RETRANSLATION AS ARGUMENT: CANON FORMATION, PROFESSIONALIZATION, AND INTERNATIONAL RIVALRY IN 19TH CENTURY SINOLOGICAL TRANSLATION

James St. André
University of Singapore
chsjgsa@nus.edu.sg

Abstract
This paper investigates the reasons behind the tendency toward retranslation in Sinological circles from the 18th to the 20th century, despite the scarcity of translators and the large number of texts available to choose from. Retranslation is taken to mean both translation twice into the same language and translation into a third language (relay translation). My study focuses on just a few cases: *The Orphan of Zhao*, which was retranslated and adapted numerous times from the 18th century onwards; *The Fortunate Union*, perhaps the most translated Chinese novel in history (sixteen times); and *The Travels of Fa-hsien* (399-414 A.D.), or *Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms*. Examining prefaces and book reviews, as well as the translations themselves, I demonstrate first that retranslation as relay was undertheorized and marks a distinction between European languages on the one hand and Œexotic[1] languages like Chinese on the other. Further, I argue that literary merit in the source culture does not seem to play a large role in determining why these texts were repeatedly translated. Instead, there were at least eight inter-related factors: the relative ease of retranslating a text versus translating a never-before translated text, a desire to establish oneself as an authority by superseding earlier translations, the rise of Sinology as a profession, factionalism within academia, canon formation, fashion, changing perceptions of how translation should properly be done, and international rivalry between different European countries.
Keywords: Chinese literature, Orphan of Zhao Fortunate, Union Travels of Fa-hsien Sinology.

In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a relatively small number of Europeans were engaged in the translation of Chinese texts into a variety of European languages: primarily Latin in the eighteenth century, then increasingly into the vernaculars: French, English, and German mainly, but also Dutch, Italian, Russian, Spanish and Portuguese. Instead of spreading their talents out, each person taking different texts, as one might at first expect, a handful of texts were translated and retranslated over and over again. Certain works were translated as many as a dozen times into several European languages, while many other texts worthy of attention were left untranslated.

Despite the commonness of retranslation in the history of Sinology, I have been unable o find any studies or theoretical discussions of this phenomenon (whereas translation is a much-discussed subject in the field). In fact, searches of electronic databases (MLA International Bibliography, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences) under "retranslation" in any tradition yields very few results.

Following Yves Gambier, I define retranslation as meaning two distinct phenomena: either translation more than once into the same language, or translation from a translation into a third language (From Chinese to Latin and then to French, for example).[1] All the texts I discuss in this paper were retranslated in *both* senses of the word; I will use 'relay' for the second sense to avoid confusion, and 'adapted' when the translation is substantially different from the original.

My basic thesis is that retranslation in nineteenth-century Sinological circles is a form of argument: with one's predecessors, with scholars from other countries, with rivals in the field, or with reviewers. As such, retranslation is interconnected with a host of factors that often make it difficult to distinguish how any one factor in isolation operates on the translation process.

The Yuan dynasty (1206-1294) play *Zhao shi Gu'er* (The Orphan of Zhao),[2] was first translated into French by the Jesuit priest

Prémare and included in Du Halde's *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise,* (1735) then relayed into English and German through translations of Du Halde, as well as being adapted separately into English by Hatchett and into Italian by Metastasio, and re-relayed into English in 1762 by Percy. Later adapted by Voltaire (who changed the title to *Orphelin de la Chine*), in this form it was then relayed again into English, German and Russian, and adapted into an opera; Goethe's *Elpenor* (1783) is also based on it. It was retranslated in the nineteenth century directly into French by Julien, and continues in vogue today: Liu Jung-en's *Six Yuan Plays* and Liu Yunbo's *Summer Snow and Other Yuan Dynasty Stories* both contain modern English retranslations (see bibliography at end of article for details of all above editions).

There are over one hundred extant plays of about the same length and linguistic difficulty from the same time period. Not more than a handful were translated into European languages in the nineteenth century, and none of them more than once, as far as I can determine, although several works translated in the nineteenth century were retranslated in the twentieth. We might attribute this phenomenon to it being a masterwork, while the other pieces are all minor works worthy at most of one translation. *Zhao shi Gu'er*, however, is not considered to be outstanding by Chinese critics;[3] many other plays from this period are considered as good as or superior to it, and the acknowledged masterpiece of Yuan drama is the *Xi xiang ji* (Western Chamber Romance), which was only translated once in the latter half of the nineteenth century.[4] Obviously, there must be other factors involved.

First, the possible use to which the play is put in the receptor culture is important;[5] there is already an excellent study of the 'use' to which Hatchett and Voltaire put their adaptations of *Zhao shi Gu'er*, showing how the changes they made in the text speak to contemporary European concerns.[6] The fact that the play was presented as speaking to European concerns, rather than merely being a Chinese 'curiosity' was an important factor.

