agenda, Lin and other writers/scholars who contributed to the magazines Lin edited or initiated were named the Analects group. Their writing shared one common feature that could be termed as “creative transliteration.” In those days, foreign words

\textsuperscript{151} Basic English is an English-based controlled language created by linguist and philosopher Charles Kay Ogden as an international auxiliary language, and as an aid for teaching English as a second language. Basic English is, in essence, a simplified subset of regular English. It was presented in Ogden’s book \textit{Basic English: A General Introduction with Rules and Grammar} (1930).
were already beginning to be transliterated systematically into Chinese characters that were either rare or exclusively used for transliteration purposes, but Lin’s group would use much more common Chinese characters with the same sound to generate new meanings. The most important transliteration of all was the term youmo after the English word “humor,” a term coined by Lin Yutang that continues to enjoy widespread use today.

**Conclusion**

Lin’s bilingual essays suggest a kind of “bi-identical’ relationship: they are certainly two separate texts, but are also identical. In producing these bilingual texts, Lin adopts a reader-oriented approach, manipulating not only the content but the structure. One frequent practice of major textual manipulation lies in the very opening paragraph, as the author tries to re-situate his audience. Nevertheless, whatever differences there exist between the two texts in two languages, it is still undeniable that these pairs of essays have demonstrated a bilingual identity that binds the two texts into one.

Lin’s ability to attract and sustain the fascination of American and/or Chinese readers, while not putting them off by the very foreignness of what they encounter in his text, rests in large part on his adoption of a balanced rhetoric, the right balance between foreignness and accessibility. He oscillates between Western and Chinese perspectives to charm rather than shock the reader. His ever-shifting vantage point surprises and delights readers, providing his texts with novelty. One strategy for establishing a bond between himself and his American/Chinese readers is to imitate a Western perspective and pretend to view China as an alien culture and vice versa.

---

Through his self-translation, Lin makes it clear his choice of strategy—domestication. To avoid translating his own English into Europeanized Chinese (a dominating trend at his time), Lin makes sure that his translation is communicative and idiomatic. I argue that Lin’s bilingual practice bears testimony to the “historical taintedness” of cultural translation and the translator in the disparate cultural and political context of Shanghai. This kind of translational politics is not necessarily reproducible in times and places beyond that particular moment; therefore, even though Lin engaged in back-and-forth translation between the two languages consistently throughout his life, the meaning of this translation changed as he moved from one context to another.

Case Study IV: Between Tears and Laughter/《啼笑皆非》

Lin’s translation and self-translation can be categorized into two distinct periods: his Shanghai era in the 1930s and the three decades after he emigrated to the United States in 1935. Lin’s two-way bilingual translation/writing gradually gave way to one-way translation from Chinese to English. To many Americans in the 1930s, China remained a largely unknown and exotic place. In representing China sympathetically, Lin sought to break down ingrained stereotypes and promote cross-cultural understanding. Lin wrote from the perspective of a cultural outsider, attempting to make his largely undervalued cultural background accessible to Americans, which was full of opportunities and challenges. In an essay titled “How I Wrote My Country and My People (1935) and The Importance of Living (1937),” Lin recorded that, after having composed over two hundred pages, he consigned the entire manuscript to flames because “the whole framework was based on an overall criticism of modern Western materialist culture, and the criticism became deeper and deeper and the style became more and more
argumentative.”153 The final product presents itself less as a critique upon Western culture, but more as a benign welcome of the Western audience to the Chinese culture and world. Since then Lin appeared to be apolitical in his emphasis on humor, self-expression and leisure. He wrote:

I am glad…I wrote on the Tooth-Brush. For a tooth-brush is a tooth-brush in 1935 as in 1930, whereas my readers themselves will have forgotten what the Fourth Plenary Session was all about, while the Naval Three-Year Plan has, for all I know, gone to sleep. I have the audacity to hope, however, that my readers will still be interested in my tooth-brush.154

After Japan invaded China in 1937, Lin wrote about more than his “toothbrush.” A lot of his essays were to support China and call for international aid. He began to question the sincerity of the help Americans gave to China. His novel Moment in Peking (1939) gives a searing portrait of the Japanese invaders. Lin became deeply concerned with world politics and dedicated himself to such practice by expanding and rewriting his manuscript of O This Age, This Moment! with a hope of winning more sympathy and even a rethinking for his beloved motherland from the West. This work, renamed as Between Tears and Laughter (abbreviated as BTL in the following analysis),155 a collection of essays, was finally published by the John Day Company in July 1943 and, instantly, became one of top ten best sellers of the year.156 However, soon after its publication, BTL was battered by criticism for its ironic tone and harsh sarcasm towards the western powers.

Lin’s critique of imperialism became a test to his cosmopolitan appeal in America. Up till this work, almost all of Lin’s books published in the Unites States, including My Country and

156 Jun Qian, Lin Yutang: Negotiating Modernity Between East and West (Berkeley: UC, Berkeley, 1996) 123.
My People, the Importance of Living, A Leaf in the Storm, With Love and Irony, and The Wisdom of China and India, had been bestsellers with almost unanimous rave reviews. The reception of BTL, however, was quite mixed, or to be exact, unfavorable. For example, Krishnalal Shridharani commented “once upon a time Lin Yutang was so ‘genial,’ so ‘carefree and irresponsible,’ so ‘witty and gay,’ and now suddenly, he had become earnest. He pulls no punches and his humor has become barbed. Dr. Lin was delightful… but to pinprick our own tribe, Well, how inconsiderate.” 157 Suoqiao Qian explains that the American intellectual establishment at that time was not quite ready for a critical cosmopolitan from China. Lin’s acceptance into the New York intellectual circles was based on his “good-will” cultural ambassadorship introducing Chinese cultural wisdom to the American public. But if that “good-will” entailed a critique of British and American imperialism and of Western modernity utilizing “Chinese cultural wisdom,” then he simply became a Chinese patriot who had lost his temper and his sense of humor.158 Orville Prescott’s review of the book clearly shows such disapproval:

Were it not for his name upon the title page and jacket it would be difficult to believe that the good Dr. Lin is actually the author of this shrill, abusive and vituperative book. In the first place, Dr Lin’ attitude throughout is smug, condescending and self-righteously superior…[Lin] claims the advantage of “intuitive insight” but he writes more like a man exasperated into a blind fury. He can expect that many of his readers will be exasperated, too.159

To Prescott, it was not so much a matter of whether the criticism was justified or not, but rather whether, as a member of “the non-industrialized civilization,” Lin was qualified to criticize materialism and imperialism.

This book even led to a break with his longstanding friend, Pearl Buck, which in turn resulted in Lin’s departure from his longtime publisher John Day. It was under such unfavorable

circumstances that, in the following year, Lin decided to translate the first eleven chapters of *BTL* into Chinese and renamed it《啼笑皆非》(*Ti Xiao Jie Fei*)\(^{160}\), which literally means “Neither Tears nor Laughter.” The phrase is used as a symbol of intellectuals’ anguished frustration. Through self-translation, Lin was able to let his voice be heard in his mother land.

Soon after Lin’s self-translation was published, Lin’s voice was heard and his message received, but contrary to his expectation, the book was met with a series of attacks from the leftists led by Guo Moruo (1892-1978), who ridiculed Lin’s critique of Western materialism as completely out of touch with the Chinese situation and questioned Lin’s motive by arguing that “when China was poverty-stricken at wartime, Lin had the privilege of flying back and forth from New York to Chongqing. If scientific materialism should be condemned, why could not Lin leave New York and come back to stay in China?”\(^{161}\) Guo Moruo named Lin Yutang as “modern Gu Hongming, wearing a Western suit, eating fancy dishes and lecturing in English in China.”\(^{162}\)

Attacks from both sides were unexpected. Wartime politics seemed to have left Lin limited space to mediate between two cultures and two worlds. Though the book and its translation were unfavorably critiqued, it did not affect their historical significance and the impact they had upon Western and Eastern intellectual worlds. Situated in a different historical era, this self-translation differentiates itself from the previous self-translations. Lin employs some translation strategies he seldom used before, like the use of double prefaces:

In the original, Lin writes a short “Preface to Myself”:

The purpose of this book is to say something that must be said and say it with simplicity…Our problem is the problem of moral decay and regeneration. From a

---


handful of dust faith must come. There is more hope in a heather rose than in all the tons of Teutonic philosophy. I do not know how to say these things, but God give me strength to say them.

In this one-paragraph preface, Lin states briefly the Skopos of the book and emphasizes that this is a “preface to myself,” a self-assurance, a mission claimer. Lin translates “God” as “黄天默祐” (blessed by imperial heaven), a commonly used Chinese expression that is not related to religion.

On top of the original preface, Lin writes a new four-and-a-half-page preface stating in much depth the circumstances in which the book is translated and the reason why he decides to do so. For translators, prefaces have often been used as a vehicle of ideology inculcation by which a translator is allowed to instill his/her own values and assert a clear-cut position for the text. Lin makes his translation a political-oriented propaganda to “speak out the unspeakable words” and ensure that the revelation of capitalism, materialism and western politics be transmitted to his fellow countrymen word-by-word. Due to his innate dual-identity, Lin is rightfully endowed with an equal power to handle, to amend, or to manipulate the content and the structure of the text.

To make sure his words won’t “be quoted out of context” by those “experts with ulterior motives,” Lin advances his detailed suggestions, in his added preface, including advising his compatriots to read the whole translation of his own in the established sequence from “the Situation”, “the Method”, “the Symptoms” to the final “Diagnosis.” Together with the discussion of the preface above, Lin’s translation is effectively an outcome of World War II, a political

---

163 Lin Yutang, Preface to 嘲笑皆非 (Tixiao Jiefei) (Chongqing: Shangwu yinshuguan, 1945) 2.
confession of one’s own and an experimental prescription set for national salvation. In rendering
the text, the major techniques Lin employs are deletion, shift, and addition.

In the beginning, Lin restates the purpose of his writing. He translates one long sentence
into twelve short statements in which there are eight fixed expressions:

For every good book is worth the reader’s while when there is a real communion of the
spirit and this is possible only when he feels he is being taken into the author’s
confidence and the author is willing to reveal to him the innermost searchings of his heart
and talk, as it were, in an unbuttoned mood, collar and tie loose, as by a friend’s
fireside(1).

盖凡著书行世，比使作者读者之间，这能开成相与，畅所欲言，始能开卷有益。
而欲如此，必使读者相信，可以听到作者肺腑之言，宛如良友谈解衣磅礴一种境
地。良友炉边夜谈，决不至意不得宣，最多意见不同而已(1)。

Lin paraphrases the English text in fixed Chinese expressions and as a result his translations are
inevitably tinged with strong Chinese characteristics. The translation uses words that are found
mainly in serious Chinese literature that is written in a grand and elevated style and thus more
formal. As a self-translator with simultaneous cultural cognition, Lin is capable of decoding the
implications of given words and reproducing the context of the original. Lin’s translation further
enriches the original, especially when he translates words with rich cultural connotations, like
the translation of “Karma”:

So I must speak of “Karma.” The Hindus have evolved a perfect theory of the law of
moral action, and you can understand this law of moral action only when you take the
historical perspective. (11)

所以我们只好谈起佛法说业。[按梵语 karma “羯磨”指身心言行必有苦了之果，
名为业因，通常所谓“宿业”“现业”之业也。] 印度人早已发明道德行为善恶果报的
因缘(12)。

Lin not only phonetically transliterates karma as “羯磨”(mo jie), but also figurative translates it
as “业因” (literally means “cause and effect” ), and even further interprets it as “宿业”
(historical cause and effect) “现业”(current cause and effect). Lin cites not just the teachings of Buddha, but scriptures of Confucius, Lao-tzu, and Thucydides throughout his book, which makes BTL read like a warning sermon, or Lin’s own words “preaching. (128)”

In order to restitute the translation loss occurring in the process of “aggression,” translators would add supplementary information to recreate the equivalent effect or further strengthen the artistic appeal in the given context through semantic shift. For example,

But if we take the historical perspective and view the development of human events, we are struck by a paradox which the science of human history so far has not been able to solve and the economic school of historians tend to ignore because they cannot make head or tail of it. (10)

但是如果我们要用历史的眼光来观察现世，我们便遇到一种难题，这也是历史科学所无法解决而历史经济观一派所常欲避免的，因为这一派辨不出他是牛是马。 (9)

Lin translates “cannot make head or tail of it” as “辨不出他是牛是马”(cannot tell bull or horse of it).” The semantic shift adds local flavor to the translation. Lin makes semantic changes not just to idiomatic expressions, but to literary quotes from well-known authors. Lin quotes from Robert Browning’s Pippa Passes, a phrase “the snails will be on the thorn” to picture the peaceful future:

When the war is over, the snails will be on the thorn, and the world will wage on, very much alive, as it always does, between tears and laughter. (9)

大战完了，花香鸟啼，世界还是世界，在啼笑悲喜之间流动下去。 (10)

A verse drama published as the first volume of his Bells and Pomegranates series in 1841, Pippa Passes is concerned with the phenomenon of a sudden recovery of moral awareness and free will, which is exactly what Lin is advocating. The phrase is from the most quoted passage in the poem:

The year’s at the spring,
And day’s at the morn;  
Morning’s at seven;  
The hill-side’s dew-pearled;  
The lark’s on the wing;  
*The snail’s on the thorn*;  
God’s in His heaven—

In the translation, Lin contextualizes the phrase, “the snails will be on the thorn” and translates it, by way of a metaphoric supplementing, as “花香鸟啼” (an idyllic scene with singing birds and fragrant flowers). Lin recreates a harmonious vision of nature that symbolizes peacefulness for Chinese readers.

Lin also employs the technique of deletion. To mock the hidden motives of the world superpower, Lin writes a poem:

And so like Alice in Wonderland,  
The fears grow bigger and  
Bigger even as the tones  
Fall lower and lower  
Until the fears  
Themselves take  
On the shape of  
A mouse’s tail—  
The ugly, filthy  
Thing. Anyway  
Look, Russia  
is such  
a big  
power  
China  
Also  
is go-  
ing  
to be  
a big  
pow-  
er  
you  
can-
Lin creates the image of the long tail of a mouse by dividing sentences into parts according to syllables to mock in form the viciousness of superpowers. To maintain the same effect in his translation is an impossible task in that Chinese characters are not breakable. Lin has no choice but to leave it out in his translation.

To make translation more reader-friendly, Lin is inclined to translate words of strong connotations into customized Chinese terms so as to serve his intention of political moralization. Lin translates “a genius” as “状元宰相(“zhuangyuan” referring to a title conferred on the one who came out first in the highest imperial examination and “zaixiang” referring to premier)”;
“the game” as “国际警卫队的牌戏 (card game of International Guard Team)”;
“the China war” as “中日战争 (China-Japan War).” The supplementing of this kind is also employed in the translation of chapter titles. Lin is eager to propagate his political viewpoints in the Chinese context and transforms the title of each chapter into a composite structure which consists of two separate parts: a Sinicized main heading and an explanatory subheading. In his subheadings, Lin not only clarifies the main points of every chapter but also associates the contents with international realities of his time so as to further justify his personal politics.
Lin, as a self-translator, seems to be “traditionally” unfaithful to the source text and eager to modify, manipulate and rewrite it at different levels, by reformatting the text, adjusting the structure, and bridging the cultures. Besides, Lin attempts to transform the source text into a Sinicized one by employing classical vernacular Chinese, adopting fixed Chinese expressions, imitating the common style of ancient classics and supplying explanatory semantic rendering, so as to make his translations better received among contemporary Chinese readers. In a word, it is the specific historical and political background that has influenced Lin’s translation in various aspects regarding the interpretation of the source text, layout of the book, titles and subtitles of chapters, selection of translation strategies, deletion of paragraphs, paraphrasing the context, and annotation of culture-loaded words.

**Conclusion**

Exceeding beyond the linguistic level, Lin’s self-translation tackles history, society, culture, and ideology. Lin considers paraphrase to be “the best and most satisfying method” of translation, especially when Lin translates ancient Chinese texts:

> The ancient texts were extremely sparing in the use of words, owing of course to the method of inscribing on bamboo sticks. Most of the important ideas and characterizations that covered a whole class of qualities were expressed by monosyllabic words, and in accordance with the general nature of Chinese grammar, the meaning was indicated by syntax or word order rather than by the usual English connectives.

The difference between ancient (traditional) Chinese and vernacular Chinese resembles the difference between: “Whither to, pray tell?” and “Can you please tell me where [we] are going?” Lin debunks the myth of ancient Chinese and translates its phonology and lexicon into modern English. His bilingual literary achievements prove to be exemplary and exceptional.

---

165 Ibid. 49.
From the perspective of the authors of the ST, Lin makes comparatively more adjustments in self-translation than other-translations. Lin is particularly flexible in making various degrees of adjustment, and in general, his translations published in America usually contained more adjustments than those published in China. To Western readers who lack the literary and cultural backgrounds of the SL, translations with too many Chinese words and phrases might distract and befuddle them and thus adjustments happen more often. From the perspective of publishers, Lin has more authority and power in China than in America, so he has greater freedom in writing and translating from Chinese publishers than from American publishers.\textsuperscript{166} Correspondingly, he gets more freedom in deciding what to translate and how to translate in English-Chinese translation than in Chinese-English translation. Even though Lin engages in back-and-forth translation between the two languages consistently throughout his life, the meaning of translation changes as he moves from one context to another. Lin, as a self-translator, crosses the two worlds of his own perception. Despite the “deep-seated” differences, Lin finds reconciliation between two worlds and two selves.\textsuperscript{167} Reading Lin and the next chapter’s Eileen Chang often means crossing linguistic boundaries in one and the same text and being exposed to translingual modes of representation.

Chapter Two

Awkward Betweenness and Metamorphosis: Eileen Chang’s Self-Translation

Eileen Zhang has had the most extensive bilingual writing career of the three writers examined in this dissertation. In her early writings, she explored both the Sinophone and Anglophone worlds and wrote bilingually between different communities, in which she adopted an omniscient knowing voice that explained the behavior and perspective of one community of readers to the other. In her later writings, particularly after her relocation to the United States, she attempted a similar authorial persona to act as a cultural broker, introducing China to the United States, while conducting extensive translations and rewritings of her old works. Different from Lin Yutang who reconciles Chinese and American cultures through his self-translations, Chang presents a somewhat awkward betweenness and reluctant metamorphosis in her self-translation.

Studies on Eileen Chang’s Self-Translation

Eileen Chang’s translation career began with a bilingual essay period of 1943-1944, and blossomed in the 1950s when she translated Ernest Hemingway’s *The Old Man and the Sea* in 1952, Marjorie K. Rawings’ *The Yearling* in 1953 and Washington Irving’s *The Legend of Sleepy Hollow* in 1954. After that, Chang began focusing more on self-translation:

*The Rice-Sprout Song* (1955) into 秧歌 (*Yang Ge*, 1955)
“Stale Mates (1957)” into “五四遗事 (1957)”
“等 (1961)” into “Little Finger Up (1962)”
“桂花燕•阿小悲秋 (1961)” into “Shame, Amah! (1962)”
*The Spy Ring* (1955) into 色戒 (1974)

*The Rouge of the North* (1967) and *The Golden Cangue* (1971)

---

168 Her translation was anthologized into Nie Hualing’s *Eight Stories By Chinese Women* (Taipei: Heritage P., 1962).
169 The translation was finished by Chang but did not get published until 2008 by Yilang Song (宋以郎), the inheritor of Eileen Chang’s literary works.
“A Return to the Frontier (1963)” into 重访边城

Her translation career ends with a translation of Han Bangqing’s 海上花列传 into The Singsong Girls of Shanghai in 1982.

Known as “the Garbo of Chinese letters” for her elegance and the aura of mystery that surrounded her, Chang is now regarded as one of the greatest and most influential modern Chinese novelists and cultural critics of the twentieth century. Her novels on domestic life earned her a nickname as “Jane Austin in China.” Though studies on her literary works have been empirically well-grounded and painstakingly detailed, her self-translation endeavors are not yet well studied. Song Qi’s article “Eileen Chang’s Self-translation of ‘Stale Mates’ as a Prelude: A Critical Study on Eileen Chang’s Translation” (1981) pioneered these studies, followed three decades later by Jing Wang’s “Cultural Mediation: On Eileen Chang’s English Translation of Jinsuo Ji” (2012) and Yifeng Sun’s “Transition and Transformation: with Special Reference to the Translation Practice of Eileen Chang in the 1950s Hong Kong” (2013), all of which focus on a single work of Chang’s. The first full-length study of Chang’s translations is Chen Jirong’s Self-Translation Approaches to Translation Studies: Illustrated with Eileen Chang (2009), followed by Xiaoji Bu’s Studies on Eileen Chang’s Rewritten Retranslated Works (2013), and Guanghong Ruan’s A Study of Eileen Chang’s Self-Translation Style (2016). All were written in Chinese and are not generally included in the studies of Chang’s self-translation in English.

170 The Chinese translation was not published in Eileen Chang’s life time. It was rediscovered by Yilang Song in the unpublished files left by Chang and republished in the Taiwan journal, Crown, in 2008.
171 Greta Garbo (1905-1990), the Swedish-born American film actress famous for her glamorous roles during the silent era and golden age of Hollywood cinema, was hugely popular in China of 1930s.
172 There are also studies on Eileen Chang’s translation from the perspective of Feminist translation, such as Wang Xiaoying’s “On Eileen Chang’s Feminist Translation Poetics in Translating ‘The Sing-song Girls of Shanghai,’” and Chen Jirong and Zhang Xiaopeng’s “On Eileen Chang’s Native Strategies in Her Feminist Translation Poetics.”
173 陈吉荣，《基于自译语料的翻译理论研究：以张爱玲自译为个案》（北京：中国社会科学出版社，2009）; 布小继，《张爱玲改写改译作品研究》（中国社会科学出版社，2013）; 阮广红，《张爱玲自译风格研究》（北京：中国书籍出版社，2016）
Tsui-Yan Li’s *Rewriting the Female Body in Eileen Chang’s Fiction and Self-Translation* (2007) and Lili Hsieh’s *The Politics of Affect: Anger, Melancholy, and Transnational Feminism in Virginia Woolf and Eileen Chang* (2005), are so far the most important works of English studies of Chang’s self-translation. Different from the previous studies which either focus mainly on a single work or interpret from the perspective of Sinophone studies, this chapter presents an inclusive view of Chang’s self-translation by contrasting her practices in the 1940s with that of the post-1950s, analyzing translation methods she adopted, and examining the changing Skopos that dictates how she conducted and metamorphosized her self-translations.

**Personal Background**

Chang was born into a family of hybridity: her father, Chang Zhiyi, lived a decidedly Chinese life of reading classics, taking concubines and smoking opium despite the fact that he had an English name and could read Bernard Shaw; her mother, Huang Suqiong, left for the United Kingdom when Chang was four and then traveled between Europe and China until her divorce from Chang’s father. If Chang Zhiyi was the avatar of the Chinese tradition, good and bad, Huang was the Western influence in Chang’s early life. Under her supervision and urging, Chang began to learn English, Western-style painting, and the piano. Growing up living in the French Concession, Chang was immersed in a multicultural and multilingual environment.


174 The Shanghai French Concession was a foreign concession in Shanghai from 1849-1943. It was located in the most prosperous part of Shanghai in the 1930s, a place of world-class lifestyle, refinement, culture, and food.

175 Founded in 1879 by American missionaries, SJU was one of the oldest and most prestigious universities in China, often regarded as the Harvard of China. Lin Yutang’s wife also graduated from St. Mary’s Hall.
in English early and published her first article in English as a teenager. Lin’s early success left a strong impression upon young Eileen and inspired her to pursue a “Yutang” dream. In Chang’s autobiographical essay “Whispers” (1944), she expresses her admiration for Lin whom she saw as cultural ambassador to the western world. Chang expresses her ambitions in one of her early essays:

I had boundless plans: go to college after graduation from high school ... and learn to draw cartoons so as to introduce the style of Chinese painting to America. I would be in more limelight than Lin Yutang, wear the most stylish clothes, travel all over the world, and own a house of my own in Shanghai, living a neat life.178

After high school, Chang arduously pursued the “Yutang” dream during her studies in Hong Kong University between 1939-1941, which provided the linguistic environment to perfect her English. Chang began to write everything in English, even personal letters. During her college years while making plans for pursuing a PhD in literature at Oxford University, the world outside her ivory tower was undergoing drastic change. In 1942, Hong Kong fell to the Japanese, bringing Chang’s education to an abrupt stop. Chang had no other choice but to return to Shanghai. To gain independence and make a living, Chang began to publish in English: film criticism pieces for the only English language daily, Shanghai Times and essays for the English readership in China on aspects of Chinese life in 二十世纪 (The XXth Century).

Along with her English writing, she also published a series of shorts stories and novellas in Chinese that brought her instant literary fame. Between 1943 and 1945, a vast amount of media coverage—including roundtable talks, interviews, profiles, photographs, cartoons, and tabloid stories—promoted her as a cultural icon. Nicole Huang argues that “Chang’s initial rise

177 Lin’s literary achievement also brought him impressive financial success: according to Lin’s daughter, he made $36,000 in 1938; $42,000 in 1939; and $46,800 in 1940—extraordinary sums in those days. Refer to Yu Xu, “Zhui Si Lin Yutang Xian Sheng (Remembering Lin Yutang),” ed. Zi Tong, Lin Yutang Ping Shuo 70 Nian (70 Years of Comments on Lin Yutang) (Beijing: Zhongguo Huqiao P., 2003) 135-156.
to fame was also the product of her own ingenious self-promotion. She moved into the limelight deliberately and with a great deal of intellectual prowess and fashioned herself as a spokesperson of wartime popular culture.

Chang’s best works published during a three-year period are collected in two volumes: Chuanqi (Romances, 1944), a collection of short stories and novellas, and Liuyan (Written on Water, 1945), a book of essays. Chang’s self-translated works, such as The Golden Cangue and “A Chronicle of Changing Clothes” are included.

Chang’s Opinion on Translation

Although Lin was her major influence, Chang’s approach to translation was significantly different. Chang focused more on the social, cultural, and ideological impact of translation rather than the linguistic. In her speech “Chinese Translation: A Vehicle of Cultural Influence” (1966-1969), Chang discusses the complex intersections between translation and society, especially China’s fraught relationship with the outside world.

Her speech traces these intersections through the late-Qing period, the early years of the republic, the May Fourth Movement, the Japanese invasion and occupation, the 1949 Communist revolution, and the Cultural Revolution. Chang speaks, less as a translator, more as an avid reader, and the inclusion of numerous authors and works, sometimes with little explanation, recreates the literary milieu in which her writing emerged.

She mentions the importance of Lin Shu’s translation and points out that the decade of the Lin-translated fiction overlapped [with] the launching of vernacular literature (though Lin

---

179 Nicole Huang, “Introduction,” trans., Written on Water, Eileen Chang (New York: Columbia UP, 2005) IV.
Shu himself strongly opposed the use of vernacular language as the language for translation). Chang situates translation in history, noting that translation has flourished alongside Westernization, as the fruition of the May Fourth Movement, with full references to “Shelley the golden-haired poet… the skylark, the nightingale—birds that China doesn’t have… It’s a catch-all—Greek myths, Bernard Shaw’s *Arms and the Man*, Oscar Wilde’s *Salome.*” Chang emphasizes the important role translated literature has played in Chinese modernity and points out that most of the best-known writers had their first stories published in *小说月报* (*Fiction Monthly*) but it devoted a lot of space to the translation of nineteenth- and twentieth-century Western writers, especially the Russians and East Europeans because the editors believed that China belonged with these oppressed countries and could learn from their experience.

Chang’s view of translation reflects the theory that now dominates translation studies, that is Susan Bassnett and Lefevere’s culture translation. Chang pays more attention to the cultural significance of a translation than linguistic equivalences. Such opinion is well presented in her practice of self-translation. When the context and audience changes, Chang rewrites and retranslates her works. Lefevere points out that translation is a form of rewriting which is as important as the literary work itself and argues that “not only does a rewriting function as an original on all levels where readers do not have the inclination, the means, or the motivation to go beyond the rewriting and tackle the original itself, but literature which is not rewritten does not survive in the system much beyond its first publication.” Since Chang is her own translator, she may be classified as creating what Eugene Eoyang calls “co-eval” translations in which the “spirit and meaning of the original is present.” Eoyang explains that such translations

---


are like Vladmir Nabokov’s self-translations of Russian into English: “in some cases it might be hard to discern which is artistically the more original; however easy it might be to determine originality in terms of chronological priority.” Chang’s English works are as equally original as her Chinese works.

Chang’s habit of rewriting and translating back and forth between English and Chinese was her lifelong pursuit and presents an occasion to examine the author’s bilingual and bicultural journey from the perspective of the performance of the self and analyze the various aims of her self-translation practice. The three rules of the Skopos theory (the Skopos rule, the Fidelity Rule and the Coherence Rule) present effective approaches to Chang’s self-translation. Whereas Chang’s earlier self-translation in the 1940s can be viewed as a form of impersonation for the purpose of producing a defamiliarized perspective on “China” and “Chineseness,” her practices after the 1950s present an extreme case of rewriting in the complex context of the diasporic subject in the Cold War era (1947-1991).

Chang’s Bilingual Writings in the 1940s

Following the footstep of Lin Yutang, Chang’s bilingual writings introduced Chinese culture and traditions to the Westerners in Shanghai. From January to December 1943, Chang published three cultural critiques and six film reviews in The XXth Century:

January, “Chinese Life and Fashions” (Essay)
May, “Wife, Vamp, Child” (Movie Review)
June, “Still Alive” (Essay)
“The Opium War” (Movie Review)
July, “Song of Autumn” (Movie Review)
August, “Mother and Daughters-in-Law” (Movie Review)
October, Movie Review without a title

November, “China: Education of the Family” \(^{187}\) (Movie Review)
December, “Demons and Fairies” \(^{188}\) (Essay)

Three cultural critiques, “Chinese Life and Fashions,” “Still Alive,” and “Demons and Fairies,” were later self-translated into Chinese as “更衣记” ("A Chronicle of Changing Clothes"), “洋人看京戏及其他” ("Westerners Watching Peking Operas and Other Issues"), which were both published in 《古今》 (Journal of Ancient and Today) in 1943, Vol. 34 and 36, and “中国人的宗教” ("The Religion of the Chinese"), published in 《天地》 (Heaven and Earth) in 1944, Vol. 11. \(^{189}\)

Chang’s writing at that time focused more on apolitical issues, such as fashion, leisure, and style and movie reviews, but The XXth Century that published Chang’s English essays in the 1940s, had a clear pro-Axis (pro-Germany, Italy, or Japan) political agenda with funding from the German foreign ministry. \(^{190}\) Its editor Klaus Mehnert was a Russian émigré to Germany and most of the articles he wrote for The XXth Century were either scholarly analyses of Soviet politics or defenses of Fascism from an intellectual perspective. \(^{191}\) The target audience of the journal were Westerners in Shanghai, especially those who lived in foreign concessions. Published in the politically charged context of Shanghai under Japanese colonialization and rendered for a difference audience, Chang’s self-translation of the 1940s should not be perceived as purely linguistic exercises; they are the textual site of an identity performance that is (to

---


\(^{188}\) Eileen Chang, “Chinese Life and Fashions,” The XXth Century 5.6 (1943) 421-429.

\(^{189}\) Another article, “私语,” ("Whispers") also published in 《天地》 (Heaven and Earth) was self-translated from “What a Life! What a Girl’s Life,” originally published in 《英美晚报》 (British and American Evening Newspaper). Two of the movie reviews, “Wife, Vamp, Child” and “China: Educating the Family,” published in The XXth Century were self-translated as “借银灯” and “银宫就学记.”

\(^{190}\) In June of 1941, Klaus Mehnert accepted a position in Shanghai as editor-in-chief of a new publication titled The XXth Century, which became the leading English-language journal in Japanese-occupied Shanghai. The final issue was in June of 1945.

borrow from Shuang Shen and Tina Chen), “impersonation” (the intentional act of copying another person’s characteristics). As Chang navigates the culturally fractured semicolonial borderland of Shanghai in the 1940s, writing between a number of different Sinophone and Alglophone communities, the practice of impersonation allows her to change perspectives of her observation by impersonating characteristics of Foreigners, overseas Chinese, or Shanghainese. The metaphor of impersonation allows us to consider linguistic, personal, and bodily performances together in trans-lingual and cross-border contexts, which are all under the umbrella of Skopos. Skopos theory is effective in guiding self-translation since both are purpose-oriented, yet John Catford’s concept of situational equivalence and Eugene Nida’s formal correspondence theory once applied to the translation of literary works are much less useful.

Three essays serve as illustration: “Still Alive”/“洋人看京戏” (“Foreigners Viewing Peking Opera”), “Chinese Life and Fashions”/“更衣记” (“Chronicle over Chang of Clothing”), and “Demons and Fairies”/“中国人的宗教” (“Chinese’s Religion”). In these pieces, Chang acts as a cultural broker, presenting and mediating between Western and Chinese culture by defining and explaining cultural dissimilarities and variances. While she engages in making essentialized generalizations about each culture as Lin Yutang often does, she adds a dose of irony. Chang satirizes Western interpretation of Chinese culture with an orientalist twist searching for the mysterious East, while at the same time mocking Western behaviors misinterpreted by Shanghainese. She adopts an authoritative and explanatory tone that is nevertheless accompanied

193 Ibid. 97.
194 My translation if not otherwise indicated.
by a sense of humor. Chang’s writing on traditional Chinese culture reflects Shanghai’s multicultural, polyglot nature, and she often addresses and speaks for a number of different subject positions simultaneously.

Case Study I: “Chinese Life and Fashions”/“更衣记” (1943/1943)

Appearing for the first time in the January 1943 issue of The XXth Century, Chang’s “Chinese Life and Fashions,” is a meticulous meditation on various changes in clothing styles from the Qing dynasty to the 1940s Republic of China. To facilitate her arguments, Chang attaches to her article twelve sketches all drawn by herself to show the evolution of fashions. Less than a year later, Chang translated, revised, and expanded the piece for publication in a Chinese-language journal, 《古今》 (Past and Present), retitling it “更衣记(Gengyi Ji)” (“A chronicle of changing clothes”). In the self-translation, those drawings were no longer included since the Chinese audience was more familiar with the designs. While much of the material remained the same, this retooling of the essay involved a subtle reconfiguration of Chang’s authorial voice and self-positioning vis-à-vis her Chinese readers, who are addressed less as psychiatric subjects than as collaborators in a troubled cultural history that extends through the largely unspoken (but ever present) privations of life during wartime. It is this version of the article that is ultimately included in Chang’s 1945 collection of essays and cultural criticism, Liuyan (Written on water).

An immediate influence on Chang’s thinking in the article, was Xu Dishan, one of her professors at Hong Kong University. Xu published in Ta Kung Pao, the oldest active Chinese language newspaper founded in Tianjin in 1902, a long article about the history of Chinese

---

women’s fashion in eight sequential installments in 1935. Chang was inspired and decided to write a piece of her own to represent not merely fashion but also a cultural analysis of the attitudes on modern China.\(^{197}\) Fashion, as superfluous and irrelevant as it may appear, under Chang’s pen, offers a unique window into the period with which she was concerned.

Chang’s interest in fashion and beautiful fabrics had another source as well. In 1890, Chang’s great-grandfather, Li Hongzhang established China’s first cotton textile mill.\(^{198}\) Chang liked to collect unusual and luxurious materials, and had them made into costumes according to her own designs—she once ran a short-lived fashion design firm. In war-time Shanghai where nothing was fixed and the present was scarcely more than a form of disappearance, the ever-changing moods of women’s fashion ironically seemed relatively stable and reliable.\(^{199}\) In a time of severe censorship, fashion as an “apolitical” topic was easily publishable. Poshek Fu quotes a telling remark by Chang: “…political topics are rarely favored because our private lives are already packed full of politics.”\(^{200}\) Revealing layers of cultural sediment, Chang traces the changes in fashion in China (for both men and women) over three hundred years. When conducting self-translation, Chang is conscious of and attentive to the Skopos of her bilingual essays and is careful in negotiating between different language communities. She makes conscious adjustments based on the different demands of English and Chinese readerships. She employs specific translation strategies in her rendition, including shifting, omission, cutting, conversion, addition and combination.


\(^{200}\) Kam Louie, Eileen Chang: Romancing Languages, Cultures and Genres (Hong Kong: Hong Kong UP, 2012) 134.
In Vermeer’s Skopos theory, the function approach to translation aims at producing a text which lives up to the cultural expectations of the target reader. Different from traditional translation, the functional approach to translation claims that the same text can be translated differently on the basis of the communicative function of the translated text. Following Vermeer’s Skopos theory, the translator is given leeway to produce a text which largely differs from the original text in both form and content. The following example presents such a difference through a shift in tone.

“Chinese Life and Fashions” opens with an invitation to outsiders to enter the private sphere of the Chinese home and observe the Chinese ritual of clothes-sunning:

Come and see the Chinese family on the day when the clothes handed down for generations are given their annual sunning! The dust that has settled over the strive and strain of lives lived long ago is shaken out and dancing in the yellow sun. If ever memory has a smell, it is the scent of camphor, sweet and cozy like remembered happiness, sweet and forlorn like forgotten sorrow (54).

The syntax of the imperative first sentence calls out to an addressee, who is assumed to be outside the typical Chinese family described here. In a subsequent self-translation of this essay in Chinese, along with the change of audience, the tone of the first sentence changes to one that is less inviting and more detached: “如果当初世代相传的衣服没有大批卖给收旧货的, 一年一度六月里晒衣裳, 该是一件辉煌热闹的事罢。(If all the clothing handed down for generations had never been sold to dealers in secondhand goods, their annual sunning in June would be a brilliant and lively affair.)” To foreigners, clothes-sunning is unheard of and eye-opening and the excitement is captured in the tone, while to Chinese people this ritual is routine.

---

and known to all, the reality of which is reflected in the tone as less exciting and more documentary.

In the second paragraph of “Chinese Life and Fashions” and the third paragraph of “更衣记” (“A Chronicle of Changing Clothes”), Chang writes “such was the stability, the uniformity, the extreme conventionality of China under the Manchus that generation after generation of women clung to the same dress style/这么迂缓，安静，齐整——在满清三百年的统治下，女人竟没有什么时装可言！一代又一代的人穿着同样的衣服而不觉得厌烦.” 203 Here “stability, the uniformity, the extreme conventionality” are translated as “迂缓，安静，齐整 (slowness, tranquility, and uniformity).” Chang does not translate “extreme conventionality”; instead, she changes this derogative term to the more neutral term “tranquility,” suggesting that Chang does not want to offend her Chinese audience. When it comes to expressing her feminist voice, however, Chang says without any reservation:

Under those layers of clothing, the ideal Chinese female, petite and slender, with sloping shoulders and a hollow chest, made herself pleasantly unobtrusive, one of the most desirable qualities in a woman (54).

Instead of rewriting, Chang faithfully translates this feminist remark into her Chinese article. Chang ironizes old-fashioned suppression of women. Feminism in the 1920s and 1930s was gaining momentum in China. Contending groups of Chinese intellectuals used the “woman question” as a keyhole through which to address issues of modernity and the nation. The process of national invention and the struggle to create a new ideas of womanhood reveals not only the anxieties associated with changing roles for women, but also the anxieties associated with

modernity and the modern nation. In this context, Chang voices her opinion with this account of changing clothes, an alternative history of constant redefinitions of female beauty, feminine propriety, and the place of women in a modern society. Chang adds in her self-translation: “男子的生活比女子自由的多 (men enjoy far more [sartorial] freedom than women),” and goes on to tease out the absurdity of gendered assumptions in cultural discourses:

衣服似乎是不足挂齿的小事。刘备说过这样的话：“兄弟如手足，妻子如衣服。”可是如果女人能够做到“丈夫如衣服”的地步，就很不容易哦。有个西方作家（是萧伯纳吗？）曾经抱怨过，多数女人选择丈夫远不及选择帽子一般聚精会神，慎重考虑。在没有心肝的女子说起她“去年那件织锦缎夹袍”的时候，也是一往情深的（73）。

(Clothes seem to be quite inconsequential. The ancient hero Liu Bei had this to say on the matter of clothes: “Brothers are like one’s hands and feet; wives and children are like clothes that can be put on and taken off.” But it will be very difficult indeed for women to reach the point where husbands are likened to clothes. One western author (was it Bernard Shaw?) once complained: “Most women put more careful thought and consideration into the choice of their hats than their choice of husband.” Even the most heartless of women will wax passionate when she starts to speak of “last year’s quilted silk gown.”)