Second, this example also raises the issue of scarcity of qualified translators; virtually no one residing in Europe in the eighteenth century was competent in Chinese, and anything translated into one European language was likely immediately to be translated into other languages by people who did not speak or read Chinese.[7] None of the people involved in retranslating/adapting *Zhao shi gu'er* knew any Chinese. This is true of the other examples I discuss below; Wilkinson/Percy's *Hau kiou choaan, or the pleasing history*, published in 1761, was subsequently translated into German, French and Dutch; this work all being done by people with no knowledge of Chinese.[8] Indeed, the original English text was revised and completed based on a Portuguese manuscript after Wilkinson's death by Percy, who knew no Chinese.[9] J. W. Laidlay, who translated Rémusat's *Foe Koue Ki, ou Relation des Royaumes Bouddhiques* into English in 1848, also seems to have known no Chinese.[10]

Retranslation as relay translation, then, was often a question of lack of qualified translators in the eighteenth century and, to a lesser extent, the nineteenth for Chinese. Yet not until 1925 was a translation of *Hao qiu zhuan* done directly into French from the Chinese (as is proudly noted on the title page; amusingly enough, this was immediately relayed into English!),[11] although at least two nineteenth-century French *Sinologistes* translated other plays directly. I hope to show at least one other possible factor at work while discussing *Fo guo ji* below; here, however, I wish to draw attention to the curious fact that there is never any doubt of the ability of the translator to work between English-French, English-German, English-Dutch, French-Italian, or any other combination of European languages *when it is a question of relaying a Chinese text*. By contrast, almost every preface to the translation of a Chinese work into any European language is sure to discuss, often at length, the great difficulties of translating from Chinese into English, French, German, or Latin. In the face of this utterly foreign language, then, English, French, German and other languages coalesce into one 'European' unit, where each language is roughly

equivalent to all the others. Witness this phrase in a review of a Chinese-Latin-French dictionary in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1871: "On possède déjà en Europe plusieurs dictionnaires européens-chinois."[12] The reviewer felt no need to specify which European languages these dictionaries were compiled in; that they were *European* was enough.

This is manifestly not the case when translations between European languages are attempted of European literary texts; a review of a translation of Tasso's *Jerusalem Delivered* into English in 1826, to give just one example, discusses at great length the problems involved in translating the Italian language into English.[13]

This belief in the equivalence of European languages (versus Chinese) is also a factor, then, in the popularity of relay translation. Why bother going through all the hard work of retranslating a Chinese text into another European language when one could simply relay, with no apparent difficulty? The subtitle of the 1926 relay of *Hao qiu zhuan* "translated from the Chinese by Charles George Soulié de Morant and done into English by Henry Bedford-Jones" suggests by the two verbs used that the process from French to English is different from the process from Chinese to French. That such practice remains common in the twentieth century, when there is no longer a dearth of trained specialists, confirms that Sino-European translation is still perceived as being somehow different from intra-European relaying.

My second example, *Hao qiu zhuan*, is different from *Zhao shi Gu'er* in that it is not from a major genre; rather, it is an example of the minor and often despised category of "scholar-beauty romance". A type of formulaic bestseller, these tales typically feature young talented scholars who meet and fall in love with a beautiful maiden; after various trials and tribulations (family, rivals, corrupt officials), they are finally united and live happily ever after. This novel, which was first translated almost accidentally by a British merchant wishing to improve his Chinese, became the most-translated Chinese work of fiction in the eighteenth and nineteenth

centuries; it is probably still unsurpassed even today by such acknowledged masterworks as the *Dream of the Red Chamber*.[14]

Certain features make it appealing as a text to translate: it is not too long, the language is relatively easy (compared to *Zhao shi Gu'er* or especially *Fo guo ji* discussed below, written over 1300 years earlier), and the plot of frustrated lovers finally united is of wide, one might almost argue universal appeal. However, there are literally hundreds of similar scholar-beauty romances to choose from, any of which share all these characteristics, and many of which are as good or better. Thus we cannot dismiss chance as a factor in such an historical study. Once chosen, for whatever reason, the text occupied a privileged position in Europe as the first Chinese novel ever, and this certainly is the main reason that it became the focal point of so much subsequent activity, both retranslation and commentary. Furthermore, as I have noted in my discussion of *Zhao shi Gu'er*, there was a scarcity of Chinese scholars; it is no exaggeration to say that *nobody* in England read Chinese when Percy published the text in 1761, and there were not more than a handful of people in all of Europe who could claim to any knowledge of the language before 1800.[15]

All of these factors explain the retranslation of Percy/Wilkinson's *Pleasing History* into other European languages in the eighteenth century, but they do not explain why Sir John Francis Davis decided to retranslate the novel into English in 1829. Prior to this, Davis had published translations of a handful of short stories, a play, and various official and semi-official documents for the East India Company. (He was stationed in Canton, where he learned his Chinese as part of his job). Indeed, it would seem that he would naturally gravitate to other texts, given the scarcity of competent translators even at this time.