Chang has only to remind the Chinese audience that women have been insincerely treated and were considered no more than a piece of clothing. But the essay does more than tease out the gendered categories embedded in discourses on fashion. Chang’s account stages history as a “costume drama.” Chang’s representation of history presents “a museum of human fantasies or a gallery of artifacts that are constantly in motion. (xxv)” Costumes seem to replace the characters; the stage is composed of shapes, colors, lines, and circles instead of people. Clothes
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are personified and animated in both words and a series of drawings. Clothes become a language through which she communicates her message.

Another example of tone shifting is found in Chang’s account of fashion history:
In pre-Revolution costumes, the individual was wholly submerged in the form—the form being a subjective representation of the human figure, conventionalized as always in Oriental art, dictated by a sense of line rather than faithfulness to the original. Post-Revolution clothes slowly worked towards the opposite direction—the subjugation of form by the figure (61).

最近的发展是向传统的一方面走，细节虽不能恢复，轮廓却可尽量引用，用的活泛，一样能够适应现代环境的需要。旗袍的大襟采取围裙式，就是个很好的例子，很有点“三日入厨下”的风情，耐人寻味(73)。

Here, the Orientalist tone that assumes the western reader, with the mention of “Oriental art,” is replaced by an intimate tone and good example of Qipao, which was popular in the Republican Shanghai era. The quotation of a well-known verse, “三日入厨下” from a Tang poem, 《新嫁娘词》 (“Ode to Bride”) that describes how a bride is expected to behave after the marriage by Wang Jian made Chang’s account closer to the Chinese readers who would have heard of the verse(s) about newly-weds.

Shift of tone also occurs with the following example where the original English essay ends this way:

Once again, China is standing at the threshold of life, more grim and practical this time, surer of her own mind because of the lessons she has learnt. (61)

In the translation, Chang rewrites the conclusion by adding this last section and ends her article in a more light-hearted and positive tone:

有一次我在电车上看见一个年轻人，也许是学生，也许是店伙，用米色绿方格的兔子呢制了太紧的袍，脚上穿着女式红绿条纹短裤，嘴里衔着别致的描花假象牙烟斗，烟斗里并沒有烟。他吮了一会，拿出来把它一截截拆开了，又装上去，再送到嘴里吮，面上颇有得色。乍看觉得可笑，然而为什么不呢，如果他喜欢？…

…人生最可爱的当儿便在那一撒手吧？ (74)

(Once when I was on the streetcar, I saw a young man… who had tailored himself a rather tight mohair robe with green checks over a rice-colored background. He was wearing women’s stockings, striped red and green, and an exquisitely carved fake ivory…
pipe hung from his mouth, although there was no tobacco inside the bowl... At first I found him ridiculous, but then I thought to myself, Why not, if this was what gave him pleasure?... Might it be that in this life that moment of letting go is the very loveliest? 207)

The reflective and sincere tone of the English ending gives way to a frivolous and anecdotal thought. Chang seems to be telling her Chinese audience that if the future is not dependable, then one must enjoy the present.

Besides the employment of shift, a rational use of addition, omission and deletion (AOD), will help a translator render a source text: addition will augment and deepen underdeveloped content, omission will partially drop undesired content, and deletion will completely remove superfluous content in the source texts.

Omission means dropping words when they are culturally insignificant or syntactically unnecessary. As Chang recounts fashion history, she exclaims over the passing of history:

We find it hard to realize that less than fifty years ago it seemed a world without end. Imagine the reign of Queen Victoria prolonged to the length of three centuries (54)!

In the translation, Chang omits the analogy between Victorian England and Manchu China because most Chinese readers would not appreciate the connection with Great Britain reminiscent of the strong colonial ties. Also, “less than fifteen years ago” is not rendered into Chinese in that Chinese writings can be general and vague when the focus is placed on the timelessness of a statement.

The technique of deletion employed in the self-translation can be found when Chang explains women’s dress style:

Young ladies brightened up the bleak winter months with the ‘Chow Kwuen Hood,’ named after the historical beauty Wang Chow Kwuen, an imperial handmaid in the second century A. D. She is always pictured on horseback, with a fur hood and despondent expression, on her way north to marry the king of the Huns, whom it was

In the translation, Chang deletes the explanatory sentences about Chow Kwuen and China’s pacifying policy since Chinese people are fairly familiar with the historical figure and the context of the pacifying policy and it would be redundant to add any explanation.

Another example of deletion is as follows:

In periods of political unrest and social upheaval—the Renaissance in Europe, for instance—tight-fitting clothes which allow for quick movement always come into favor. Jerkins in fifteenth-century Italy were so tight that slits had to be made at the joints of the body. Chinese clothes just stopped short of bursting open in the turbulent days when the Revolution was in the making. The last emperor, Pu-yi, reigned for only three years, and by then the jacket clung like a sheath to the arms and body. And such were the wonders of Chinese corseting that even then we did not see the realistic picture of a feminine figure, but rather the disembodied conception, one of Byzantine severity and Pre-Raphaelite spirituality: slim, straight lines flaring a little at the knees, whence issued tiny trouser legs which dropped a timorous hint of even tinier shoes apologetically attached to the ground (56-57).

Here, Pu-yi is translated as “little Emperor” and the fact that he reigned only three years is deleted since it is a fact known to all Chinese. “Byzantine severity and Pre-Raphaelite...
spirituality” are simplified as “poetic soul.” “Bound feet in shoes” are euphemized as “Tinier shoes” in the original, which translates as “Golden Lotus,” a further beautified euphemism.

In the original, Chang elaborately explains the woman’s hairstyle with various cultural analogies:

> When I was young, a women’s hair-know was usually in the shape of a Sycee. A little later it was prolonged to the shape of a spoon, called the ‘Soochow Hair-know.’ Two knots right and left were called the Pipa Style. [Pipa is a form of guitar.] Wire-matting was tucked inside the ‘Castanet Hair-know’ to give it shape…Another style has the hair twirled over the forehead like spirited serpents; some call that the ‘Republican Hair-know.’ (58)"

Chang writes and interprets the hair fashion for its Western audience with metaphors and analogies, such as “Sycee,” “Pipa/guitar,” “Castanet,” or “Republican.” However, the Chinese audience take their hair styles for granted and seldom associate them with those exotic terms, like “spirited serpents.” Chang deletes this passage altogether in the translation.

Chang’s composition of the original essay aims not only to introduce fashion to its English speaking audience, but also Chinese society and history. Thus, Chang reveals:

> Ching His Huang, the first emperor of united China and the builder of the Great Wall, found pleasure in the ‘Hair-know which Rises, above the Clouds,’ very becoming to petite maidens, if we are to believe the writers of modern beauty columns. Ladies at the Han Court designed coiffures entitled ‘Welcome Spring,’ (with an eager forward tile) and ‘Two Hearts in One,’ “Smoky…” The Han princesses were the first to wear wigs…Aside from those courts fashions, the wife of an official dressed her hair in a style called ‘Falling off the Horse,’ with a towering puff tilted on one side and plenty of soft loops flying free. (58)"

Chang does not include this part in her translation probably because she finds common knowledge mundane, like the first emperor of China, the Great Wall, and the hair styles women wore.

Chang continues to describe the hair style of the latest:

> …that which ties a false knot at the end of loose-hanging hair, a likely name for it should be the ‘Hair-know of Disintegration and Homeless Wandering.’ What an omen! The times are indeed out-of-joint! I tremble to think of what is to come (58).
The deletion of this part is justifiable in that Chang does not want to offend her Chinese audience by revealing her overt criticism.

Other than the minor changes to cultural terms or explanatory sentences, Chang drastically deletes two whole sections: “Profusion and Confusion” about women’s hair-style and “Hats and Mental Equilibrium” about hat fashion. The two sections are suffused with explanatory comments about basic Chinese history and society.

With the change of audience, Chang modifies cultural metaphors. For example, as she describes the dress code of Chinese women and emphasizes the minute details in the design of dresses, she uses similes:

The trouble with old Chinese dress designers was that they did not know the all-importance of brevity. After all, a woman is not a Gothic cathedral. And even with the latter, the diffusion of interest by the heaping up of distracting details has occasioned much criticism. The history of Chinese fashions consists almost exclusively of the steady elimination of those details (56).

Its translation reads as:

古中国的时装设计家似乎不知道，一个女人到底不是大观园。太多的堆砌使兴趣不能集中。我们的时装的历史，一言以蔽之，就是这些点缀品的逐渐减去 (68)。

(Chinese fashion designers of old seemed not to have understood that a woman is not a Prospect Garden. The heaping together of details will inevitably diffuse interest and result in a loss of focus. The history of Chinese fashion consists almost exclusively of the steady elimination of those details.)

The well-known Western architecture, “Gothic cathedral” is translated into “Prospect Garden,” the large, idyllic, and elaborately wrought fictional space that serves as the principal setting of Cao Xueqin’s masterpiece of eighteenth-century fiction, Dream of the Red Mansions. The conversion of cultural symbols facilitates the audience’s perception.

---

Another common practice employed by self-translators is addition. Chang adds a new section discussing men’s clothing which is nowhere to be found in the original English essay:

直到十八世纪为止，中外的男子尚有穿红着绿的权利。男子服色的限制时现代文明的特征。不论这在心理上有没有不健康的影响，至少这是不必要的压抑(74)。

(Until the 18th century, men in China and abroad still had the right to wear red and green. The restriction of wearing colorful clothing only began in modern time. Whether such practice would have bad impact upon mental health, it was an unnecessary repression.)

Chang points out that the modern history of men’s clothing has been less eventful. Chang feels confident adding this remark of generalization in the Chinese essay, while for the English essay such generalization will need stronger textual support.

Case Study II: “Still Alive”/ “洋人看京戏及其他” (1943/1943)

The translation of the cultural chronicle, “Still Alive” (1943), is intended to achieve more than providing a sketch of Chinese life and customs from an objective perspective since Chang has already dismissed Western Sinophiles as hopelessly naïve and ignorant. In offering a new perspective to Shanghainese residents, Chang implies not that it will increase their enjoyment of opera but, rather, that it will allow them to see how opera and, by extension, Chinese culture, are seen by outsiders. Not assuming the authoritative role of being a cultural ambassador, Chang emphasizes her own ignorance of Peking opera, regarding her perspective of an aficionado as a qualification for writing about the opera’s more superficial pleasures, as she lacks specific knowledge regarding the actor’s proper costume or the significance of the various gestures. Chang describes herself as perfectly placed, sophisticated but untrained, yet also knowledgeable of what makes China attractive to outsiders.²¹⁰ Throughout the piece, Chang walks the reader

²¹⁰ Clara Chiyoko Iwasaki, Towards an Itinerant Sinophone: Transnational Literary Collaboration in the Writings of Xiao Hong, Zhang Ailing, and Lao She Diss. of UCLA, 2015, 96.
through a number of lessons that an outsider might learn about Chinese opera, Chinese culture, and literary and cultural conventions. She also explains why her piece, while taking as its subject the Western perspective on China, focuses on Chinese opera. Klaus Mehnert introduces Eileen Chang as “a Chinese who, in contrast to most of her countrymen, does not simply take China for granted. It is her deep curiosity about her own people which enables her to interpret the Chinese to the foreigner.”

Skopos rule plays an important role in Chang’s translation of the title. The English title, “Still Alive” reveals the status quo of Peking Opera to its English-speaking audience, while the Chinese title, “洋人看京戏,” which literally means “Peking Opera through foreigners’ eyes,” addresses its Chinese audience intimately by juxtaposing themselves against foreigners. Chang adds an entire section (four new paragraphs) at the beginning of the Chinese essay to recontextualize her essay.

Chang opens with a Westerner’s perspective on China, constructed through fragmentary glimpses of local color and sounds heard on the gramophone and the radio.

头挂了竹竿，晾着小孩的开裆裤；柜台上的玻璃缸中盛著「参鬚露酒」；这一家的扩音机里唱著梅兰芳；那一家的无线电里买著癞疥疮药；走到「太白遗风」的招牌底下打点料酒……这都是中国。  

(Placing bamboo poles horizontally above to dry baby’s split trousers; a glass bowl on the cupboard full of ginseng rootlet wine; this house’s gramophone playing Mei Lanfang; that house’s radio advertising leprosy and scabies medication; walking under the Legacy of Libai street sign to buy a little cooking wine. This is China.) (My translation)

Chang presents China as imagined through the superficial glimpses of surfaces. These sights and sounds are by nature incomplete, momentary snippets of sound or a quick glance. The sights of split trousers and ginseng are arresting images divorced from any larger context. These images
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occur as quick and incidental sights of Chinese people or Chinese homes as seen by a passerby. Chang imagines these disconnected points of view as that of the foreigners who live in Shanghai and claim to know it. At the end of the passage, she proclaims ironically, “This is China.” Chang conjures up an idea of Western Sinophiles feeding their obsession with superficial encounters with colorful fragments of Chinese culture. In doing so, they construct a China of their own imagining. Chang gently mocks these Westerners, characterizing their imagination of China as rather deluded.

Chang then shifts away the Sinophile perspective and talks directly to her Chinese audience, especially young people:

多数的年轻人爱中国面不知道他们所爱的究竟是一些什么东西。无条件的爱是可钦佩的——唯一的危险就是：迟早理想要撞着了现实，每每使他们倒独一口凉气，把心渐渐冷了。我们不幸生活于中国人之间，比不得华侨，可以一辈子安全地隔着适当的距离崇拜着神圣的祖国。那么，索性看个仔细吧！用洋人看京戏的眼光来观光一番吧。有了惊讶与眩异，才有明了，才有靠得任的爱。（Most our young fellow Chinese love China, but they do not understand what patriotism really means. Unconditional love is admirable, but it is also dangerous. When faced with cruel reality, they would lose their faith. Unlike overseas Chinese who could spend a lifetime worshipping their motherland at a safe distance, we live in the heartland of our war-inflicted country. Let’s now assume the perspective of foreigners to observe our own country. We will gain new insights. Once we understand our love, our love becomes genuine and resolute.) (My translation)

The opening paragraph of the translation places the speaker in relation to the collectivity of Chinese by using pronouns like “we” and expressions like “our young fellow Chinese.” Chang proposes that seeing China from the Western perspective would help Chinese people raise their consciousness and improve their cognition. She makes a distinction between their China, the China dreamed up from advertisements and opera recordings, and the one that she and her readers know. Chang’s perspective shifts in this passage and moves between Western,

---

Shanghainese, and overseas Chinese perspectives in short order, considering each and then moving on. She suggests that while Westerners are attracted to the mysterious and colorful Orient, overseas Chinese, in their distance from Chinese culture, are uncritical because they place it on a pedestal as part of their sacred motherland. The discerning reader, however, living among the Chinese, is in a position to be more informed than a Westerner or an overseas Chinese but without losing critical distance. It is this critical distance that Chang maintains throughout the piece.

Trying out a Western perspective would enhance readers’ experience of Peking opera and rediscover its beauty and influence. Chang adds a short passage analyzing its unique contribution:

京剧的世界既不是目前的中国，也不是古中国在它的过程中的任何一阶段。它的美， 它狭小整洁的道德系统，都是离现实很远的， 然而它绝不是罗曼蒂克的逃避 ——从某一观点引渡的显示连接起来方才看得清楚。(106)
(The world of Peking opera is not present-day China, nor is it any stage of the past. Its beauty and its restricted and pristine value system are far different from today’s reality, but it is not a romantic escape. One can only appreciate it better when observing from a different perspective.) (My translation)

Chang suggests that the world of Peking opera is not made up of a pure reflection of contemporary Chinese culture or any other specific time period in China’s past. Rather it constitutes an emotional bricolage of various stories or themes in Chinese culture. While it does not possess documentary fidelity, it has a kind of detached insight into Chinese culture as a whole, precisely because it is removed from actual events. Chang once again claims a similar detached perspective as the narrator and impresario of the operas and operatic traditions that she discusses. Chang demonstrates her ability to understand and repackage the views of outsiders for the amusement and edification of Shanghainese readers. Presenting herself as a cultural broker,

---

Chang navigates between a number of different cultural positions within the semicolonial landscape of Shanghai.

Under the section of “the Secret of Eternal Youth,” Chang once again emphasizes the charm of Peking Opera:

Our case is the exact opposite to the New York public, which takes to impressionism, surrealism, peasant poetry, etc., upon the recommendation of art critics. Chinese men of taste are unanimous in pronouncing Peking Opera vulgar, lowbrow, but its childlike vigor appeals to the primitive in us which the Chinese civilization has been too sloppy to root out. Somewhere about there lies our secret of eternal youth (35).

Chang comments that Peking Opera keeps Chinese audience alive, provides them with childlike vigor, and ensures them “eternal youth.” Chang interprets the popularity of Peking Opera in a self-critical way, which is used as the conclusion in the Chinese version as an analytical self-reflection:

粗鄙的民间产物怎么能够得到清朝末叶儒雅风流的统治阶级的器重呢？纽约人听信美术批评家的热烈的推荐，接受了原始性的图画与农村自制的陶器…文明人听文明的昆曲，恰配身份，然而新兴的京戏里有一种孩子气的力量，合了我们内在的需要。中国人的原始性没有被根除，想必是我们的文化过于随随便便之故。就在这一点上，我们不难找到中国人的永久的青春的秘密(109)。

When translating this passage, Chang does not literally translate “impressionism, surrealism, peasant poetry”; instead, she translates the abstract terms as images, like “primitive pictures” and “countryside pottery,” which are more relatable to Chinese readers. Chang deletes derogatory terms, like “vulgar” and “lowbrow.”

In the English essay, Chang elaborates on the discussion of the origin and history of Peking Opera:

Peking Opera originated not in Peking but in the provinces of Anhwei and Hupeh, where it amused the gods and, incidentally, the peasantry on divine birthdays and festivals in general. For some time, it remained one of the many types of provincial dramas held in disdain by adherents of the elegant Kwun Opera, handed down from the previous dynasty and much polished up by the literati…A revolutionary actor, Wang Kwei-fung, experimentally combined the Anhwei Opera with the drama brought in by the Manchus.
The result was a great success, especially among royalty and officials…That the sophisticated upper classes are receptive to such a product is a tremendous tribute, not so much to Peking Opera, as to its new audience. Then, as now, the Chinese public was fond of Peking Opera against its better judgment.215

Chang deletes the whole paragraph. In lieu of it, she makes a one-sentence comment, that is, “中国人舍昆曲而就京戏”, which means “it was amazing that Peking Opera won over Kun Opera among royals and officials.” (my translation) As a national treasure with a history of 200 years, Peking Opera is known to almost all Chinese people, which makes a detailed account of its history unnecessary.

Chang employs analogies a lot. For example, she compares the sound of Peking Opera to European symphonies:

The music of Peking Opera reflects the extreme and perhaps disproportionate emphasis on brevity in all forms of Chinese art. We do not seem able to appreciate vast complicated construction in art. European symphonies, in which form is discernible only when viewed as a whole, are to the Chinese a giant, unintelligible, sprawling mass. The Peking Opera tunes are short and shapely, and their effect instantaneous. Every line and stanza is a semidetached entity (35).

She also compares the singing in the Peking opera to that of Western singing: “The male voice is akin to the Western tenor or baritone, but the female voice is nearer to the bird and the flute than the soprano. (37)” Chang, however, deletes most of these analogies in her translation, probably because the Italian terms of “bariton” or “soprano” are beyond the knowledge of most Chinese readers. Not to offend her Chinese readers, Chang also deletes remarks of criticism she makes over modern Chinese writing: “The Chinese always create best with a predetermined mold, as in the case of Tang poetry and Song lyrics. Modern Chinese poetry has had scant success because it starts out with a negation of form. (38)”

If, at the beginning of the essay, China and Chinese life are passive objects waiting to be seen, towards the end of the essay Chinese themselves play an active role in spectatorship and the production of spectacles. The perspective of the foreigner looking in at Peking Opera is reversed and transformed into the Chinese looking with “surprise and wonderment” at each other and the things around them. This essay’s conclusion— that there is no unseen position for seeing— is a powerful argument against the adoption of an “omniscient” perspective in cross-cultural knowledge production.216

The practice of self-translation for this article starts from the role-switching of the author from a supposedly “authentic” Chinese informant addressing a foreign audience to a Chinese person adopting the perspective of a foreigner while addressing a Chinese readership. With the migration of the text, there is the change of identity. In this process of role-switching, the Chinese person is delinked from Chinese culture, as is a foreigner from a foreign perspective. To think of self-translation as impersonation allows us to see that translation is more than a linguistic act; it is an intellectual performance as well as a bodily performance. Chang’s Chinese essay pushes against the cognitive and bodily limits against which “Chineseness” is defined.