I have argued elsewhere that Davis was motivated by at least two factors: the desire to establish himself as an authority on things Chinese (the word "Sinologist" having entered English from French in the early nineteenth century), and to set certain standards of fi-

delity for translation from Chinese.[16] Space limitations preclude my going into detail here, but briefly, Davis belonged to the first generation of British Sinologists, and Percy's text provided him with an opportunity, by means of contrast, to show his (and by extension, his colleagues') expertise on things relating to China. This is accomplished by harping on a lack of accuracy in Percy's version, which the Sinologist alone is capable of remedying. Paradoxically, part of his strategy to convince the reader of the accuracy of his translation is to adopt a smoother, or nativist translation strategy; unable to judge from the original, the reader is 'persuaded' by Davis's easier text that he has more successfully understood and rendered the Chinese faithfully into English. This trope of retranslation as correction of an earlier generation holds for virtually all retranslation in the nineteenth century; Julien's retranslation of *Zhao shi gu'er* in 1834, for example, contains a preface where he protests that Prémare's translation was defective.[17] This issue will also come back in my discussion of *Fo guo ji* below.

Davis's retranslation does several other things besides contrasting him with Wilkinson/Percy. First and foremost, it is part of a larger set of choices which sets apart British Sinology from the French tradition of *Sinologie*. The French *Sinologistes* had, from the beginning, been mainly interested in classical Chinese culture, and their translations (primarily into Latin; later French also) reflected this taste: excerpts from early Chinese histories, Confucian classics, Taoism, and Buddhism made up the bulk of their work; chronologically speaking, Yuan drama was about the limit of their range.

Davis, his mentor Sir George Thomas Staunton, and some of Davis's colleagues at the East India Company chose quite different types of texts to translate. Starting with Yuan drama, where the French leave off, they concentrated mainly on late-imperial fiction and contemporary materials such as the Qing penal code, short fiction from the seventeenth century, a poetry by the current em-

peror, and numerous documents issued by various branches of the Chinese government, news items, and accounts of strange or extraordinary events. These works are all distinguished as being of *practical* value (by their definition), in contrast to French *Sinologie*, which is branded as a musty scholastic enterprise.

This Anglo-French rivalry in Sinological matters is well documented, and of course relates to the larger ongoing conflicts between the two nations. A reviewer of Davis and Morrison's 1815 *Translations from the original Chinese: with notes* first takes the Jesuits to task for having suppressed the truth about daily life in China, ignoring the reality around them for the ideal represented in the Chinese classics.[18] Then on the next page he admonishes the present generation of French *Sinologistes*: "If M. de Sacy, Julius von Klaproth, and Doctor Abel Remusat are desirous that the world should really profit from their Chinese studies, we would recommend them to leave the digrams [sic] and trigrams of *Fo-hi*, for something less ancient and more intelligible; let them follow the example of the gentlemen whose labours we are about to notice [Davis and Morrison], and they may then do the literary world some service." The volume in question contained a seventeenth century novelette and a series of translations from the *Peking Gazette* (an official publication used to disseminate news to the provinces from the capital). Two years later a review in the same journal of another translation by Davis notes that Chinese fiction can give us a "true estimate of the national character" of the Chinese and how they act in ordinary life, as opposed to how the sages say they should.[19]

Thus *Hao qiu zhuan*, retranslated, becomes a textbook of both modern Chinese everyday life and the current vernacular; readers who do not know Chinese can learn something about the current state of Chinese civilization, while students of the language may use it as a pony in their study of the original, the mastery of which will allow them either to do business or to proselytize in China.[20] This view of the text reached its apogee in 1904, when Frederick

Baller published an edition of the Chinese text along with footnotes in English for tyros in the Chinese language.[21]

Davis's generation also marks a turning point in the relative status of Chinese and European civilizations. Earlier French *Sinologistes* tended to laud China to the skies, and Percy's translation follows this tendency. Writing in 1829, sixty years later, Davis is by contrast sure of British superiority, and the adoption of a nativist style results: he does not want English to be 'corrupted' by the inferior style of Chinese composition, which is full of "ill-looking and worse-sounding exotic words."[22]

Finally, the repeated translation of *Hao qiu zhuan* (the last being into German in 1927—see bibliography), after which it vanishes from Sinological view, is an interesting example of fashion and the effect of early marketing strategies. For the Chinese edition which Davis used contained, on the cover, the phrase "di er caizi shu" (the second novel of genius). This phrase, a simple marketing ploy by the Chinese publisher, was taken at face value and repeated in prefaces to the various translations. As one of China's "most famous novels," *Hao qiu zhuan* was used (and re-used) to evaluate the status of Chinese literature on the world stage. From Percy and Goethe, who praise it, to Davis and others who later denigrate it, the book was a 'must' read for proponents and opponents alike of Chinese literature. Eventually, the May Fourth Movement in China, which raised the status of vernacular fiction and lowered that of fiction written in classical, along with the growing realization in Sinological circles that *Hao qiu zhuan* was not such a famous novel in China, led to its decline. After being translated so often and discussed so much for almost two-hundred years, *Hao qiu zhuan* has disappeared from the syllabi for classes of Chinese literature in translation, as well as classes in Chinese literature taught in Chinese.

Comparing these two examples, I would like to draw a few tentative conclusions before moving on to my third and final example. First of all, the accident of being 'first' in both cases was an ex-

tremely important factor in the decision by others to relay/retranslate. With little known about China and fewer people capable of translation, these texts came to be disproportionately important for anyone with an opinion for or against China. Second, in both cases, early nineteenth-century Sinologist(e)s were dissatisfied with the quality of the translation and advanced this as a major reason to retranslate (not relay) the text. In effect, the earlier translation became *a point d'appui*, allowing them to establish themselves as more knowledgeable while at the same time allowing them to make arguments as to how Chinese texts should be translated. They established norms of fidelity, accuracy and learnedness. Both Davis and Julien include a facsimile of one page of the original Chinese text as frontispiece to their translations, signaling that their translations are also going to be facsimiles of the original text. In addition, lengthy prefaces, footnotes, and appendixes all became staples of Sinological translation.

There are, however, some instructive differences. *Zhao shi gu'er* could be said to have been more successful, mainly due to the fact that it was extensively *adapted*. Obviously, the fact that Voltaire did one of the adaptations must also be counted as a factor.

Second, the relative success of *Zhao shi gu'er* may also be seen to be related to the status of the original text in Chinese. Yuan drama has not gone out of fashion in China or in Western Sinological circles; as the earliest form of Chinese drama extant, it is a well-studied genre and a 'must' in survey courses of Chinese literature (Tang dynasty poetry, Song dynasty Ci-poetry, Yuan dynasty drama, and Ming-Qing dynasty fiction being the 'big four' genres). On the other hand, as I have noted, scholar-beauty romance is a low-status genre which is little studied or taught today either in China or Europe. Yuan drama, then, continues to attract translators, and *Zhao shi gu'er* is thus seemingly assured of being retranslated/reprinted every generation or two.[23]

My third example of a frequently retranslated text is the *Fo guo ji*, or *Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms* (circa 415 CE). Briefly, this

book narrates the journey on foot by the Chinese Buddhist monk Faxian (335-422 CE) from China through various parts of Central Asia, down to India, where he studied and copied Buddhist scriptures, and then by boat to Java and thence back to China, where he spent his remaining years translating and expounding on Buddhist scriptures. Like *Hao qiu zhuan*, *Fo guo ji* comes from a 'minor' tradition in Chinese literature. Although such work was not despised by the cultural elite, it was by no means considered important; *Fo guo ji*'s survival is mainly due to Faxian's fame as translator of Chinese scriptures, and the narrative of his journey is seen as a 'Buddhist' text, and of interest primarily to Buddhists.

The age of the text, along with the great number of foreign terms and geographical names, make this an extremely difficult text to translate; most Chinese readers today need footnotes, and there are still disputed passages. Yet a whole series of people tackled this text in the nineteenth century: Rémusat, Landlay, Beal, Giles (twice!), and Legge.

Fo guo ji, although easily the most translated of Chinese travel literature in the nineteenth century, is not by any means the only such one. There was a certain vogue for *any* Chinese text which concerned other lands — Japan, Vietnam, and other parts of Southeast Asia, Central Asia, and India.[24]

Here perhaps we see the effect of the relative value placed on travel literature in Europe as a major factor in determining what gets translated. The genre was extremely popular in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, especially travels to 'exotic' locations. Chinese texts which treated foreign countries and peoples, a minor genre in China, 'fit (or were fit) into this category; in addition, they often provided glimpses of faraway places in the distant past.