As a self-translator, Chang seems to have the liberty that traditional translators do not have. She focuses less on the fidelity rule or coherence rule, more on Skopos rule. She makes changes at her authorial will. Her self-translation can be largely defined as rewriting rather than a faithful translation of the original.

Case Study III: “Demons and Fairies”/“中国人的宗教” (1943/1944)

Chang moved between the Anglophone and sinophone publishing worlds of Shanghai and changed perspectives seamlessly through her bilingual essays. Chang satirizes Shanghai’s

worldly incorporation of Western ideas, while celebrating their ability to fuse them with Chinese sensibilities. The process by which her name “Zhang Ailing” became “Eileen Chang” is an excellent illustration of the way in which the linguistically diverse atmosphere of Shanghai nurtured her dual linguistic identities. The act of repositioning and repackaging her work between two languages, cultures, and communities often meant more opportunities for wider readership. In the essay “Demons and Fairies,” Chang transmits Shanghai idiosyncrasies for the amusement of Western audiences. In its translation, Chang changes perspective by juxtaposing western religious beliefs with those of the Chinese to challenge her Chinese audience’s perception of their own religious beliefs and superstitious behaviors.

Klaus Mehnert adds an editorial comment to Chang’s article “Demons and Fairies”:

China has a vast, richly populated borderland, the borderland of the beyond, the borderland between superstition and religion. In her whimsical meanderings in these realms, the authoress [Chang] does not attempt to answer religious or ethical questions. But in her own amusing way she succeeds in conveying to us a great deal of information on the mentality of the Chinese masses.

Chang states in the beginning of the essay that “A rough survey of current Chinese thought would force us to the conclusion that there is no such thing as the Chinese religion. (421)” Chang believes that the Chinese intelligentsia has always been staunchly atheistic. Thus, this essay focuses more on the discussion of the mentality or spiritual world of Chinese people than Chinese religion. It attempts to answer the question for its Western audience: if Chinese people do not have religious beliefs, how do they manage their spiritual world?

Chang explains that “An educated Chinese does not believe that man personally is heading anywhere in particular on his journey through time, and the same applies to

---

217 Chang’s childhood name was Zhang Ying, but when her mother enrolled her in English-language school, she quickly chose an English name for her, Eileen. “Eileen” was then phoneticized in Chinese as “Ailing.” For more information, refer to Clara Chiyoko Iwasaki, Towards an Itinerant Sinophone: Transnational Literary Collaboration in the Writings of Xiao Hong, Zhang Ailing, and Lao She, Diss. UCLA, 2015, 74.
race. (421)” She further interprets, “One Chinese after another sees the withering of a flower and shudders at the impermanence of life, but none ventures any further from that point. The thought of inescapable doom does not drive him to despair, to slackness, to gluttony or excessive sensuality. (421)” The lack of the concept of inescapable doom helps Chinese people focus on this life, not the after-life.

In translation, Chang applies Skopos rule by changing the perspective from addressing her Western audience to her Chinese audience. She adds a new section of “外教在中国(Foreign Religions in China),” interpreting Christian beliefs to Chinese people:

基督教的神与信徒发生个人关系，而且是爱的关系。中国的神向来公事公办，谈不到爱。
(The relation between God and Christians is personal and reified in love, while Chinese Gods are far more business-like, detached and judgmental.) (My translation)

Chang also abides by the Skopos rule in translating the title of the essay. For purposes of communication, Chang employs the technique of expansion. She translates “Demons and Fairies,” into, “中国人的宗教(Chinese Religion),” which is broader in its topic. The Chinese counterpart of Demon is “鬼(gui),” which springs from a mix of Confucianism, Buddhism, and Taoism. Its connotation is distinctively different from “Demon” in the English context. Literal translation, in this case, can be dangerously misleading.

At the beginning of the English essay, Chang defines China as a country without religion: A Rough survey of current Chinese thought would force us to the conclusion that there is no such thing as the Chinese religion. The Chinese intelligentsia has always been staunchly atheistic. 218

Chang adds a new comment in her translation and talks directly to her Chinese audience:

这边东西本是写给外国人看的，所以非常粗浅，但是我想，有时候也应当像初级教科书一样地头脑简单一下，把事情弄明白些。219

218 For the text selected here, refer to <https://evols.library.hawaii.edu/bitstream/10524/32608/1/63-Volume5.pdf> Access Aug. 5, 2016. I will not provide page numbers for my quotations.
This essay was originally written in English for foreigners and thus it discusses only fundamentals, since I believe it could help people think more clearly by making things simple like what elementary textbooks do. (My translation)

The candid revelation of her Skopos at the beginning of the text makes her translation intimate to her Chinese readers.

When translating her discussion about Chinese literature, Chang employs both addition and omission:

It is doubtless owing to this agnostic tendency that Chinese literature is pervaded by a great sadness. It finds joy only in materialistic details, which explains why traditional novelists dwell so tirelessly on the unabridged items in meals and love-making (complete menus are often given for no specific purpose). The details can be gay and distracting whereas the theme is invariably pessimistic. All generalizations on life point to nothingness.

就因为对一切都怀疑，中国文学里弥漫着打的悲哀。只有在物质细节上，它得到欢悦——因此《金瓶梅》、《红楼梦》仔仔细细开出整桌的菜单，毫无倦意，不为什么，就因为喜欢——细节往往是和美畅快，引人入胜的，而主题永远悲观。一切对于人生的笼统观察都指向虚无。

Chang adds two classical works, *The Plum in the Golden Vase*\(^\text{220}\) and *Dream of Red Mansion* in her translation, and alludes to the detailed descriptions of their outlandish banquets. Chang omits the sensitive term, “love-making,” but the mere mention of the work’s title, *The Plum in the Golden Vase*, still carries the connotation of explicit depictions of sexuality.

Due to the lack of similarities between the “jurisdiction of the Dark” in the west with that in China, Chang merges the two sections, “Legal Complexities” and “Transmigration of Souls” and deletes most religious terms, like “hell,” “formalities,” “constitution,” and “God.” Instead, the translation talks about religion with terms that are more familiar to Chinese people, like “supernatural,” “self-sacrifice,” and “filial affection.” To preserve the spirit of the original text, a

\(^{220}\) Written during the second half of the sixteenth century and first published in 1618, *The Plum in the Golden Vase* is noted for its racy narrative and surprisingly modern technique. Its graphically explicit depiction of sexuality has garnered the novel a level of notoriety in China akin to *Fanny Hill* and *Lady Chatterley’s Lover* in English literature.
translator should recognize unique cultural features and show the cultural differences in a creative way. Chang presents a flawless shifting from Christianity to Buddhism in her translation of a section title: ‘Transmigration of Souls” to “投胎” (Celestial Designation of Birth Place).

**Conclusion**

The three bilingual essays follow a similar pattern: English essays, written for foreign readers, are fundamental and unsophisticated, while the translations, for Chinese readers, are elaborate and complicated. Because of the introductory nature of the English articles, Chang adds some explanatory remarks concerning Chinese history, culture, and tradition but deletes intricate historical allusions and labyrinthine literary references. In translation, she gets opportunities to compensate for the loss of the complexities. In general, the English-language versions adopt a more unequivocally anthropological standpoint in terms of introducing the “Chinese way,” while the Chinese-language versions express a world-wise perspective in which she turns an observant eye toward traditional and historical Chinese behavior.

Chang’s approach to self-translation works both in line with the commonly held notion of “fidelity” in translation and against its grain. Chang aims to show that her self-translations should be understood as different versions of the same text. Although we have a text—the English one—that chronologically comes first, translation makes it acquire a new existence in the native language. As each language actively produces different axiological systems, the two versions will be subject to different modes of reading and reception. By going against the idea of translation as a one-way movement of departure and arrival, Chang aims to open up her texts to a process of estrangement carried out through linguistic displacement and repeated readings. In the process of self-translation, both the writer and the reader are asked to recontextualize their
frames of reference: the text thus takes on new meanings that exceed the biographical, national, and linguistic positionality of the “original” text and of its author.

**Chang’s Self-Translation in the 1950s and Onward**

Though Chang spent the first few years in Shanghai after the New China was founded in 1949 and wrote *Eighteen Springs* in 1951 and “Xiao’ai” in 1952, both of which carry the leftist message of the time (pro-communism), Chang soon realized that she did not belong to the new political and literary environment. In 1952, Chang left for Hong Kong and stayed till 1955, during which time she finished two novels, *The Rice-Sprout Song* (1955) and *Naked Earth* (1956) that were widely regarded as anti-communist since they fictionalized failures of political campaigns carried out by the Chinese government like the land reform. Those works earned her a controversial title of being a propagandistic writer. Following that, her works were banned in mainland China for decades until the early 1990s. One important reason why Chang got intensely involved in politics was that both novels were commissioned and sponsored by the United States Information Agency (USIA). During the Cold War (1947-1991), the main goal of USIA was to influence public attitude in foreign countries in support of the United States. To achieve that goal, they sought literary talents to write for them to influence public opinions in third world countries. Chang became the best candidate for this mission due to her outstanding bilingual capacity. For lack of better job opportunities in Hong Kong, Chang accepted the job and wrote the two novels with plots provided by USIA. Some critics accuse Chang’s choice as opportunistic while Dai Qing argues that it is far-fetched to imagine that Chang’s writing was distorted by USIA since she is too powerful a writer for that—“too immune from being tricked…If nothing else, the beauty of Chang’s writing makes it hard to view as anyone’s
propaganda.” David Der-wei Wang also explains that “Chang’s movement from the leftist to the rightist camp in the short span of five years . . . bespeaks, however, not her opportunism but her predicament as a Chinese writer trapped in the drastic imperatives of an ideological age.” Chang later translated the two political novels into Chinese. In contrast to the immense popularity of Lin Yutang’s English writing, Chang’s English works were received with checked enthusiasm. Due to their finite influence, this chapter will not discuss these two self-translated novels.

Of the second period of Chang’s self-translation, one work that deserves our special attention is 《金锁记》 (Jinsuo Ji), one of her most widely acclaimed works and arguably the darkest and most claustrophobic of her stories, originally published in Shanghai in 1943. It was later compiled into Chang’s first collection of stories, Chuanqi (romance), which claimed in the preface that “its objective is to look for ordinary humanity in legends and look for the extraordinary in the quotidian.” Over a span of three decades, Chang translated and rewrote this particular story seven times. This is a rare phenomenon even in the field of self-translation worldwide. Such ongoing re-translating and rewriting clearly show Chang’s strenuous attempts to get her work published outside of her home country and her determination to give her work new lives and new identities.

The novel was based on Chang’s family anecdotes about her remote relative, Li Jingshu (1864–1902), the second son of her great grandfather, Li Hongzhang (1823–1901), a leading Chinese statesman of the 19th century, who made strenuous efforts to modernize China.

223 The original Chinese text is “书名叫传奇，目的是在传奇里找普通人，在普通人里寻找传奇” (epigraph on the cover page of the first edition of Chuanqi).
Working from the characters and plot of *Jinsuo Ji*, Chang wrote *Pink Tears* during her stay at the MacDowell Colony from 1956 to 1958; it was not accepted for publication. Chang then rewrote it and renamed it *The Rouge of the North*, which was not published either. She subsequently translated *The Rouge of the North* into Chinese under the title 怨女 (*Yuannü*), which was first serialized in 星岛晚报 (*Singdao Night Newspaper*) in Hong Kong and 皇冠 (*Crown*) in Taiwan in 1966. She retranslated *Yuannü* into English under the same English title as her earlier novel, *The Rouge of the North*. The revised English version was eventually published by the Cassell Company of London in 1967.\(^{224}\) She revised *Yuannü* again after she thought its manuscript was lost in the mail when she sent it to Hong Kong in 1965;\(^{225}\) it was published by the Crown Publishing Company in 1968. Later on, Chang translated her Chinese novella *Jinsuo Ji* into English as *The Golden Cangue*, which was anthologized in *Twentieth Century Chinese Stories* published by Columbia University Press in 1971.\(^{226}\)

Different from the first period when Chang’s self-translations were published in Shanghai for the readership in China, the self-translated works of the second period were targeted towards an American audience and sought publishers in the United States. Chang wrote in the mindset of an exile. Even if exile can be perceived as a positive experience in terms of a liberation and/or reinvention of the self, in the case of Chang, exile was a traumatic experience where one’s emotional stability is lost in transit as the mother tongue becomes uprooted and is unable to provide meaning for the new reality. In order to find a breakthrough in the new literary world, she resorted to self-translation. According to Janine Altounian, writing in the language of

---

\(^{224}\) It was republished by the University of California (two decades later) in 1998.

\(^{225}\) Mentioned in her letter to Hsia Chih-tsing dated March 31, 1966.

the other is in fact a part of the healing process. In the absence of unity, fusion and proximity, self-translation works as a way of repairing the broken tie, preventing the self from becoming dispersed, and finding an appropriate channel to produce an intelligible narration out of chaos. However, the healing process is not that simple for exiles. For Chang, her solution was to dwell obstinately and obsessively in her memory in order to save every detail from oblivion, which partially explains Chang’s obsession with the retranslating/rewriting of the same work seven times.

By the time Chang entered the American literary stage in the 1950s, the reception of China in the West had very often been dominated by Chinese scholars/translators like Lin Yutang who once defined the Chinese people as “joyful beings” and Chinese civilization as a “civilization of joy.” Even though Lin later expressed a more critical voice, dominating interpretation of the Western media still endorsed Lin’s earlier portraiture. Chang’s works featured the expression of sadness, which was met with an unenthusiastic response. She metamorphosed her work through repeated self-translations, but the situation did not improve. In a letter to Hsia Chih-tsing, Chang expressed her confidence, stating that the difficulties in getting her works published were largely due to the Orientalism, which limited their view of China, and thus, her works. It seems that American audiences were not interested in tales of old Shanghai, preferring less morally ambiguous works.

Chang’s role as self-translation is also reflected in her screenwriting. She wrote screenplays for MP&GI from 1957 to 1964 while trying to support herself and her husband.

228 Zhiqing Xia, My Letters from Eileen Chang (Beijing Changjiang Wenyi P., 2014) 39.
Ferdinand Reyher.\textsuperscript{229} Eight of Chang’s screenplays were made into motion pictures, mostly in the comedy genre.\textsuperscript{230} As a creative agent, Chang mediated between differing cultural regions, media, and languages in the context of mass culture and commercial cinema. Chang not only reconciled artistic and commercial sensibilities within the confines of the film industry, but also crossed over different historical locations, cinematic traditions (Hollywood vs. Chinese films), and narrative forms and media (fictionstagefilmcomedy), recreating new meanings for different local film audiences. The study in this field is beyond the scope of the current work, but this will serve as a good research topic for future study.

Case Study IV: 《金锁记》(Jin Suo Ji)/The Rouge of the North (1943/1967)

Of the seven retranslations/rewritings, I chose two versions for the case study—the very first publication of 《金锁记》(Jinsuo Ji, abbreviated as JJ) and The Rouge of the North (abbreviated as RN) of 1967. The choice of these two versions lies not only in their much wider circulations and bigger influence, but in the disparities between the two in terms of linguistic rendition, cultural translation, and metaphorical representation. Such disparities are less obvious in other English translations, like The Golden Cangue, a word-for-word rendition of JJ. The focus on the pair will provide more opportunities to analyze the Skopos behind the authorial choices of translation techniques. It will examine how an English translation gives account of the complexity and richness of the original, combating a Western invention of China. It will also investigate how Chang reproduces in her translation the major features of the original work: the sharp descriptions, the modern techniques, the exquisite language, and classical Chinese

\textsuperscript{229} Once a prominent American leftist writer in the United States, he began to suffer from declining career and health. Their marriage was beset by financial difficulties and Chang’s screenplays became the couple’s primary source of income.

\textsuperscript{230} The plays included Qingchang ru zhanchang (The Battle of Love, 1957), Rencai liangde (A Tale of Two Wives, 1958), Taohua yun (The Wayward Husband, 1959), and Liuyue xinniang (June Bride, 1960).
narrative. A successful translation depends not only on a deep understanding of the original text and its position in the literature of the time, but also on an accurate interpretation of the translation Skopos.

The *JJ* is widely acclaimed for its scalpel-like observations on human nature and delicate psychological description of women’s conditions in 1920s China. In spite of the success of *JJ* in China, Chang felt compelled to continue rewriting her story and produced *RN* twenty-four years later. Chang took her translation very seriously. A letter of September 5th of 1963 from Chang to C. T. Hsia says, “I am interested in translation and joint publications research service would be ideal.” A letter of September 25th from Chang to Hsia says, “Sorry that I did not write back because I have been busy translating the novel (which refers to *RN*).”

The translation and retranslation accompanied Chang for decades. Chang needed a novel to bring her a breakthrough to the Western book market. *JJ* seemed to contain the most promising ingredients: a woman protagonist, an orientalist allure, and a family-saga structure. The novel is set in Shanghai, the ultimate source of Chang’s inspiration: Shanghai’s meandering alleys, crowded bungalows, hybrid fashions, cries of vendors, and courtesan culture are fondly called up as the subtext of *RN*.

*JJ* and *RN* echo and re-echo each other. *RN* became a full-fledged novel with ample context and character development, as opposed to the briefer novelette. *JJ*’s protagonist Ch’i-ch’iao emerges as more rancorous and destructive than Yindi in *RN*. The images and metaphors of *JJ* such as the cangue, the moon and the mirror appear to be sharper and artistically

---

231 The personal letters between Eileen Chang and C. T. Hsia are 118 in total between 1963 to 1994. They are now available to the public. These letter would be a good subject for scholars to study. If Yilang Song would publish the 650 letters between Eileen Chang and his parents (Mr. Qi Song and Mrs. Song), the study would be more productive and would contribute a lot to the study of Eileen Chang.

interwoven with the plot to a greater extent than the rouge and the beads images with the plot of the later novel. RN captures moments of explicit sexual contact, while JJ depicts only desires and sublimation. It seems that the novella is more invested in dramatic conflicts: its emotional effect is more powerful and its portrayal of Ch’i-ch’iao is sharper. RN appears to be slower paced and its portrayal of Yindi is surfeited with details. Read in tandem, the two works complement each other.  

From a structural and linguistic perspective, JJ and RN are an ideal pair of texts for bilingual readers, as they avoid presenting rigid translations that defer to a sense of “strict liberalism.” Rather, the pair of works offers bilingual readers numerous playful and inventive instances of linguistic recreation in which the English and Chinese narratives appear as different, revised versions of each other. As Julio-Cesar Santoyo notes, “…self-translations do, at times, end up modifying their original. If the act of translating is a creative one, there is little doubt that self-translation is its most creative expression.” With its abundant use of bilingual idioms, puns, and analogies and its frequent recourse to restatement and interpretive parallel, RN is a highly creative work of self-translation.

RN documents, in a third-person narration, Yindi’s constant battle for acceptance as a woman of lowly origins who marries into the rich Yao family. The name “Yindi” betrays her humble origin and a predictably ordinary life, as the sound “yindi” puns between “silver girl” and “inducing brothers.” On the other hand, “Qiqiao” in JJ means “Seven Skills,” a name also suggestive of a slave girl or village woman as it aspires for no other “feminine virtues” than deft

---

hands.\textsuperscript{236} After a brief liaison with her brother-in-law, Yindi attempts suicide, but she survives. No such suicide occurs in \textit{JJ}. Unlike \textit{JJ}, where the protagonist dominates both her son and daughter, \textit{RN} has no counterpart for Chang-An, the daughter. Yindi’s son Yensheng becomes the focus of her attention when she sets up her own household after her spouse’s death. She gives him opium to smoke and controls him by getting him addicted. With the help of a matchmaker, Yensheng marries a young woman who is ugly and old-fashioned. Like the bride in \textit{JJ}, she has big lips and no chin. Yindi says, “chop up her lips and they’ll make a heaping dish” (164), repeating the words used in the novelette. Subjecting her daughter-in-law to verbal abuse and revealing details of the newlyweds’ sex life, Yindi oversees her daughter-in-law’s destruction. She evolves from a normal but poor young woman to a hateful, rancorous woman who destroys every member of her family. Like Yindi, Ch’i-ch’iao at the conclusion of \textit{JJ} lies in an opium daze, thinking about her life:

\begin{quote}
七巧似睡非睡横在烟铺上。三十年来她带着黄金的枷。她用那沉重的枷角劈杀了几个人，没死的也送了半条命。她知道她儿子女儿恨毒了她。她婆家的人恨她，她娘家的人恨她。
(For forty years now she had worn a golden cangue. She had used its heavy edges to chop down several people. She knew that her son and daughter hated her to death, that the relatives on her husband’s side hated her and that her own kinsfolk also hated her.)
\end{quote}

\textit{RN} ends in a similar way:

\begin{quote}
Suddenly it all came back, the banging on the boarded shopfront, she standing right behind it, her heart pounding louder than that, the hot breath of the oil lamp in her face, her fringe coming down muffling the wet forehead and her young body picked out in the dark by the prickly beads of perspiration. Everything she drew comfort from was gone, had never happened. Nothing much had happened to her yet (185).
\end{quote}

Both protagonists have destroyed their familial relationships. Ch’i-ch’iao self-reflects on her life remorsefully, while Yindi laments on the emptiness and wastefulness of her life unlovingly.

Chang takes an approach of foreignization as opposed to Lin Yutang’s domestication. Lin mixes Chinese patterns with English structures and combines syntax, while Chang seems reluctant to submit to English structure and often peppers her English text with untranslated Chinese words in *Pinyin* (the official romanization system for Standard Chinese). The way she deals with foreign lexicons can be understood in two complementary ways. First, Chang considers untranslated Chinese words unique and idiosyncratic. For example, when referring to Yindi with respect, a special term “Gu Nana” is used, which means “Madame.” The term usually denotes a uniquely intimate relationship between a Madame and her servant who has been serving the Madame since she was young and then moved along with the Madame into the husband’s home after Madame’s marriage. Since there is no such English term to symbolize such a close rapport, Chang keeps it in the untranslated *Pinyin* format. Second, Chang finds the Chinese terms too localized to be translatable which results in her choice of a method of stiff translation. When describing Mahjong, a popular tile-based Chinese game, Chang says, “All the games went on in silence until someone discarded a tile which had not turned up for some time. Old Mistress snapped it up crying ‘Eat!’ and inserted the five stripes between the waiting jaws of her four and six stripes. (78)” In Chinese, players use the term “吃 (eat),” to indicate their willingness to claim the discarded tile. But for the English-speaking audience, the term “eat” sounds uncoordinated. They have to stop and think about the meaning of the term before they move on with their reading. Chang is faced with the paradox of translating the untranslatable which can be further defined as linguistic untranslatability and cultural untranslatability. John Catford points out that there are situations when an item can be linguistically translatable into the TL but culturally untranslatable into the Target Context. To solve the issue of
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untranslatability, Chang finds an uncomplicated solution: instead of adding footnotes or
glossaries, Chang bets on the original words in the format of Pinyin or stiff translation, believing
that they are powerful enough to break through the cultural barriers. It is a way of highlighting
the capacity of original languages to reveal new realities, otherwise left unattended.

Untranslated words in a text seem to have a special power to signify a culture and an
identity. They acquire as they reflect an assumed ubiquity and vehicularity of use.\(^\text{238}\) Bill
Ashcroft argues that “Refusing to translate words not only registers a sense of cultural
distinctiveness, but also forces the reader into an active engagement with the … culture.”\(^\text{239}\)
There is little doubt that in encountering untranslated text, “The reader is unequivocally in the
presence of an ‘Other’ culture.”\(^\text{240}\) Even more significantly from a linguistic standpoint it that,
“The refusal to translate is a refusal to be subsidiary.”\(^\text{241}\) Translation holds a special place in this
cross-fertilization between worlds and cultures and Chang’s experience with \(JJ\) and \(RN\) have
borne fruit beyond expectations.

In \(RN\), Chang translates a significant number of proverbs signaled by italics, which
rhythmically punctuate the novel like a chorus. The proverbs also function as a strong cultural
bind, making each Shanghainese speaker part of a community in recognizing the art of the writer
as well as the context of the writing. A Shanghai reader will immediately recognize an allusion,
but for an English-speaking audience it is not an easy task. “Golden cangue,” an image occurring
in both versions, symbolizes the destructiveness of the protagonist who, while metaphorically

\(^{240}\) Ibid. 25.
\(^{241}\) Ibid.
bearing the frame used to hold prisoners in old China, is both imprisoned and imprisoning. Such a familiar image to Chinese people is unknown to Chang’s English-speaking audience.

Chang also translates a number of Chinese idioms. When describing the Third Master’s hunger for money, Yindi openly teases “Whoever has milk is Mother.” When Old Mr. Chu (the family accountant) tries to refuse the Third Master’s request for extra money, he pleads “I’ve taken a lot of risks for Third Master, by heaven and earth and conscience. (43)” Mr. Chu continues “The bit of coffin money I saved up is not enough to fill the space between Third Master’s teeth. (43)” “Third Master is always in such a hurry, as if his eyebrows are on fire. (43)” When one of the servants found that one of the Big Mistress’s jewelry is stolen, she is so worried and suggests that “this has to be reported to the police. If we don’t get to the bottom of this I’ll never wash the mud off me, not if I jump into the Yellow River…This is too much, to get a tooth knocked off and have to swallow it. (65-66)” Chang quotes a Chinese saying concerning women’s role in a marriage, “Married a chicken, follow the chicken; married a dog, follow the dog. (75).”

All the examples illustrate that Chang employs the technique of metaphrase (a literal, word-for-word translation, as opposed to paraphrase) to translate the idiomatic expressions. According to Jean Vinay and Jean Darbelnet, a literary translation can only be applied with languages which are extremely close in cultural terms. Chang’s choice tests her English-speaking audience’s ability in deciphering cultural metaphors. To help with the situation, Chang makes adjustments by cultural transference. When she describes Chinese women’s clothing, she alludes to those images that are more familiar to English-speaking audience.

---

When the sixtieth birthday of the long-dead master of the house was celebrated posthumously in the Temple of the Bathing Buddha, the women dressed themselves with special clothing: their sheath jackets were violet, turquoise and apricot respectively. They all wore the long necklace called the many-treasured chain, twisted ropes of pearls with rubies, emeralds and sapphires woven in. In ended in a large pendant of pearls and gems strung into a variation of the swastika that looked exactly like a dollar sign (73).

The analogy between “swastika” and “dollar sign” saves ink on explanation. Readers would instantly know the shape and design of the jewelry. When recounting an eldest servant’s hair style, Chang states “She pinned on a false bun no bigger than a silver Mexican dollar and not much thicker. (30)”

Chang makes adequate changes to overcome cultural obstacles so as to better reach her audience. Chang creatively settles the problem of translating proper names. For example, Chang simplifies the translation of Chinese names by using family titles. Most Chinese names have rich connotations which are inevitably lost when phonetically reproduced in the format of Pinyin. The use of family titles, however, is far from being an easy solution. China has much more fine-grained terms for different types of family relationships than the English-speaking countries do. An “uncle” in English can refer to a brother or brother-in-law of either parent. Chinese not only distinguish between paternal and maternal uncles but also between younger and older one. When translating the family titles into English, Chang experiments with various ways. For instance, Gu Ya (姑爷, the broom) is translated as “Master of Miss” and Gu Nana (姑奶奶, the bride) as “Madame Miss” (25).

The translation of profane language is always a tricky matter, considering its wide range of coverage (swearing proper, scatology, slang, ethnic-racial slurs, vulgarity, taboo speech, name calling profanity, blasphemy, and obscenity).244 What language and words are perceived as foul

---

in a culture is in strong connection with what is considered taboo in that culture. It seems that the English version cannot do justice to the proficiency of Yindi’s use of vulgar language. Her foray of curses can be divided into four groups: those thematically connected to the dead body, like “rotten corpse afloat” (“懒浮尸/Lanfushi”), “Corpse on the roadside!” (“路倒尸/Ludaoshi”); those related to animals, like “Swine” (“猪猡/Zhuluo”); those about low-life, such as “tramp” (“瘪三/Bieshan”); and those about sub-group slangs, like “dead man.” In her translation, Chang employs the strategy of under-translation, toning down her translation to avoid misunderstanding. For example, “dead man” as a curse term can also be used to show intimacy between a married couple. At other times, swears words are used just for emphasis and these words can even be left out in translation without changing the primary meaning of the sentence.

*JJ and RN do not present a perfect linguistic “double” of themselves. Rather, Chang provides what appears to be enriching and enlightening extensions of both versions of the text. As Raymond Federman observes, the act of self-translation not only “enlightens,” “reassures,” and “reasserts” the knowledge presented in the original source text, but it also occasionally corrects the errors of the original text.*

245 For Federman, self-translation “…is no longer an approximation of the original, nor a duplication, nor substitute, but truly a continuation of the work—of the working of the text.”

246 The differences between the two works lie in the addition of interlocutors, the shift from first to third person narrative, and the plot development. The twenty-four-year time lapse between publications might very well explain the variations in perspective: memories get distorted across time and stories inevitably change with each retelling.
Federman argues that writing should expose the fictionality of reality.\(^\text{247}\) Chang’s rewriting is achieved through various other translation techniques, like addition, shift, and deletion.

Chang adds more details of characters’ habits, backgrounds, and their conversations, and offers more information on family social structure and styles of living in her translation. The added upbringing and post-marriage life details give her protagonist more opportunities to justify her self-destruction and the merciless torture she inflicts upon her child. Xiaojue Wang points out that the original work has to be “transformed and translated in order to be transmittable.”\(^\text{248}\) Chang also resorts to a kind of Orientalist ethnography and incorporates more descriptions of Chinese practices and customs. In Chapter Two, she adds a two-full-page description of a Chinese wedding tradition, registering a full range of ritual images, like candlesticks and incense, kotow, sacrificial table, square cakes, firecrackers, and sedan chairs. Chang also adds detailed descriptions of traditional Chinese medicinal practices:

A small purplish red mark stood like a spindle between the brows where she had pinched herself over and over again to pinch the heat sickness out of the system (2). She felt under the pillow for a copper coin. Dipping it in a bowl of water she sat down in front of the mirror and scraped her neck with it, to scratch out the heat sickness…dipping it back in water from time to time. Three wide stripes of mottled purple and red appeared running alongside the throat. The bruised skin burned but she felt slightly eased around the heart (6).

Chang explains the medical practices in great detail to help English-speaking readers understand Eastern shamanism, some of which practices are still in use today.

Chang adds more details to demonstrate Yindi’s unhappiness which stems partially from her relationship with her blind, asthmatic spouse whose impotence suffocate her: Yindi deliberately crushes his beloved Buddhist rosary and throws it away in a fit of perversity. The


breaking of a Buddhist rosary is a bad omen signifying a breaking of a life cycle. Yindi’s blasphemous action reveals how desperate and tortured she is. To augment romance to the original novella, Chang adds more descriptive details about Yindi’s relationship with Third Master, her brother-in-law, a womanizer and gambler. Chang adds an episode when Yindi succumbs to his charm in the Buddhist temple. They kiss and he fondles her. Fearing he will reveal the incident and the Yaos will punish her, she tries to commit suicide by hanging, but fails. Chang also adds more psychological monologues. For example, Yindi complains: “A woman is a crab without legs and the child is still little. They’re long years ahead. What’s to become of us” (95). Such monologues graph out the inner feelings of Yindi. The employment of addition in this rewriting/retranslation shows that Chang endeavours to help English-speaking readers understand the psychopath of a character like Yindi.

Chang also makes syntactic changes in her translation. The structure of the novel is subjected to the influence of Chinese literary tradition, with the ending echoing the beginning—

*JJ* begins in this way:

三十年前的上海，一个有月亮的晚上…我们也许没赶上看见三十年前的月亮。年轻的人想着三十年前的月亮该是铜钱大的一个红黄的湿晕，像朵云轩信笺上落了一滴泪珠，陈旧而迷糊。老年人回忆中的三十年前的月亮是欢愉的，比眼前的月亮大，圆，白；然而隔着三十年的辛苦路往回看，再好的月色也不免带点凄凉。

(Shanghai thirty years ago on a moonlit night…maybe we did not get to see the moon of thirty years ago. To young people the moon of thirty years ago should be a reddish-yellow wet stain the size of a copper coin, like a teardrop on letter paper by To-yun Hsuan, worn and blurred. In old people’s memory the moon of thirty years ago was gay, larger, rounder, and whiter than the moon now. But looked back on after thirty years on a rough road, the best of moons is apt to be tinged with sadness.)

*JJ* ends with an obvious echoing of the beginning:

三十年前的月亮早已沉了下去，三十年前的人也死了，然而三十年前的故事还没完——完不了。

(The moon of thirty years ago has gone down long since and the people of thirty years ago are dead but the story of thirty years ago is not yet ended—can have no ending.)
JJ begins and ends with the framing device of the Shanghai moon, while RN begins and ends with an incident that occurs in the sesame oil shop. The shift of image shows Chang’s endeavor in recreating and readapting for her new audience. This flashback and framing device, found in both novels, illustrates how Chang’s Modernism and Western style of writing superimposes upon the Chinese narrative. Jing Wang says “the Chinese narrative model is based on the spatial form of ritual as opposed to the Western narrative model built on the temporal form of myth.”

Chang plays with both models: her flashback is temporal while the frame is spatial.

At times, Chang blurs the distinction between a realistic style of documenting details and psychological depictions:

月亮倒已经出来了，白色的，半圆形，高挂在淡青色下午的天上。今天这一天可惜已经快完了，白过了，有一种说不出的怅惘，像乳房里奶涨一样，她把孩子抱紧一点，恨不得他是猫或是小狗，或是光是个枕头，可以帮她狠狠的挤一下。(84)

It was still light but the moon was already out, a yellow half-burned blotch on pale blue silk. The main palace of the Buddha was there up a broad flight of stone steps, all the carved paneled doors silently open. She was so full of herself and this lovely day it ached gently like milk-laden breasts. She held the baby tighter wishing it was a cat or Pekinese dog or just a pillow so she could squeeze it hard. (79)

Chang adds images of “Pekinese dog” and “main palace of the Buddha” in her translation to appeal to the oriental imaginations of her readers. In the original, the switch from the moon light to the protagonist’s consciousness or inner monologue is abrupt. In the translation, Yindi’s consciousness does not move as freely; it is narrated by an external observer, as if in English she suddenly loses her own voice.

In translating or transposing into English, Chang also makes deletions, the most noticeable of which is about how Qiqiao tortured her daughter into widowhood. The episode seems too “Chinese” to be transposed into English. The mother’s cruelty goes against the

Christian belief of motherly love. Chang deletes the whole episode. The process of understanding a text supposes that both author and audience share a mutual cognitive environment. As Harriet Hill puts it, “If a text does not evoke any context at all, processing is arrested.”

Chang also leaves out some pornographic passages and classical poems. Those passages and poems are laden with double meanings and esoteric allusions that are deemed by Chang as untranslatable. Unlike Lin Yutang who translates many classical poems in his works, Chang rarely takes that challenge. A major feature of Lin’s writing style is to summarize and modernize Chinese philosophy and literature for Western readers, while Chang focuses more on her own literary creation and originality.

Another important technique Chang adopts is transliteration, which means translating verbatim of a text from one writing system to another while keeping it in its original language. Chang privileges Chinese words within the English text: the matchmaker Aunt Wu is described as having “a gold ear-spoon tucked into the little bun and a small red plush bat with a gold paper cutout of the character fu stuck between its wings. Bien-fu, bat which puns with fu, blessings” (18). Yet even with this emphasis upon the Chinese word fu, the author still explains its meaning, thus illustrating her concern for her readers’ understanding of the text. Still, the translation shows how Chang tries to maintain the Chinese tone and metaphor. Throughout the text, Chang applies transliteration in various occasions, especially those ceremonial occasions that are distinctively Chinese, like a wedding:

亲亲热热： She offered them tea with a green olive on the lid of the cup and quoted the well-wishing phrase that puns on ching guo, green olive, “Ching ching jurh jurh, billing and cooing (25).

Both petite, in their thirties, dressed in dark clothes, one of them reached for some sugared dates and set then before the newly-weds. “Bride and groom have some mizao,” she chirped, “Tien tien mi mi! So sweet on each other.” (26)

The other offered them balls of parched rice. “Bride and groom eat up this huan-his tuan. Tuan tuan yuen yuen, always together.” (26)

Her companion set down a handful of red dates and dragon eyes. “Bride, have some dzao dze and gwei yuen, Dzao sheng gwei dze, give birth soon to a son who will be a high official.” (26)

Chang uses Chinese pinyin to indicate the unique features of the idiomatic expressions related exclusively to Chinese weddings and then interprets them in English.

The foreignization technique does not always work well for Chang. Her self-translation occasionally shows some linguistic awkwardness as in Chinese-style English and English-style Chinese. As a servant bids farewell to her friend, she calls out “Come and play,” a common expression for good-bye that would only confuse English-speaking audience (11). From Yang Ge (1955) and Naked Earth (1956) to her last attempt at English fiction, RN, Chang does calibrate her English somewhat, yet she never deviates from a fair number of Chinese phrases.

From JJ to RN, Chang’s translation presents her employment of feminist translation. Compared to western feminist translation thoughts, Chang tends to be more gentle and neutral, stating that “don’t fight is fighting,” which may unintentionally give enlightenments to the development of feminism in modern times. Chang herself revels in womanhood, in its fashions, hairstyles, in parties, and in her fictional world.

In Chang’s translation, she adds more feminist descriptions and softens the image of Ch’i-chi’iao who emerges as contemptible, scheming, destructible, and venomous. Instead, Chang creates a new Ch’i-chi’iao, Yindi, who takes more initiative in her fate. In translation,
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251 Feminism was introduced to China through Japan during the period of the May Fourth Movement. Arranged marriage was condemned, and young people got the right to choose their own marriage partners. The custom of bound feet was denounced, and the “new” women were to be educated just like their brothers. Much influenced by the Western feminist thoughts, feminism in China came much later than that of the western society.
Chang does more than describing what she observes in a detached attitude. She employs corrective measures. She adds more details to make Yindi a human, a woman, instead of a ghostly figure, like Ch’i-ch’iao. Chang explores Yindi’s feminist instinct:

There was just the most primitive desire to hide in a cave, crawl into the dusty darkness hung with lint behind the faded apricot silk apron of the table, right next to the baby on the prayer cushion. In Peking opera, the courtesan went to see her impoverished lover living in a deserted temple and they made love under the god’s table (82).

The description of Yindi’s inner thought forthrightly uncovers her sexual sensations. Luise Flotow gives another example of feminist translation—the more traditional translator renders a line from the play *La Nef des sorcières* as “this evening I’m entering history without pulling up my skirt”; the feminist translator, on the other hand, translates, “this evening I’m entering history without opening my legs.” Such over-translation of the original text presents the feminist translator’s outrage and sensation over the matter of women’s status and role in a society.

Feminist translators noticed that translation was always sexist leaving men as macho with the most power, considering them as significant, faithful and authoritarian while women were seen as less important, unfaithful and with no authority whatsoever. With Sherry Simon and Luise Von Flotow as its representatives, feminist translation theory is a political movement under which women are making themselves visible. Luis von Flotow proposes major feminist translation strategies, including supplementing, prefacing and footnoting, and hijacking. On top of these strategies, translator’s notes, diaries, statements, and even theoretical writings or essays are important tools to facilitate translation from the feminist perspective. These additional explanatory materials are usually called metatexts or paratexts of the translation. In terms of feminist interventions, Flotow makes an inventory: neologism, feminization, over-translation,

---


correction measures, self-censorship, etc. Chang has employed the methods of corrective measures and self-censorship in her translation and imprinted her feminist thoughts on her translation.

**Conclusion**

Chang’s translation/rewriting of JJ into RN come as a fascinating project. The two works beget each other’s causes and effects, and as such they break open multiple entry points onto the real within the mimetic closure of representationism. Chang is culturally and linguistically well-equipped and prepared in earnest for a bilingual writing career in the cosmopolitan atmosphere of Shanghai and post WWII America. When she moved to the United States, she did not become an American writer like Singer or Nabokov. Neither was she successful in the role of a Chinese writer explaining China to the West, like Lin Yutang or more recent luminaries like Zheng Nian, or authors of popular autobiographic novels like Zhang Rong with *Wild Swans*. However, Chang does enjoy an increasingly successful literary career in Taiwan and Hong Kong. For her Sinophone readers, her knowledge of sophisticated Shanghai and aristocratic lineage are perceived as reasons for her writing’s authenticity. In addition, her ornate and classically influenced prose becomes a touchstone for many Sinophone writers. David Der-wei Wang chronicles a long list of the “Chang School” (*Chang pai*) writers from Taiwan, Hong Kong, and mainland China. Chang’s self-translation and translation become an important way

---

255 The author of *Life and Death in Shanghai*.
for her to recuperate her literary talent. Besides Chang’s self-translated works, attached below is a list of her translation of some prominent western writers during the Cold War era:

- *Seven Modern American Novelists* (1967)

The list shows that the range of Chang’s translations covers almost every genre in the series—essay, fiction, poetry, and literary criticism—which is rare. This list indicates Chang’s broad interest as a translator and her competence in dealing with works of different authors, periods, and genres. Thus, there should be less doubt about her capacity in rendering her own works.