Most of these texts, however, were only translated once, whereas *Fo guo ji* was translated six times (see list in bibliography). The only other texts that comes close both concern the travels of another monk, Xuanzang, over approximately the same route two centuries after Faxian.[25]

In the introduction to Rémusat's French translation, left unfinished at his death, continued by his colleague Klaproth, and finally completed by Landresse after Klaproth's death (rather an inauspicious beginning!), Landresse discusses at length the value of this text. I distinguish at least six distinct reasons in his lengthy argument. First and foremost, the text is valuable in the reconstruction of primitive Buddhism.[26] As I noted above, French *Sinologie* was concerned first and foremost with ancient texts and beliefs; Faxian's record of the various Buddhist countries he visited records religious practices, sites, and countries long vanished in India and Central Asia. This discourse of an 'original' Buddhism is accompanied by two value judgements: contemporary Buddhism is 'corrupt' (hence the need for Europeans to reconstruct it)[27] and Hinduism is inferior to Buddhism (because caste-less and eschewing the worship of images).[28] Second, the text helps to reconstruct the history and geography of Central Asia and India before the arrival of Islam.[29] Third, it documents the scope Buddhism once had in the world.[30] These three reasons, in turn, are linked to a fourth, the belief in the progress of positive science and the gradual perfection of (European) knowledge, which can retrieve and reconstruct this history, but which is also an end in and of itself; Rémusat has surpassed the earlier De Guignes,[31] and one day Rémusat may also be surpassed in turn.[32]

Two other reasons emerge, however, which return us to the Anglo-French rivalry I see in the retranslation of *Hao qiu zhuan*. First, the translation of this text exposes certain errors in the British understanding of Buddhism.[33] By a bit of slippery logic, an identification is suggested between Hinduism and the British on the one hand, and Buddhism and the French on the other; since Hinduism is inferior to Buddhism, the British, needless to say, are inferior to the French. Finally, the publication of this French translation in France contributes to the greater glory of the country. Landresse notes that Rémusat had originally planned to publish the translation under the auspices of the British Oriental Translation Fund (it would

not have been the first, nor the last translation into French sponsored by them). Rémusat's widow, however, insisted that the text be published in Paris, and Landresse says that this work will be the envy of other nations.[34]

A review by the British scholar Wilson takes up the gauntlet thrown down by Landresse, where national partisanship is seen triumphing over scholarly cooperation. First, he 'corrects' many errors in Rémusat/Klaproth/Landresse's geographical identifications.[35] The first examples (111-113) are particularly interesting because he bases his 'corrections' on Persian/Indian sources which, presumably, Rémusat and company were unfamiliar with. This shifts the grounds of debate from the meaning of the Chinese *text* to the verification of its *accuracy* based on non-Chinese sources, and in more than one place Wilson speculates that Faxian (not his translators) must have been mistaken.[36] Moreover, when Wilson picks out sections that interest him most, they are invariably those which tell the reader something about Indian history and culture. So on pages 118-9, the fact that *Fo guo ji* substantiates an Indian tale is of interest to him, while on page 134 he notes that the text establishes the historical fact of cavern temples in the Dekhin [Deccan] area at that time. On page 137, Faxian confirms that Hinduism arrived in Java before Buddhism, and that the Hindus were excellent navigators; finally on page 138 he ends on the note that the text proves that Brahmins were trading up the coast of China. The Chinese text, then, is 'read' by Wilson as glorifying Indian history. On page 130 he even suggests that *Fo guo ji* be used by British explorers in India to go treasure-hunting. Finally, Wilson deplores the fact that a German scholar has the honour of using two Sanskrit texts, the Ramayana and the Mahabharata, to locate and verify ancient geographical names. Having colonized India, Wilson seems to see Professor Lassen's efforts almost as an invasion of his territory.

This issue of international rivalry continues in the 1848 English relay, published in Calcutta by Laidlay. Following Wilson,

Laidlay makes several changes, all of which aim at lauding British scholars over their French rivals. First, he does not translate Landresse's sixty-five page introduction, wherein he displays French erudition concerning Buddhism, Central Asian history and, as I have noted, the faults of the British. Second, he adds supplementary footnotes to the already quite extensive notes of Rémusat, Klaproth and Landresse (in the French edition, the notes are routinely two to five times the length of the translation in each chapter), while cutting or eliminating certain of the French notes. As I mentioned above, Laidlay's elimination of all discussion of Chinese characters indicates his unfamiliarity with Chinese; it also shifts emphasis away from the text as *written* in Chinese to the content being *about* Central Asia and India in the same manner as Wilson's review. Third, virtually all of his 'additions' are drawn from British scholarship.[37] On page 14, for example, he claims that the controversy over whether Buddhist scriptures were written in Pali or Sanskrit has been "decisively" answered by "James Princep's splendid discoveries". This move is coupled with the elimination at times of references to French scholarship; for example, on page 19, where a reference to one of Rémusat's articles on Buddhism is eliminated. The translation has, in short, been colonized, "corrected and supplemented" by British scholars and turned to British use: an emphasis on the text as concerned primarily with territories now directly or indirectly under British control/influence.