Other than self-translations, there are various editions of her works being translated by other scholars. They all agree that translating Chang’s Chinese works into English is a formidable task, because her prose is both idiomatic and idiosyncratic, combining elements from divergent sources, most notably the traditional vernacular fiction of the Ming and Qing dynasties and the nineteenth and early twentieth century European literature that nurtured her precocious literary imagination. Chang’s prose belongs to the many deliciously refreshing and always piquant metaphors and similes that enliven the descriptive passages between saucy and spirited dialogue. It is fair to say that no character or object appears in her fiction *as is*, without a double life, without being subverted by a mischievously fabulous mind—not even a maid who has less
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258 The years designate the publications of Chang’s translations by different publishers.
260 In contrast, Gold Greenblatt, one of the most influential translators of Chinese works, has translated more than fifty works of modern Chinese literature which focus exclusively on fiction.
than half a page of fictional life.\textsuperscript{261} In rendering Chang’s full-bodied and many-flavored prose, her self-translation seems to be on the side of under-translation (in contrast to the method of over-translation adopted by Karen S. Kingsbury, one of the first American scholars to study and translate Chang’s fiction). For example, of the 21 novels/novellas by Chang, one could find 255 different words describing colors. For instance: 红色包括大红、粉红、虾子红、橙红、深粉红、焦红、枣红、银红、灰红、朱漆红、石榴红、砖红、鲜红、橘红、玫瑰红、嫩红、嗓子红、通红、樱桃红、象牙红、火红、微红、梅红.\textsuperscript{262} In Chang’s self-translation, the translation of minute differences in colors are mediated and minimalized.

Chang’s English is moderate compared to the sensuous texture of her Chinese. There is the feeling of reverence, which is also a feeling of inadequacy between a foreign language and the self. English for the non-native writer is a formal language with its rituals and rules, a “ceremonial language” that can be seen as restrictive. For Chang’s Chinese writing, there is a kind of transparency between everyday life experiences and her literary writings. Words flow easily, embracing life and the self, which Chang highly valued when she created her literary world. Unlike the natural yielding of a first language to the writer’s manipulation, a second language blocks easy access to its resources, which perhaps enables Chang to overcome the erudite word-play and clever allusions that tempt her in Chinese, so that she could work with language from a position of inferiority and underdevelopment. Chang’s English styles is characterized by its stern lack of ornamentation and elaboration.


\textsuperscript{262} Guanghong Ruan, A Study of Self-Translation Style of Eileen Chang (张爱玲自已风格研究) (Beijing: Zhongguo Shuji Chubanshe, 2016) 95.
Chang’s self-translation and her inspiration, even after her move to the United States, does not move on and away from the Shanghai of her youth. Chang confines herself eventually to the role of the nostalgic writer-historian of former Shanghai. She retreats to a world of yesterday.\textsuperscript{263} A devaluation of one’s social status and image might have a strong impact on the reevaluation of the “self” and consequently on Chang’s eagerness to go back to her previous work, to rewriting, retranslating and generally reevaluating it according to each new situation and her actual reading audience. Chang remains faithful to herself till the end, using her freedom and imagination to create and recreate her own intimate universe.\textsuperscript{264}

Chang engages with a number of different audiences and literary markets, which are the key factors of Skopos. As the changes from \textit{JJ} to \textit{RN} demonstrate, Chang takes pains in recontextualizing the original, endeavoring to meet the cultural expectations of her target readers. She frequently breaks away from the narrative to address the stereotypes and foibles of the communities she describes. This role worked well in cosmopolitan Shanghai, but her authority as a cultural broker faltered when she arrived in the United States. While American readers did not question her authority on China, she did not provide them with the type of narratives they were seeking. In part, this may have to do with Chang’s uncompromisingly desolate tone. Lao She’s initial success in the American market came in part from his translator, Evan King, who decided, without being authorized, to create a happy ending to what was intended to be a tragedy.

Although Chang migrated from Communist mainland China only to find herself awkwardly trapped by McCarthyism on the other side of the Iron Curtain, Chang’s translingual

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
practices not only question the restraints of modern Chinese literary and political discourse but also bespeak the equally manipulative ideological and cultural control of the Cold War United States. Knowing all too well the political and cultural rationale that prevent her work from being accepted by major American publishers, she nevertheless maintains her literary and aesthetic stance. Her deep suspicion of ideological hegemony of any kind is brought to the foreground by her prolific repetitions, or to be more precise, her translingual and trans-generic fission of works. In this way, self-translation/rewriting, or a kind of literary schizogenesis, became her strategy of deterritorialization, a way of avoiding any political dominion over literary creation by either side of the Cold War dichotomy—Communist or anti-Communist. In today’s heterotopic world where cultures converge, intersect, and interact in a multitude of ways and places, Chang’s self-translation and rewriting presents less as a study of the schizophrenically divided world but more as a study of metamorphosis, transition, and hybridity across borders. Chang’s Anglophone work was marked by a unique use of the Chinese-styled English, a forerunner of that of the critically celebrated Anglophone Chinese writer Ha Jin.

---

Chapter Three
Belonging and Betrayal: Ha Jin’s Self-Translation in A Good Fall/《落地》

The last 20 years have seen a proliferation of English publications by Chinese authors along with increased emigration from China to English speaking countries after the Open and Reform in the 1980s, which distinguishes itself from Lin Yutang and Eileen Chang’s time when English writings by Chinese-born writers were limited. Ha Jin was a member of this later generation and unlike Lin Yutang and Eileen Chang who had received considerable English training in missionary schools and were accomplished authors in China before moving to the United States, Jin studied English as a second language and did not publish anything before he came to America in 1984. Despite humble origins, Ha Jin’s acclaim within the United States is comparable to few contemporary Chinese authors. His first short-story collection about life and the Chinese People’s Liberation Army, Ocean of Words (1996), won the Hemingway/PEN Award for First Fiction in 1996; Under the Red Flag (1997), his subsequent short-story collection depicting village life in China during the Cultural Revolution, won the 1997 Flannery O’Connor Award for Short Fiction. His stories have also garnered three Pushcart Prizes, and four were selected for inclusion in Best American Short Stories volumes. Along with three books of poetry, Ha Jin has published eight novels, and won the National Book Award for Waiting in 1999, which also won the PEN/Faulkner Award in 2000. Ha Jin heralds a new era of global literature, one that promises cultural rebirth through transnational crossings and bilingual imaginings.

Most of these authors have never published in Chinese, and their works in English are mainly autobiographies and memoirs, such as Jung Chang’s Wild Swans: Three Daughters of China (1992), Nien Cheng’s Life and Death in Shanghai (1986), Anchee Min’s Red Azalea (1994), Ting-Xing Ye’s A Leaf in the Bitter Wind: A Memoir (1999), and Xiao Di Zhu’s Thirty Years in a Red House: A Memoir of Childhood and Youth in Communist China (1998).
Ha Jin’s popularity has come after a prolonged surge in the popularity of Chinese-American literature, which paved the way for the reception of his work by generating a substantial interest in subject matter related to China. While Chinese-American authors like Maxine Hong Kingston, Frank Chin, Gish Jen, and Amy Tan have typically created immigrant stories interwoven with Chinese folklore and fairytales evocative of their cultural roots even as they appear to be “claiming America”, Ha Jin’s way of “claiming China” advances a model of Asian-Americanness that reads the hyphen backward.\footnote{Belinda Kong, “Theorizing The Hyphen’s Afterlife in Post-Tiananmen Asian-America,” \textit{Modern Fiction Studies} 56.1 (2010): 137-138.} If an increasing number of prominent Asian-American authors since the 1990s, like Jhumpa Lahiri and Chang-Rae Lee, have turned to more bilateral flows of the hyphen and proposed more theoretically familiar models of cultural hybridity or transnational subjectivity, Ha Jin operates at the opposite pole of this trend by maintaining the outright priority of Chineseness in the majority of his work.

The Chineseness in Ha Jin’s work exhibits characteristics similar to “contact literature,” a blend of two or more linguistic textures and literary traditions where institutionalized varieties of English are used, in terms of text design, organization, and convention of cultural norms.\footnote{Braj Kachru, “Transcultural Creativity in World Englishes and Literary Canons,” \textit{Principle and Practice in Applied Linguistics}, eds. Guy Cook and Barbara Seidlhofer (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1995) 271-287.} However, Jin’s bilingual’s creativity differs from contact literature because it is the expression of the author’s immersion into a performance variety of the English language rather than an institutionalized variety like pidgin English. Jin’s literary creativity includes lexical innovation and the use of cultural metaphors. The ingenuity comes from blending the linguistic forms and connotations from the two different languages and creating a language of his own. Ha Jin’s use of a variety of Chinese Englishes have transformed its form and function so that English can appropriately reflect Chinese socio-cultural, political, and ideological realities. His works exhibit
typical Chineseness in his use of nativized discourse patterns, rhetorical strategies, and speech acts. The analysis of cultural metaphors (e.g. “A sparrow shouldn’t match itself against a raven”269) calls for cultural sensitivity to fully understand his bilinguals’ creativity.

Growing out of the particular cultural and historical milieu of bilingualism, cultural hybridity and transnationalism, Ha Jin’s self-translated work *A Good Fall/《落地》* 270 published in 2000, marked a unique point in his literary career, the move from an Anglophone emphasis to a Sinophone one. Despite numerous studies about Jin’s English works, limited attention has been paid to his self-translation. This chapter will compare Jin’s self-translation with those of Lin Yutang and Eileen Chang, highlighting how Skopos dominate Jin’s employment of translation techniques, and how Jin’s writing, regarded as “translation literature,” has a unique impact upon his practice of self-translation.

Ha Jin’s Skopos approach to self-translation creates an intimacy with his mother tongue that has gained significant popularity in China. His choice to translate *A Good Fall* was an act of good will in that most of his other works harshly criticize the government of Maoist China. *A Good Fall*, as an exception is concerned with Chinese Americans, and a critique of the American dream. It did not invite the same censorship that resulted in the banning of his earlier works except *Waiting* in China.271 Although he abandoned plans to return to China after the Tiananmen Square Incident, choosing to write only in English for more than a decade, he saw his return in another way, believing that “only through literature is a genuine return possible for the exiled writer.”272 Through self-translation, Ha Jin made an open allegiance to his mother tongue. He
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271 Now, more works are available in Mainland China, such as *Nanjing Requiem, The Good Fall, Pond, and The Bridegroom*.
refutes the charges and speculations that he has “abandoned Chinese” and turns the idea of a “foreign linguistic haunt into a different homestay.”

Jin claims that he translated *A Good Fall* into 《落地》(*Luo Di*) word-by-word without any significant change, a statement that invites investigation.

The possibility of such verbatim translation reflects his idiosyncratic use of English: “his English sounding like a direct translation of Chinese” and, therefore, seemingly readily translatable back into Chinese. Jin carves out a unique place in the field of émigré Chinese writing by creating a special form of what Haoming Gong termed “translation literature.”

Laying bare the cultural and linguistic confinements of a particular language, Jin’s “translation literature” foregrounds the importance of migration and the deterritorialization of languages, enabling us to reflect on literary production in an age so marked by border-crossings of all kinds.

**Personal Background**

Ha Jin (pseudonym of Xuefei Jin, 1956-) was born in Liaoning Province, China, and grew up during the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976) when schools were closed and books were burned in an attempt to prevent the development of a bureaucratized Soviet style of Communism. In late 1969, Ha Jin enlisted in the army as a telegrapher and served for five and a half years. From 1974 to 1977, while working for the Harbin Railroad Company, he began a process of intense self-education, studying Chinese classical literature and English. His facility facilitated his entry into Heilongjiang University as an English major. He continued his studies in American literature during a period of relative cultural openness to the West, earning his MA at Shandong University in 1984. Jin arrived in the United States a year later to pursue a PhD in

---

275 Ibid.
English at Brandeis University in Boston, with the expectation that he would return to China as a
teacher or translator. Following the 1989 Tiananmen Square events, he began to think of himself
as a permanent exile, an identity that profoundly changed the direction of his career.276 He
enrolled in creative-writing courses at Boston University and decided to write and speak
exclusively in English. “The process was excruciating,” he noted in the Post-Dispatch profile,
“like changing my blood. I was full of anxiety as if I were running a fever all the time.”277 When
The Paris Review accepted his first poem, he chose the pseudonym Ha because Xuefei was so
difficult for English-speaking readers to pronounce. His pen name “Ha” came from his favorite
multilingual city “Harbin,” which related to “Xuefei (literally means ‘snow flying’).” Harbin is
frequently referred to as the city of ice and snow.

Studies on Ha Jin’s Works

Critics of Ha Jin have largely focused on his impact upon the conceptual boundaries of
various canonical literatures. Ihab Hassan includes Jin in a catalog of nonwhite Anglophone
authors who, in the age of globalization, write new versions of “Jinglish” and ring the “death
knell” for the very concept of “national literature.”278 Lo Kwai Cheung argues for his
instrumentality in redefining modern Chinese literature from a nation-bound and language-based
model to one that is “transnational, translingual, and global.”279 Zhou Xiaojing claims that Jin is
a “transformative force” for both American and Asian American literature.280

276 Jin’s decision to stay abroad parallels that of many other Chinese writers at the time, including Gao Xingjian,
Hong Ying, and Yang Lian; together, these voluntary expatriates join the ranks of writers in enforced political exile,
such as Bei Dao, Duo Duo, and Liu Binyan.
277 Robert D. Sturr, “Ha Jin,” Twenty-First-Century American Novelists eds. Lisa Abney and Suzanne Disheroon
279.
280 Xiaojing Zhou, “Writing Otherwise Than as a ‘Native Informant,’” Transnational Asian American Literature: Sites
regards Jin as a key figure whose work “underscores the need to continue expanding the notion of ‘Asian American’ beyond the conceptual boundaries of national citizenship and the referential domain of the United States.”\textsuperscript{281} To anchor Jin’s work more solidly in its historical and material contexts, four recent readings have opened up a more fruitful path.

Steven Yao’s appraisal of Jin’s poetry focuses on how he bridges the English of his composition and the Chinese identities he lyricizes. Yao regards Jin’s trademark style of “plain English” and his “unwavering commitment to linguistic transparency” as being “accommodationist,” which appeases the public’s perennial appetite for multicultural narratives of otherness.\textsuperscript{282} In Yao’s view, Jin’s writing conveniently feeds a post-Cold War mentality, one that lingers into the 1990s, the decade of his rise to literary fame, “immediately before radical Islam gained temporary ascendancy as the most pressing threat to global ‘American interests’ following the events of September 11, 2011.”\textsuperscript{283} At heart, Yao’s critique is rooted in an Asian Americanist cultural politics, with its imperative to combat racist stereotypes of Asia as the yellow peril and the Asian as a despotic or victimized other.\textsuperscript{284} Within this framework, the import of diasporic experiences is largely subordinated to that of ethnic representation.

A second analysis by Sheng-Mei Ma focuses on Jin’s fictional world. Ma argues that if Anchee Min and Wang Ping eroticize Maoist China, Dai Sijie romanticizes it, then “Ha Jin rapes it, or rapes it back after having been raped himself.”\textsuperscript{285} Sexual and physical assault becomes Ha Jin’s central trope for the searing sense of violation inflicted upon individuals in most of his works set in China, according to Ma. Consistent with fellow diasporics, Ma sees Ha Jin as de-

\textsuperscript{282} Ibid. 140.
\textsuperscript{283} Ibid. 111.
\textsuperscript{284} Belinda Kong, \textit{Tiananmen Fictions Outside the Square} (Philadelphia: Temple UP, 2012)132-133.
alienating Chinese materials through translated names and follow-up glosses for difficult
terms. For example, “a pair of Mandarin ducks” is explained, in the same breath, as “an
affectionate couple” (Waiting, 115).

A third critic, Haoming Gong considers Ha within the context of “translation literature.”
Gong argues that émigré Chinese writing has a long history, and Ha Jin is working in a literary
field that is becoming increasingly crowded in the United States. Current authors include Wang
Ping, Liyun Li, Anchee Min and many others. Gong points out that Jin’s uniqueness lies in his
idiosyncratic use of English, which is not simply a literary trick that a minority writer plays in
order to survive in an alien linguistic environment; rather, it has complex implications that would
eventually destabilize such current concepts as exile, diaspora, national identity, and language-
based literature. Gong argues that Ha Jin carves out a unique place in the field of émigré Chinese
writing with his special form of translation literature. This literalness in his play with languages,
not only has a defamiliarizing and a humorous effect on his readers, but also reveals the
“absurdity” of being imprisoned within a particular language.

The other significant recent analysis of Jin unfolds in Jing Tsu’s study on Sinophone
“literary governance.” As a counterpoint to Yao and Ma, Tsu locates Jin squarely within a
lineage of Chinese diasporic bilingual writers, one that extends back to Lin Yutang and Eileen
Chang. Instead of exploring Jin’s reception in America, Tsu focuses on Jin’s reception in the
Sinophone world. For her, Jin’s numerous clashes with Sinophone cultural authorities are neither
unique nor unprecedented but typify the pressures exerted by native critics and readers on
overseas Chinese writers since the beginning of the twentieth century. Tsu maintains that, in
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response to the recurring charges of linguistic betrayal (writing exclusively in English), Jin’s decision to translate A Good Fall back into Chinese himself signifies a linguistic return to home. 288 His translation of the collection’s title, Luodi, is not a literal back-translation of the English title; instead, it comes out of a Chinese idiom luodi shenggen—“to fall to the ground and take new root,” which is a proverbial metaphor for the longtime emigrant. He is indicating that “a good fall” is a fall that takes root.

Jin’s works also differentiates him from those modern and contemporary Chinese writers who are trapped in either nativism or elitism. Gao Xingjian, the 2001 Nobel laureate in literature, says that Jin’s writings manage to transcend “ideology, national boundaries, and racial consciousness.”289 Jin’s bilingual capacity demonstrates a skillful employment of linguistic tactics for mediating the disjunction between the English writing and the Chinese milieus of his stories. On this score, however, critics diverge widely. Some view Jin as intentionally writing in a “transparency plain English’ that panders to an American “multiculturalist ideal of providing privileged and total access to Chinese difference”290 Others see his English as offering a “viable model for cultural translation” or “new global literary language capable of reflecting multicultural sensibilities”;291 and still others find his fiction a fertile source of “language innovations” full of “hybrid” and “bilingual creativity.”292 When Zhu Tianwen insinuates that Jin capitalizes on his foreign background by creating a quirky pidgin English and relying on

290 Yao 140.
“straight translation from Chinese to write his English-language novels,” he fails to recognize the emerging trend of translation literature or charm of bilingual works. Jin’s self-translation challenges Zhu’s critique of his language choice. Ha Jin notes that “the ultimate betrayal is to choose to write in another language.” Through self-translation, Ha Jin rectifies that “betrayal.”

**Self-Translation of A Good Fall/落地(Luo Di)**

In addition to *A Good Fall*, Ha Jin and his wife co-translated his debut collection of short stories, *Ocean of Words*. These efforts suggest that he values his Chinese readership as much as his Western readership. Reaching his Chinese audience would be an important means of reclaiming Ha Jin’s attachment to his homeland, especially since he began writing first in English. Most of his works have been translated and published in Taiwan, because the censorship of his works prohibit publication in Mainland China. For the Chinese translation of *Waiting*, Ha Jin worked closely with his translator, Jin Liang, and reviewed the work before publication. He was concerned that Liang use various strategies to portray the Chinese characters in the novel accurately, including the employment of a dialect from Northeastern China and cultural-specific metaphors and idioms.