The four subsequent translations (all into English) repeat more or less the three principal reasons for translating the text in the first place: knowledge of primitive Buddhism, Asian geography and the extent of Buddhism. The main reason for *retranslation*, moreover, is that noted by Laidlay: either to supplement and improve the translation, or to correct errors; this actually accords with Landresse's original preface to the French edition, where his belief in the progress of (European) science led him to posit that, one day, Rémusat's translation would be superseded by others due to ad-

vances in European understanding of Buddhism. Here, however, the collegiate "European" collective seems to have been dissolved.

Following Laidlay' lead, it is common in the prefaces and/or notes to point out the errors of one's predecessors, rather than 'silently' correcting them. Beal's introduction contains half a dozen examples of 'mistakes' in Rémusat's version, while not a page in Giles' 1877 translation but contains at least one, sometimes two or three notes pointing out Beal's 'errors'. Legge is slightly more circumspect vis à vis Giles to no avail: Giles lambasts him in a review for his numerous errors, sneering at Legge floundering around in a text that is not copiously annotated (Legge had previously translated the Confucian classics, all of which have a wealth of commentary to explicate difficult passages; *Fo guo ji* did not).[38] In Giles's retranslation of 1923, he states in the introduction that all earlier translations had errors (including his own).

In the case of *Fo guo ji*, it is actually possible to see that certain errors in understanding the text are gradually overcome in the successive translations, although it is not a strictly linear process: Giles, for example, while vilifying Beal's translation for the number of errors he introduces on top of Rémusat's, manages in two places to 'introduce' errors of his own in the first five chapters alone: where Rémusat and Beal both have one person Giles supposes two,[39] and where Rémusat and Beal both have 'pomegranate' he substitutes 'guava'.[40] (Perhaps Giles forgoes specific examples in his second edition because it would entail him 'eating crow' in these and other instances.)

Although error is advanced (justifiably) as the main reason in the retranslation of this text, certain other factors are at work here as well. First, Beal uses many more Sanskrit terms than Rémusat who, even when he knows the original Sanskrit term, prefers to use transliteration of the Chinese in the text, only mentioning the Sanskrit equivalent in the notes.[41] For Beal, the identification of Sanskrit terms and their adoption in the text again emphasizes what the text is *about* (Buddhism in Central Asia/India). Not surpris-

ingly, a glance at Harvard University's online catalog reveals that Beal published exclusively on Buddhism. Giles and Legge, by contrast, are the two most famous translators in nineteenth-century British Sinology; Giles more in the field of literature (his most well-known, and still read translation being *Strange Stories from a Chinese Studio*) while Legge spent many years on a multi-volume edition of the Confucian classics, along with certain Taoist texts. Both Giles's and Legge's translations, then, tend to be more concerned with philological issues (treating the Chinese text) than geographical ones. Rémusat or Beal can spend two pages discussing the possible location of a place-name in Central Asia; Giles and Legge spend a corresponding amount of space arguing about the syntax of a sentence and how it should best be rendered into English. This preoccupation with textual issues is a hallmark of Sinology. Their texts use correspondingly fewer Sanskrit terms than Beal, and have no long explanatory prefaces on Buddhism. Giles, in his preface, instead notes that he has limited himself to correcting grammatical and interpretive errors by Beal; he has not identified any new locations or Buddhist Sanskrit terms. True to this principle, he has many fewer notes concerning geography and the belief system of Buddhism. In place of an introduction detailing the Buddhist belief system, he translates an 'original preface' (in 1923 he quietly corrects this to "Descriptive Catalogue of the Imperial Library") and two long notes by later scholars; all three of these commentaries address questions of provenance and possible scribal errors of the text.

On pages 2-3 of his introduction, Giles notes that Beal paraphrases, a practice which he deplores because it might lead the student of Chinese astray. We are back to translation as pedagogical tool for the next generation of Sinologists, as with *Hao qiu zhuan*.

Legge is so concerned about historical reconstruction of the Chinese *text* that he prefers to use Morrison's phonetic spelling of Chinese terms according to the Cantonese dialect rather than the Northern Mandarin, because he believes (along with many linguists) that the pronunciation of Chinese in Faxian's day was closer to

Cantonese. He goes so far as to append a copy of the Chinese text which he felt was superior to others used heretofore. Furthermore, in opposition to Buddhologists and historians of religion, Legge is anxious to refute the idea that Buddhism is the most popular religion in the world. Himself a Christian missionary and proponent of Confucianism as a secular philosophy, his 'recount' puts Christianity first, Confucianism second, and Buddhism fifth, rather than Buddhism first. He is also more interested in attacking the ignorance of former *Chinese* scholars who commented on the text.