*Luo Di*, Ha Jin’s self-translation of *A Good Fall* reflected in his belief in the universality and translatability of literature and his search for a temporary resting place in his mother tongue to “alleviate the nostalgia” he felt for his home country. The opening paragraph of his preface explains the origins of the project:
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294 Although all of his novels have been translated into Chinese and published by Taiwanese publishers, only *Waiting* and *Nanjing Requiem* have been published in Mainland China thus far. Censorship comes into question whenever he attempts to have his books published. He had contracts to publish four volumes of his fiction and a collection of poetry in 2005.
In early February, 2005, I was invited by the World Journal [the largest Chinese newspaper in North America] to attend a conference at the city center of Flushing. On that first visit I saw the bustling streets and a large number of Chinese immigrants…They took their roots here and began their new life…Altogether, I visited there about twenty times. Now Flushing has already been the new Chinatown of New York, so *A Good Fall* can be seen as stories of the new Chinatown. (Jin, *Luo Di 5*)

Drastically different from Jin’s previous works, this collection of twelve stories shows Chinese immigrants on a continuum with professors and realtors at one end and laborers and sex workers at the other. To them, the United States is both a land of opportunity, where they can pursue their dreams, and one filled with hostility, especially to those who do not have a good command of English. They live in the in-between space of having left China, but not yet having entered mainstream American society. This space is the underbelly of transnationalism. Many of the characters have names that indicate an American identity coupled with a Chinese heritage, such as Dan Feng, Eileen Min or Elbert Chang. Other Chinese American characters, especially wives or girlfriends, have only English first names such as Connie, Gina, Sherry or Cindy, suggesting the extent of their Americanization. While Flushing may provide the feeling of being at home in China, the monetary and other life-style possibilities (real and imaginary) are limited and ultimately not achievable in Chinatown.

The short stories are told in what has become Jin’s signature style—an unadorned realistic prose punctuated with understatement. Although *A Good Fall* was written more than half a century after Lin and Chang’s bilingual writings, in many ways it reads as if it were written earlier. The experiments in form that distinguish Lin’s and Chang’s texts are missing in Ha Jin. There are no multiple narrators, no attempt to render an infant’s consciousness, the plot generally proceeds chronologically, and the style is simple and direct. Ha Jin refuses to commit himself completely either to the culture into which he was born or to the one he has adopted. He
intentionally maintains an in-between perspective in stories that may refuse any specific cultural ambiance.

What kind of life has self-translation given to the original? Octavio Paz answers this question in his “Translation: Literature and Letters” that the idea of the original is simply a myth:

Each text is unique, yet at the same time it is the translation of another text. No text can be completely original because language itself, in its very essence, is already a translation--first from the nonverbal world, and then, because each sign and each phrase is a translation of another sign, another phrase. 297

Kenneth Rexroth supports the translator’s right of appropriating the original text and advocates that this transmutation should not be considered as violation but as “viable eccentricity” (173), “imaginative identification” (181), and a companion text to the original. 298 Gerald Bruns also asserts that “to be original is to transcend the literalness of one’s antecedent texts by finding in them openings for further invention.” 299 Jin’s intent appears in the “序 (Foreword)”: 300 to challenge the idea that American readers do not want to read about immigrants and they only want to know about “the Big China.” 301 He further explains his choice to self-translate: English work would resonate among Chinese readers who have shared values and worldviews.

Jin’s “word-for-word translation” or “Yingyi (stiff translation)” 302 does not result in incomprehensibility; on the contrary, it reveals and recreates the beauty of its Chineseness. Jin tells us that writing in English was his personal tragedy because of the enormous efforts required
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300 Quotes from the Foreword used below are all my translation.
302 Ibid.
for the original work written in English. Yet, he admits that writing in English made him more independent and he considered it invaluable for building a strong readership.

**Ha Jin’s Translation and Language**

Lin and Chang learned and wrote in a traditional Chinese system. Jin, however, learned a simplified Chinese writing system that was introduced in the 1950s as part of the PRC’s campaign to increase literacy. Simplified characters were promoted as the common written language. Today, simplified characters which replace many traditional characters remain the standard writing system in China, even though traditional Chinese is still used in places like Taiwan and Hong Kong. Important distinctions exist between the two systems, as Jin explains, “In Chinese, especially if you are writing literary fiction, you don’t write in plain speech: a lot of words and phrases would have a long history of allusions, so it’s very different…it’s not just language, you have to see the work in the context of the literature written in the tradition.”³⁰³ For Jin, the written Chinese language is literary and highbrow and detached from the spoken word. In contrast, English has much more flexibility and possibilities in writing—different levels of diction are much closer to the spoken word.³⁰⁴ These differences between the written and spoken languages did not necessarily make Jin’s writing in English any easier. It did require a new way of thinking, the result of which was his hybrid language. In “Exiled to English,” Jin recalls his experience and final decision to make English his language of choice:

> By then I’d have my first volume of poems accepted for publication, but I took this English book only as an excursion because I believed I would write in Chinese eventually. I’d kept in touch with a few friends, poets, in China and we thought that the Chinese language, polluted by revolutionary movements and political jargon, had reached the stage where changes must be made, and that we could work to improve the poetic
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³⁰⁴ Ibid.
language. As a possibility, we might attempt to create a new kind of language for poetry.\textsuperscript{305}

This sense of mission recalls Lin Yutang’s aspirations for reforming the Chinese language that led to the New Cultural Movement. Despite the shared sense of mission, Jin makes it clear his desire to take a path different from Lin Yutang:

In English there were two models I could follow. One was exemplified by Yutang Lin, who served as a “cultural ambassador” and who spoke to the West about China and to the Chinese about the West…For some time such a grand role was very attractive to me, but I soon began to be aware of my inadequacy and to feel uneasy about Lin’s dependency on China for his literary existence. The other model was embodied by Conrad and Nabokov, who didn’t represent their native countries and instead found their places in English prose, in which some nonnative speakers have become essential writers. This is a unique phenomenon, one of the glories English has…Every nonnative writer has his or her own unique problems and situation and has to figure out a personal way of survival. As beginners, it might be insane for us to seek a place in multiple languages, because the task of surviving in one language is already Herculean. Sometimes we have to make great sacrifice in order to proceed, including giving up a country or a language.\textsuperscript{306}

Rather than serving as a cultural ambassador to represent China as a whole, Ha Jin sought for his private history, a personal survival. His decision brought new opportunities:

Because I’m not a native speaker, there’s a lot of flexible room for me to abuse the language, so I have to be very careful and accurate. There are both advantages and disadvantages to coming to writing in English so late. It’s hard to write with the full weight of the language and with the natural spontaneity. The advantage is that I may write with a different kind of sensibility and a slightly different kind of syntax, idiom, and style.\textsuperscript{307}

Jin’s literary creation in English, in the meantime, offers him opportunities for self-translation, an effective way to introduce his fictional world to his home country. While a translator usually conceals his/her role of mediator, playing the part of an absent presence, Ha Jin is more self-


\textsuperscript{306} Ibid. 120-122.

reflective and auto-referential. Now with the following case studies, we will examine in great detail how Ha Jin tackled these issues and what translation techniques he employs for the specific Skopos he endeavors to achieve.

**Case Study I: “An English Professor”/ “英语教授”**

“An English Professor” tells the story of Rusheng Tang, a Chinese assistant professor with a Harvard PhD who writes an incorrect word in the materials submitted for his tenure evaluation. Obsessed with what seems to him an unforgivable mistake, he goes to apply for other jobs as a newspaper editor and as a salesman for a publishing company. Eventually, his fear of rejection proves unfounded, and he is so overjoyed with his promotion and tenure that he seems to have “lost his mind. (154)” The error appears in his closing line of the application letter— He wrote “Respectly yours,” instead of “Respectfully yours,” which troubles him deeply:

People wouldn’t treat it as a mere typo or slip. It was a glaring solecism that indicated his incompetence in English. If he were in science or sociology or even comparative literature, the consequences of the mistake would have been less dire. But for an English professor, this was unforgivable, regardless of his sophisticated use of various methodologies to analyze a literary text. (140)

They wouldn’t treat it as a mere typo or slip. It was a glaring solecism that indicated his incompetence in English. If he were in science or sociology or even comparative literature, the consequences of the mistake would have been less dire. But for an English professor, this was unforgivable, regardless of his sophisticated use of various methodologies to analyze a literary text. (140)

Here, Jin emphasizes the status of being an English professor, which implies that despite one’s accomplishments, a Chinese immigrant can hardly escape the perception of one’s “otherness.” At any moment a simple mistake— one that would not be made by a native speaker – or a

---


309 This arguable point is based on a particular perception of language proficiency by Rusheng Tang. It is his thinking, not the reality. For immigrants, language learning is an important part of identity formation. Rusheng Tang is certainly not alone in his reaction to misspelling or misuses.
minor infraction of language or decorum could lead to disaster. Rusheng Tang’s name underscores his omnipresent Chinese identity and perpetuates the stereotype of a Chinese American locked into an exotic and foreign past. His last name, Tang, recalls the classic Chinese Tang dynasty (618-906 A.D.), one of China’s most glorious periods, and his first name; Rusheng (陆生), at least as a homophone (儒生), indicates a student of Confucianism in that “儒” literally means “Confucian liturgy.” Rusheng when translated as “陆生” can be interpreted as “the child of the land” in that “陆” means “land.” The “land” here refers to China for its alias, “Mainland.”

In spite of his efforts to excel in American society, Rusheng remains marked as “foreign” by his language mistakes, his phenotype, and his foreign name. Jin’s translation employs techniques of shifting, addition, omission, and mistranslation to fulfil his Skopos—bringing his English work back to his home country.

Shifting semantics offers another example of Jin’s Skopos practices, as seen in the following description of the professor:

He was neither an exceptional teacher nor had he done a lot of service. He’d sat on two departmental committees and each spring helped run the students’ writing context (137).

他书教的并不特别好, 也没有做过许多服务工作; 他参加了系里的两个委员会, 每年春季组织学生的作文比赛(147)。

The translation is faithful with the exception of one semantic shift: two separate English sentences are made into one Chinese sentence via the use of a semi-colon. The Chinese language uses punctuation marks different from English, although the Chinese written language adopted modern standard punctuation in the 20th century to align itself with Western practice. Traditional poetry and calligraphy maintains the punctuation-free style. The two main punctuation devices in particular are different from their English counterparts. The Chinese period has a conceptual rather than grammatical function, as it often marks a distinct section of narration or
argumentation. The Chinese comma, on the other hand, can be used to mark a phrase, a sentence, or a structure longer than a sentence. For example, a simple Chinese sentence can have “run-on VPs”; that is, several VPs predicating an NP without proper coordination between them. Linguistic faithfulness is, therefore, not the only factor to consider when rendering the text; semantic adaptation or shift is equally essential.

Ha Jin also shifts tenses, another characteristic of his translation style. While waiting anxiously for the news of his tenure application, the professor teaches his class with some inattentiveness:

On this day, a Thursday, the class was discussing *America Is in the Heart*, by Carlos Bulosan (138).

今天是星期四, 班上讨论卡洛斯布鲁森的《美国在我心中》。

Ha Jin shifts the adverbial phrase “on this day, a Thursday” into a sentence “今天是星期四 (Today is Thursday).” In Chinese, tenses are not marked morphologically and an unmarked predicate can refer either to situation time or speech time—which of course do not need to be identical—without any reference time being involved. But Chinese complex temporal relations can be depicted in a very precise way through the employment of temporal adverbials. In the translation, the situation tense “today is Thursday” precedes a sentence that uses the present tense, making the readers feel that they are part of the on-going activity. The English sentence indicated that it was an activity that happened in the past.

Jin also shifts the tone of the professor’s explanation for the publication history of Bulosan’s story.
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310 For more information, see Chris Shei’s *Understanding the Chinese Language: A Comprehensive Linguistic Introduction* (London: Routledge, 2014) 168.
311 For more information, refer to Barbara Meisterernst’s *Tense and Aspect in Han Period Chinese: A Linguistic Analysis of the “Shiji”* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter GmbH, 2015) 80.
Bulosan originally wrote his story as a novel, but the press persuaded him to publish it as a memoir (138).
布鲁森是把他的故事当成小说来写的，但出版社逼他作为自传出版。(148).

“Persuaded” is translated as “逼(forced/threatened).” The change indicates the uneasy relationship between authors and publishers due to the censorship practices that complicate the publication process. Such change of tone might also reflect Ha Jin’s attitude towards censorship in China, where most of his books were banned, other than Waiting, Nanjing Requiem, The Good Fall, Pond, and The Bridegroom. Shifts also happen in other occasions, such as shift of meaning and shift of figures of speech.

The worries the professor has about his tenure application drive him to look for another job:

The bitch would definitely bad-mouth me to that man to make it hard for me to land another job (166).
这娘们儿肯定会对那家伙说我的坏话，让我很难再找到工作(177)。

In the translation, “Bitch” is euphemized as “娘们(woman).” Such shift of meaning is necessary in that profanity has to be used with great care if the literature is to be taken seriously in China. When translated literally into Chinese, the word “bitch” would be considered inappropriate for a professor educated at Harvard University.

Likewise, the shift in meaning is visible in the description of Tang’s job routine:
After the class, nobody showed up during his office hours, so he left work at four p.m. (139).
课后是会谈辅导时间，但没有人来他的办公室，所以他四点钟就下班了(148)。

“Office hours” are translated into “会谈辅导时间(meeting and tutoring time),” because Chinese universities do not routinely observe the office hours system. Thus, Jin provides further explanation to increase his readers’ understanding.
Figures of speech present a challenge that Jin must carefully mediate. Jin narrates the professor’s response to his wife’s suggestion:

She suggested that he look for a job at another college, but he wouldn’t do that, saying he would become a kind of pariah that few schools would be interested in hiring (146).

妻子建议他在别的学院另找一份工作，但他不愿那么做，说自己从此低人一等（155）。

Ha Jin translates “pariah” (a metonymy) into a simile by way of a stock phrase “低人一等 (socially or cultural inferior).” Rather than sticking to his word-for-word, literal translation with Pinyin phonetic of “pariah,” he adopts sense-for-sense translation and shifts the use of metonymy into simile.

Addition, omission, mistranslation, and restoration are other techniques that Jin adopts. The following example shows his use of addition:

But coming to the end of the long report, he noticed the phrase “Respectly yours.” (140)然而读到长篇报道的结尾，他注意到“Respectly yours”这个莫名其妙的短语（148）.

Ha Jin adds a stock phrase “莫名其妙 (unable to make head or tail of something).” Concerned that some Chinese readers might not understand the misspelling in the phrase, he chose to further describe “Respectly yours.” Other occasions call for omission. In a scene that highlights the professor’s sleeplessness, Jin omits some details in his translation.

When he finally went into the bedroom, his wife, Sherry, was already asleep, with a comforter over her belly and her right leg on his side of the bed. Carefully he lifted her foot, with its henna-painted toenails, straightened her leg, and moved it back to her side (141).

后来他进入卧室时，妻子已经睡了，茸被盖在肚子上，一条腿伸到他这边的床上。他小心地抬起她涂了红指甲油的脚，放平了她的腿，把它移到他那边（151）。

Jin omits the wife’s name altogether since vagueness is acceptable for Chinese readers. In the same fashion, he (mis)translates “henna-painted” into “红指甲油(red-painted).” Chinese readers would not readily recognize the word “Henna,” since it does not denote the color red, but rather
a design, a painting technique that was originally used in India and later adopted in Western countries. Jin deliberately substitutes it with a word that is more familiar to Chinese readers. In the quote,

“Take a short nap in your office before you go to class, dear,” she told him (142).
“上课前在办公室先打个盹儿。”她告诉他说(151)。

Neither does Jin translate the intimate word “dear” because Chinese couples do not typically address each other this way. To mediate the cultural difference, Jin resorts to mistranslation. For example,

“Let me try that blouse on, the flowered one. So beautiful. (141)”
“让我试试那件连衣裙，带花的那件。太漂亮了。(151)”

The translation of “blouse” as “连衣裙 dress” is consistent with fashion terms and styles for women’s garments in the target language. Since there is no such category as “blouse,” the term is usually translated into “shirts” in Chinese. To emphasize the aspect of feminine beauty, Jin mistranslates the term as 连衣裙(dress). In another instance,

“Recently he’d been thinking of the Buddhist temple near Niagara Falls…drinking chrysanthemum tea and cracking spiced pumpkin seeds. (151)”
“近来他老想起尼加拉大瀑布…喝着菊花茶，嗑着五香瓜子。(161)”

“Pumpkin seeds” is translated as “瓜子(seeds)” which, if not specified, would be naturally understood as “sunflower seeds.”

For some occasions, Jin must choose between two different translation traditions: that in Mainland China and that in Taiwan. For example, Niagara Falls is translated as “尼加拉大瀑布,” as is the widely accepted translation in the Taiwan area, but in Mainland China it is translated as “尼亚加拉大瀑布.” Such disparities in translation are fairly consistent. For instance, the car
brand “Volvo” is phonetically translated into “沃尔沃” in mainland China but rendered as “富豪” (literally means “magnate”) in Taiwan.

Jin’s translations often result in his restoration of Chinese sayings. In “The English Professor,” Jin discreetly includes a number of popular Chinese expressions, whose English translations are literal with limited exegesis. Though they are rooted in Chinese culture, they seem to be understood and accepted by English-speaking readers. When Jin translates them back into Chinese, their idiomaticness resurges:

“People always feel that other hills are higher than the one they’re sitting on. (146)”
“人总是这山望着那山高。 (156)”

Some sayings, however, may sound cliché to Chinese readers. Thus, Jin needs to give the old Chinese sayings a new life to appeal to his audience.

In other instances, anecdotes or legends, for example, literal translation would be difficult because of the lack of familiarity. For example, “一言既出, 驷马难追” can only be translated by the method of free translation— “A word spoken is past recalling,” which is much better than the literal translation “one word let slip and four horses will fail to catch it.” Finding the Chinese counterparts would be challenging for readers. For example,

Rusheng was still singing, though he spewed out snatches of Beijing opera now: “Today I’m drinking a bowl poured by my mother/Ah, the wine makes me bold and strong… (154)”
陆生还在唱着，不过他此时唱的是些京剧片段：“临行喝妈妈一碗酒，浑身是胆雄赳赳 (164).”

If Jin were not self-translating this passage, other translators might have difficulty finding the source. It is taken from The Legend of the Red Lantern, one of the “Eight Model Plays,” the only operas and ballets permitted during the Cultural Revolution in China. In contrast to Jin who grew up listening to those eight model plays with many lines carved in his memories, later generations
ceased to pay attention to these operas that have long fallen out of favor. Since American readers could not decode veiled references to this body of writing about Chinese history and culture, Jin’s English lines make vague references to the opera. It takes Jin’s own expertise to retrieve and translate with accuracy from the original source.

**Case Study II: A Pension Plan/ “养老计划”**

“A Pension Plan” is another short story that exemplifies Ha Jin’s application of translation techniques in fulfilling his various Skopos. The story is about Mr. Sheng, who suffers from “a kind of senile dementia” and almost falls in love with his caregiver, who narrates the story with considerable delicacy. What emerges is a compelling portrait of Mr. Sheng’s need for love, coupled with the narrator’s struggle to achieve dignity as she seeks gainful employment. To better present the story to his Chinese readers, Jin employs the techniques of addition and compensation.

At the beginning of the story, the narrator describes Mr. Sheng’s life routine as a patient.

A young nurse came every other day to check his vital signs and give him an injection (156). 

一个年轻的护士每隔一天来给他量体温和血压，还给他打针(166)。

“Check vital signs” is translated as “measure temperature and check blood pressure.” In Chinese, “vital signs,” a medical term, is seldom used in everyday language. Jin adds more details to the translation by listing two (temperature and blood pressure) of the four main vital signs (pulse rate and respiration rate are the other two).

As the narrator recounts her duties as a caregiver, she says:

I made fine meals for him—chicken porridge, fish dumplings, shrimp and taro pottage, noodles mixed with shredded shiitake mushrooms (156). 

我给他烧好菜好饭——鸡肉粥、鱼丸子、虾仁芋头羹、香菇炒面条。
Jin compensates his translation of the names of the dishes with more accuracy. The description of the meal—“Noodles mixed with shredded shiitake mushrooms”—does not specify what kind of noodles they are but the Chinese translation identifies them as fried noodles. As the caregiver continues to narrate her responsibilities, she remarks:

Even so, he’d make me push him from one herbal store to another, and sometimes he went there just to see how those doctors, unlicensed here because of their poor English, treated patients—feeling their pulses, performing cupping, giving therapeutic massages, setting bones (160-161).