Almost forty years later, Giles published a retranslation (the first time that anyone had used this term) in 1923. The target audience is manifestly different; Giles says in the much shorter introduction that he is aiming at a more general audience this time, and he therefore makes certain adjustments. The most importance is the complete elimination of footnotes, something virtually unheard of in nineteenth century Sinology, which was heavily invested in footnotes as part of the didactic function of translations. He also breaks with the tradition begun by Rémusat, and followed by all other nineteenth-century translators (including his own first attempt), of dividing the text into forty sometimes extremely short chapters. Instead, he breaks the text into paragraphs but eliminates all chapters. He also moves away from his and Legge's earlier preference for transliteration of Chinese towards use of Sanskrit/ Central Asian spellings of geographical names. I found ten examples in the first seven pages:

Giles 1923	**Giles 1877**	**Legge 1886**
Kara-shahr	Wu-I	Woo-e
Turfan	Kao-ch'ang	Kâo-ch'ang
Khotan	Yu-t'ien	Yu-teen
Gomate	Ch'ü-ma-ti	Gomati
Bodhisatvas	P'u-sas	Bodhisattvas
Kashmir	Chi-pin	Kophene
Karghalik	The Tzu-ho country	Kingdome of Tsze-hoh

Tâsh-kurghân	Yu-hui	Yu-hwuy
Kâshgar	Chieh-ch'a	K'ech-ch'ê
Pancha parishad	pan-che-yüeh-shih	pañcha parishad

The lack of footnotes, use of paragraphing, and choice of geographical terms all make the text easier for the English reader. "Popular" translation, here, resembles what Lawrence Venuti has described in *The Translator's Invisibility* where the translator effaces her/himself along with the foreign culture as much as possible,[42] whereas in nineteenth-century Sinological translations, the translator is manifestly, insistently, present to the reader, and the utter foreignness of the text is displayed by the need for introduction, footnotes, and a large number of transliterated terms.

Summing up, *Fo guo ji* became a focal point for at least two, possibly three types of argument: between French and British Sinologists, between Buddhologists and Sinologists, and finally on the personal level between two individual translators (Legge taught at Oxford and Giles at Cambridge; perhaps there is a bit of rivalry here). To a certain degree, the retranslation in the nineteenth century of *Zhao shi gu'er* and *Hao qiu zhuan* is also a type of argument, again between British and French orieintalists, but also a generational struggle by nineteenth century Sinologist(e)s to establish their field (there is more than a hint of what Harold Bloom called the 'anxiety of influence'[43]). There were many other variables involved, but these factors are often discussed as general factors influencing the decision to translate a particular text. The decision to retranslate, however, seems more centrally concerned with argument: correcting errors of earlier translations, advancing new interpretations of the text, making changes in overall translation strategy to fit changing tastes/norms of translation, adapting the text to meet particular needs in the receptor culture, etc.. In some cases the argument may have little to do with the retranslated text; for example, Legge's argument in his preface that Buddhism should be ranked

fifth, not first, among world religions is only tangentially related to the *Fo guo ji*.

Relay translation in the eighteenth century seems clearly to be associated with a lack of qualified translators, and thus to be a separate phenomenon from retranslation into the same language (indeed, almost its opposite, as retranslation implies a plethora of translators). However, in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries it remains an entrenched tool of the Sinological trade; as late as the 1950s, it was not uncommon to see such relay translations.[44] Furthermore, as in the example of Laidlay's 1848 relay, we have an example of relay translation involved with essentially the same issues as retranslation: correction and rivalry. The two phenomena of retranslation and relay translation cannot, then, be so easily treated as distinct, especially in a situation like nineteenth century Britain, where a knowledge of French was assumed among educated people. In this situation, relay is another form of retranslation. Further, relay highlights the construction of a European identity in the face of a more radical Other.

Finally, this paper is merely an attempt to raise awareness of the number and complexity of issues involved with retranslation in nineteenth century Sinology. There are many possible areas of future research (as, indeed, the whole question of Sinological translation is generally under-studied): statistical analysis, to balance my discussion of three rather exceptional cases, might reveal certain trends; more research into determining factors for why these three texts attracted so much more attention than other similar narratives would be useful; a careful comparison of different versions, as Pekka Kujamäki does in a study of six German translations of a Finnish novel,[45] might reveal certain tendencies over time; and any one of these three texts, or the various issues I have raised, could be the subject of more in-depth study. Retranslation remains a rich field to explore in translation studies.

Notes

1. Yves Gambier, "La Retraduction, Retour et Détour" *META* 39.3 (Sept 1994): 413.

2. To avoid confusion between indicating the original Chinese text versus the various translations, I will use transliteration to refer to the originals. French, German, or English titles then refer to the translations.

3. See for example Chen Shouyi, "The Chinese Orphan: A Yuan Play. It's Influence on European Drama of the Eighteenth Century" in *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Adrian Hsia (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998), 359, who is rather dismissive of the play.