尽管这样，他还是让我推他去各种中药店，有时候他去那些地方主要是看医生们怎样治病：号脉，拔火罐，按摩，推拿。

“Performing cupping,” an ancient form of alternative medicine, is employed in different parts of the world. In China, not only “fire” cupping is performed but also wet or dry cupping. Another example of compensation comes in a later passage:

Together we’d sing, “As the limpid brook is babbling east, /I shall keep your words secret and sweet/I shall keep your words secret and sweet.” Or, “A little pouch with a golden string,/Made for me by the village girl/Who smiles like a blooming spring. (161)”

我们一起唱：“小河静静流，微微泛波浪， / 你的话我永远记心头”或唱：“小小荷包带金线，村姑针针为我缝。 / 她的微笑是春花， / 一朵一朵唯我红。(172) ”

The phrase “As the limpid brook is babbling east,” would be difficult for the post Cultural Revolution readers to make a connection to the “Red Arm Choir: Moscow Nights,” one of the best known Russian songs outside its homeland. It has gained immense popularity since it was introduced to Chinese audience during the Cultural Revolution in China. Jin’s translation uses the exact lyrics of the song which instantly connects Chinese readers to the unforgettable memory of the Red China days.
Case Study III: “The Bane of the Internet”/ “互联网之灾”

The shift of metaphor is an important translation technique demonstrated in “The Bane of the Internet.” The story tells of two sisters (one in China; one in the United States) who email each other about their own lives. From China, Yuchin discusses her desire for a car. The narrator, who is the sister in America advises against the decision but Yuchin’s desire only grows stronger. After Yuchin offers her organs online in exchange for it, the narrator, in fear of her sister’s well-being, steps in and helps her pay using the money the narrator had saved up for the future.

The story opens with a plain declarative sentence, a practice Jin often adopts: “My sister Yuchin and I used to write each other letters.” Jin is a master of the straightforward line and he makes the most of his sparseness. As in Chekhov’s later works, Jin’s writing, mostly stripped of adjectives and adverbs, covers a lot of ground quickly.

Ha Jin shifts metaphors, another technique used for the fulfillment of Skopos. In describing Yuchin’s materialistic pursuit, Jin gives a Chinese phrase a twist by shifting metaphors.

At the sight of that gorgeous machine, I felt as if a dozen awls were stabbing my heart (4).
看见那漂亮的德国货，我觉得万箭穿心 (12).

“A dozen awls were stabbing my heart” is not an idiomatic English expression. It is translated from a Chinese saying by Jin. Jin renders it back into Chinese “万箭穿心,” which can be literally translated as “ten thousand arrows were piercing my heart.” Here, “awl” is translated into “arrow” to restore the original metaphor the Chinese four-character expression adopts. Another change of metaphor is shown in the use of numbers. Ten thousand, in Jin’s eyes is too big a number to be idiomatically accepted by American readers. Jin uses a dozen instead.
Chinese culture is steeped in number and numerology, and is remarkable for its strong reliance on proverbs and idioms as discourse tools. Four-character idioms known as 成语 (chengyu) are accorded high regard and high frequency of use in spoken and written Chinese, and comprise nearly ninety percent of Chinese idioms. Like the one we just discussed, there are thousands of four-character idioms that contain numeric values.\(^\text{312}\)

Ha Jin tries to absorb patterns of speech and capture the way language evolves in diaspora, so he tweaks common Chinese expressions rather than translating them verbatim. After Yuqin begs for money to buy a new car, her American sister replies:

Certainly I wouldn’t lend her the money, because that might amount to hitting a dog with a meatball—nothing would come back (5).

当然了，我不会借给她钱，那等于牛排打狗，有去无回。

Here, Jin borrows the image from a Chinese phrase, “hitting a dog with a pork bun,” an expression that means it’s useless to punish people by rewarding them. But when Jin translates it back into Chinese he does not use the Chinese saying as it is; instead, he tweaks it into “牛排打狗,” which is literally translated as “hitting a dog with a piece of steak.” Maybe Jin wants to add a bit of foreign flavor to the old Chinese saying to recreate and reinvigorate. At other times when a saying is too idiosyncratic to be changed, Jin keeps it untouched and faithfully translates it back into Chinese. The narrator is so worried about her sister in China that she resorts to superstitious belief in interpreting a bad omen:

For the whole day, I kept wondering what she was up to, and my left eyelid twitched nonstop. She might have solicited donations (6).

一整天窝不断寻思她在搞什么名堂，我的左眼皮跳个不停。她也许在乞求别人捐助(14)。

This again comes from an old Chinese saying that “the twitching of the left eyelid indicates the coming of good fortune; while the right one is a warning about the coming bad luck.”

Jin’s English writing is modest and unobtrusive. His translation presents similar characteristics. He doesn’t crash or pirouette his way into a reader’s consciousness. The analysis of the next story focuses on the discussion of mistranslation.

**Case Study IV: “The Beauty”/ “美人”**

“The Beauty” is an O. Henry-esque story about a real estate mogul who suspects that his wife, Gina, is being unfaithful to him because their daughter does not look like him and his beautiful wife, but he soon discovers that it is the numerous plastic surgeries before their marriage that transformed a plain-looking girl into his beautiful wife.

At the beginning of the story, the concern about the wife’s fidelity is brought to the readers’ attention.

Ever since the birth of their daughter, Jasmine, a year ago, he had harbored misgivings about his wife’s fidelity. Their baby was homely, with thin eyes and a wide mouth, and took after neither Gina nor himself (28).

自从女儿茉蕾一年前出生,他就疑心重重,怀疑妻子有外遇。他们的孩子不好看，细眼大嘴，既不像妈妈又不像爸爸(36).

Jin renders “Jasmine” as “茉蕾”, instead of “茉莉,” the standard Chinese term for the flower. The result is that their daughter is seen as their offspring since “蕾” literally means “bud” and often has the connotation of “beauty” and “purity.” Concerned with the possibility of any sexual scandal, the husband pays attention to relative articles in social media.

Seated on his rattan chair, he resumed skimming some articles on a Web site where people had been arguing about whether it was appropriate for a seventy-five-year-old celebrity, a Nobel laureate in chemistry, to marry a woman of twenty-eight (31).

他继续浏览一个网站上的文章——人们在争论一位八十五岁的诺贝尔化学奖得主该不该跟一位二十八岁的女人结婚(39).
An obvious disparity in translation exists in the descriptions of the Nobel laureate’s age: in English it says 75, but it is translated as 85. Since this anecdote is based on a real story, maybe Jin wants to avoid being a paparazzi and thus literally retouches it. In 2004, Nobel Prize winner, Yang Zhenning, 82 years old, married 28-year-old Master’s student Weng Fan. As soon as the news got out, it became a hot topic of discussion in China and served as headlines for weeks.

Tortured by his concerns and worries, the husband regrets his unchecked passion in pursuing his love:

You were foolish, running after her like a rutting animal (32).

“A rutting animal” is reified into “a rutting bull” when translated into Chinese, as bull symbolizes physical strength and power.

Some mistranslations are done to conform to cultural conventions. Dan recalls intimate family time together with his wife and daughter.

In a sleepy voice Gina was humming a song Dan vaguely remembered—“Come on, Little bunny./Open the door to your mummy…” (35)

吉娜语音困倦地哼着一支童谣：冯丹仍依稀记得些歌词：“小羊乖乖，把门开开，我是你妈妈的朋友…”(42)

Jin translates the song into a lullaby known to most Chinese kids, changing the image of “bunny” into “baby lamb.” He translates “Dan” into “冯丹(Feng Dan),” because Chinese people are often addressed by both their first and last names even in casual conversation. In translating the name, Jin uses the technique of transliteration, that is, to write words using a different alphabet/character. The method focuses on the conversion of pronunciation and script rather than conversion of meaning.
Conclusion

Jin’s success in English-language fiction in the United States and translated/self-translated works in China bodes well for bilingual creativity. It paves the way for the acceptance of other Chinese English-language fiction in America and for future work by Chinese bilinguals through an expanding readership. In terms of literary production, such writing can further redefine world literatures in English to include the writing by those giving voice to non-Eurocentric, non-Judeo-Christian, and non-western cultures. Linguistically, a range of devices are employed, especially in Jin’s self-translation: the transfer and calquing of address terms, proper names, unique vocabulary items, curse words and obscenities, metaphors and proverbs, and the use of “nativized” discourse norms and strategies, to convey the particularities of two language systems. The success of Jin’s self-translation suggests the blur between an original text and its translation, source and target. Normally, the translation is always seen as the handicapped version of the original, the one that cries of “loss,” while the source language is always seen as the first language in which the literature is produced. In this case, it is the English that is the “target,” his “second” language and the language he translates into, the first language. Thus, devices such as supplementation and addition are widely used to reproduce the conceived world in his mother tongue.

What distinguishes his self-translations from those of Lin and Chang lies in his “faithfulness” and lack of rewriting, as he proudly proclaims in the preface that he translates the work word-for-word. Such practice can be guaranteed mainly because of his unique writing style—the so-called translation literature he produces. Jin’s linguistic ingenuity lies in the ability to blend the linguistic forms and semantics of Chinese and English to create a hybrid language of his own. A good example is the loan translation from Chinese. For example, “son of a turtle” is a loan translation from Chinese to replace the more commonly used one in English, “son of a
bitch.” A native-English reader may expect “son of a bitch,” but the phrase “son of a turtle” achieves a more comic effect as the phrase structure is the same, while the cultural nuance is different. In Jin’s English fiction, many such metaphors transposed from Chinese come with a rich load of cultural information, which when translated back into Chinese makes an easy return to home. Maybe the ease Jin claims when he self-translates his work further proves that his English works are the true acts of translation, linguistically and ideologically. But such generalization is only partially justified. For instance, the translator of Jin’s Waiting, Jin Liang, at times departs from the English text to such a great extent that the only way he could get away with it is to proclaim that the English is not a direct translation of actual Chinese. Even claimed as “translation literature,” Jin’s works are far more complicated than the mere duplicate of a conceived Chinese world. What he adds to the extensive use of Chinese expressions are a large number of American idioms, proverbs and expressions. Jin even revamps age-old English expressions, to borrow two examples from Waiting:

But that should provide no grounds for divorce, because it was normal for a married couple to have a quarrel or even a fist fight once in a while. A good marriage was full of moments of cats and dogs. It was uneventful marriage that was headed toward disaster (124). The visitors all congratulated the couple on having two sons. “You landed two birds with a single bullet,” one would say. And another, “What a lucky man! (280)”

Jin preserves the structure and signature words of stock phrases, replacing only certain words with others, so as to induce a comical, humorous, or ironic effect.

Jin is careful in building connections with his readers. He does not plunge his reader too deeply into a cultural tradition entirely foreign to them, and therefore avoids an impassable gulf that turns away the English readership, in marked contrast to Eileen Chang. Jin’s awareness of the Skopos, the audience’s reception of his works, underwrites his success. As Jin’s fiction assumes a significant historical dimension, his Skopos as a fiction writer is to creatively translate
history literature creatively, not to lecture his English-speaking audience with Chinese history. One such “translation” is, “A Tiger-Fighter Is Hard to Find,” in his anthology of short stories, The Bridegroom.\textsuperscript{313} The name of the legendary tiger-killer, Wu Song, appears only once in the story of “The Tiger-Killing Hero and the Hero-Killing Tiger,” and elsewhere is referred to simply as “the hero.” The titles of the classic novels that contain the tiger-killing episode, Shuihu zhuang and Jin Ping Mei, are never mentioned, either in the original or the English translation.\textsuperscript{314}

Such adaptions are often seen in migrant writing that carves a cultural space, often including a cross-section of linguistic play.\textsuperscript{315} Jin takes full advantage of the experience of writing as a migrant in the United States, drawing on bilingual resources and geographical and psychological distance to more objectively observe and critically reflect on both his home country and the adopted one. By writing this way, Jin joins the literary tradition established by Joseph Conrad and Vladimir Nabokov while carving out a niche of his own. His “translation literature” transgresses the boundaries of national literatures, challenging the linguistic determinism and imagined cultural unity that are deeply embedded in their conception. Jin is only one among many to import non-English languages’ semantic and orthographic differences into the American republic of letters. He is in the company of Sandra Cisneros, Junot Diaz, Abraham Cahan, Henry Roth, and Ezra Pound. The paradox is the more that writers from the non-English world write in English, the “lingua franca” in search of an international audience, the more they seek to represent their cultures and languages of origin. The bi- or multilingual texts could define the future of global literature. With ever-increasing numbers of Chinese

\textsuperscript{313} Ha Jin, The Bridegroom (New York: Pantheon, 2000).
people becoming English-Chinese bilinguals, one can expect to see an increased production of Chinese/English bilingual literature and self-translations between the two languages.
Conclusion

This project started with my empirical observation of the self-translation practice within the opus of bilingual writers. Freely circulating cosmopolitan Lin Yutang, self-exile Eileen Chang, and political exile Ha Jin all catch the cultural politics of their respective moments, illustrate the heterogeneous cultures of their times, and seize iconoclastic perspectives of different societies. To figure out what moral or political imperatives that have forced them to conduct self-translation and to what extent the writers’ choice of translation strategies are dictated by linguistic, cultural, or historical contexts, I employed a theoretical tool of the Skopos theory to specifically explore purposes of self-translation, employment of Skopos rules in translation, and the practice of rewriting and adaptation for new audiences. This dissertation presents that each self-translator has their own way of rendering their own texts and testifies that there is no model self-translator, only trends and exceptions. The heterogeneity of this practice renders each encounter site-specific, dependent upon myriad personal, political, linguistic and historical factors. Rather than offering a definition of “self-translation,” this dissertation proves that the hybridity of self-translators presented here reflects the hybridity which gives birth to self-translation itself.

In the meantime, Lin, Chang, and Jin’s self-translations raise questions about what it means to translate between two distant languages. As bilingual writers publishing in a literary market marked by uneven translations between English-language books and foreign-language books, they may be distanced from the centers of culture for political, linguistic, and cultural reasons. They approach it from an underprivileged position, sometimes with an undependable linguistic toolkit for creating a meaningful or comprehensive representation. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari refers to this type of situation wherein language loses its proper place as
deterritorialization. To support this point, Mary Besemeres argues that the greatest risk for writers “translating themselves” into a second language is the threat to their identity, an identity formed in the first language and thus reliant on this language for a true expression of self. By pointing to the interrelation between selfhood and language, Besemeres believes bilinguals live inside conflicting versions of selves. With multilingual exchange with the self, self-translation can illuminate the shaping of a multilingual subjectivity and fragmented identity against a more fixed and rooted monolingual self. Through self-translation, one can gain a new, translated self. Through self-translation, Lin finds reconciliation as a cosmopolitan; Chang falls into awkward betweenness despite her metamorphosis attempts; and Jin regains a sense of belonging and dismisses charges of betrayal.

In this regard, self-translators emphasize the permissibility of linguistic and national identities and embrace the fraying between the versions of their texts. As a form of self-dialogue, self-translation takes place in more than one idiom. Through the negotiations of translation, self-translators actively approach the spacy emptiness between two national languages in spite of linguistic, literary, and social hierarchies. The specific Skopos of self-translating enables these writers to tweak, readjust, revise, or keep aspects of their texts and their literary personae. Self-translators, particularly, disrupt the boundaries of self, language, and nation by elevating “translation” and asserting ownership of the dissonances between the versions of their texts and/or the translingual gestures within their texts. Still, self-translation can be a powerful tool for individual self-promotion, giving them a competitive edge over their colleagues with no access

---

to bilingualism. They can become their own ambassadors, agents and even career brokers. When located in new speaking positions, the migrant writers could draw on linguistic translation processes such as addition, deletion, shift, mistranslation and combine autobiography, historiography, ethnography, and fiction, in order to bring their own works to new audiences.\textsuperscript{319}

Bridging between/among cultures, self-translation encourages a cultural literacy suited to the era of globalization as knowledge of extra-national cultures and societies increasingly becomes a necessity. By inserting themselves into the canons and sub-canons of national literatures that are traditionally observed as distinct, self-translators reveal categorizations of literature based on national or linguistic identity as inadequate. By introducing new hybrid and heterogeneous categories into Translation Studies and literary practice, self-translation increases the visibility of the translation process and challenges a binary logic of translation, playing with notions of author and translator, source text and target text, monolingual and multilingual reader. Its hybrid nature resists classification within literary systems, as well as in the professional field, where the subordination of the translator to the author, and the target text to the original, is not to be questioned. Self-translation might thus be studied together with other hybrid forms of writing and literary mystification, such as pseudo-translation, plagiarism, parody, adaptation, etc., because these forms also imply the existence of another text from which they are derived.

My project extends conversations about translation and exile, translation and authorial reinvention, and translation and bilingual literary praxis. Self-translation, in particular, offers self-translators a route of escape, allowing them to camouflage, reconstruct, restore, and perhaps disavow or reclaim their characters through a different linguistic lens. I argue that such rewriting, recreation, or reconstruction is also a kind of self-criticism. Unlike monolingual writers who

have to forge their literary language out of the distance away from the natural everyday idiom to
discover the otherness of their mother tongue and its semiotic vitality, bilingual writers can
create their own artistic originality by changing the medium of expression that provides them
with a new or enlarged productive signifier. French scholar, Aleksandra Kroh points out that
unilingual countries are rare and from the global viewpoint of contemporary conditions,
monolingual people are a distinct minority today. This study of self-translated texts suggests
that when writers routinely elect to write in adopted dialects and languages, the compass of the
bilingual text and its audiences will widen. As communication channels expand and literatures
become ever more melded, scholars and social scientists will have to recognize that bilinguality
is an election and self-translation a desirable journey of venture.

It is true that there are parts of the self-translation history that are well charted, the many
translations of Nobel-laureates for instance. However, it is also true that there still remain vast
unknown territories which concern not only places and times but also whole fields of inquiry and
research. If we think of the history of self-translation practice and theory as mosaic, there can be
little doubt that there are still many small pieces or tesserae missing, such as the history of oral
self-interpretation, unerudite or non-literary self-translations, pseudo self-translation, as well as
large empty spaces yet to be filled in. The full design is far from complete. Much is still
unknown.

Works Cited


---. “Chinese Life and Fashions.” *The XXth Century* 5.6 (1943).
---. “Still Alive.” *The XXth Century* 4.6 (1943).


Li, Jing and Changbao Li. “A Comparative Analysis Between Self-Translation and Conventional Translation of *Between Tears and Laughter* From Gender Translation Perspective.”


---. “Lin Yutang zizhuan” (part 2). Yijing (Unofficial Text), November 20, 1936.


---. 子見南子 (Confucius Saw Nancy) in 大荒集 (The Lone Wayfarer). Shanghai: shenghuo shudian, 1934.

---. “對於譯名劃一的一個緊要提議” (“An Urgent Proposal for the Uniformity of Translated Terms”), 晨報副刊 (Supplement to the Morning News) 4 Apr., 1924.

Liu, Lydia. Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity—
Liu, Xing. 《英语世界的张爱玲研究》 (Eileen Chang Studies in the English World). Beijing:
Liu, Yansheng. 林语堂评传 (Critical Biography of Lin Yutang). Nanchang: Baihuazhou Wen
Yi Chubanshe, 1994
Louie, Kam. Eileen Chang: Romancing Languages, Cultures and Genres. Hong Kong: Hong
Lu, Xun. “Confucius in Modern China.” Lu Xun: Selected Works. Gladys Yang and Xianyi
Ma, Sheng-Mei. East-West Montage: Reflection on Asian Bodies in Diaspora. Honolulu:
Martin, Helmut. “Zhang Ailing’s Writing Experience.” Ed. Wolfgang Kubin. Symbols of
Meisterernst Barbara. Tense and Aspect in Han Period Chinese: A Linguistic Analysis of the
in America, 1981.
Nall, Timothy M. An Analysis of Chinese Four-Character Idioms Containing Numbers:
Structural Patters and Cultural Significance. Diss. of Ball State University, 2009.
---. Translating as a Purposeful Activity Functionalist Approaches Explained. Manchester: St.
Oh, Seiwoong. “Cultural Translation in Ha Jin’s Waiting.” Querying the Genealogy:
Comparative and Transnational Studies in Chinese American Literature. Ed. Jennie
Paolini, Shirley J. “Chang Ai-ling’s Fictional Evolutions and English Translations.” Eds. Lieven
D’Hulst and John Milton. Reconstructing Cultural Memory: Translation, Scripts,
Literacy. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2000
Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Eds. Rainer Schulte and
Qi, Shouhua. Western Literature in China and the Translation of a Nation. New York: Palgrave
University California, Berkeley, 1996.
Berkeley: University of California, Berkeley, 2015.


Song, Qi. Ed. 翻译纵横谈 (Problems of Translation: An Anthology. Hong Kong: Chenchong tushu gongsi, 1969.
Ungaro, Valentina. “Self-Translation as Rewriting: Reframing the Concept of the Original.”