4. Stanislas Julien, translator. *Si-siang-ki: ou, l'histoire du pavillon d'occident: comédie en seize actes traduite du chinois. Extrait de l'Atsume Gusa*. Genève: H. Georg-Th-Mueller; Paris: Ernest Leroux; London: Trubner and Co., 1872-80.

5. I wish to avoid the phrase 'target language', which for me is too loaded with various significations, including agency of the original, lack of choice of the receiving culture, and rather crude sexual innuendo implying an (en)gendering of the translation process.

6. Chen Shouyi, "The Chinese Orphan: A Yuan Play. It's Influence on European Drama of the Eighteenth Century" in *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*, edited by Adrian Hsia (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998), 366-72.

7. The translations in the eighteenth century were done mainly by Catholic missionaries based in China; Prémare sent his translation of *Zhao shi gu'er* from Beijing to Du Halde in Paris for inclusion in his work.

8. See list of translations in the bibliography.

9. For details of the translation, compilation, editing, and publication of this novel, see inter alia Chen Shouyi, "Thomas Percy and His Chinese Studies" in *The Vision*

of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries, edited by Adrian Hsia (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998), 302-11.

10. I have not actually been able to locate any information about Laidlay's background, but base my supposition on two points: the fact that his text was published in Calcutta by a mission press indicates that, if he knew any 'oriental' languages, it would have been an Indian one, and second, that he consistently eliminates all discussions of the Chinese language in Rémusat's footnotes.

11. See list of translations in bibliography.

12. *Journal Asiatique* sixth series, 17 (Mar-Apr 1871): 354.

13. Anonymous review of *Jerusalem Delivered* translated by J. H. Wiffen in *Quarterly Review* 34.67 (Jun, 1826): 1-15.

14. Also known variously as *A Dream of Red Mansions* and *The Story of the Stone.* I know of five English translations (three of which are incomplete or abridged), one French, and one German.

15. The East India Company made various attempts to arrange for one or more of the men stationed at Canton to learn Chinese beginning in the mid-eighteenth century, but nothing like a regular practice was established until after 1800, when Sir George Thomas Staunton, who had learned Chinese as a boy while accompanying his father and Lord Macartney to China in 1791, began working for the company in Canton. By 1829 there were a handful of British subjects in Canton and a few back in England who knew Chinese, but no academic chair in the subject was established until later in the century. See T. C. Fan, "Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies," *Review of English Studies* 22 (1946): 309, 314 and Hosea Ballou. Morse, *The Chronicles of the East India Company, Trading to China, 1635-1834*, (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1926-1929), volumes 2-3 (The information of which employees of the East India Company were learning Chinese at different times is scattered over these two volumes).

16. James St. André, "Xianzai fanyi lilun yu guoqu fanyi shijian: yi *Hao qiu zhuan* wei li" (Modern translation theory and past translation practice: European translations of the *Hao qiu zhuan*) in *Chung-wai Literary Monthly* 29.5 (October 2000): 105-129.

17. Stanislas. Julien, “Avant-propos” *Tchao-chi-kou-eul: ou, L’orphelin de la Chine: drame en prose et en vers, accompagné des pièces historiques qui, en ont fourni le suject de nouvelles et poésies chinoises. Avec spécimen du texte chinois* (Paris, 1834), viii.

18. *Quarterly Review* 13.26 (Jul 1815):409.

19. Review of Davis, *Laou-Seng-urh, or ‘An Heir in His Old Age’, A Chinese Drama* in *Quarterly Review* 16.32 (Jan 1817):398.

20. All early British translators worked for the East India Company or were involved with missionary work (some did both); as I noted above, there were no academic chairs in Chinese in British universities at this time.

21. Baller, Frederick, editor. *The Fortunate Union* Hao qiu zhuan. Edited with notes. Shanghai: Mei-hua, 1904.

22. Sir John Francis Davis, “Introduction” to *The Fortunate Union, a romance, translated from the Chinese original, with notes and illustrations. To which is added, a Chinese tragedy,* (London: Printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, and sold by J. Murray, 1829), xiii. The ‘anti-Chinese’ stance of Davis is another factor in Anglo-French rivalry, British travel literature of the eighteenth century already having a generally negative view of the Chinese. See George Anson, *A Voyage Round the World in the Years 1710-14* (London: Printed for W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1776), part II, chapters 6-7 for an early example.

23. Over forty Yuan drama were (re)translated in the period 1967-2000; see bibliography.

24. See list of fourteen translations of Chinese travel literature in the bibliography; this list does not include the four texts concerning Xuanzang, the six translations of *Fo guo ji,* or various shorter translations published in journals.

25. Both texts were first translated by Julien, and later translated into English by Beal. I have not had a chance to compare them to see whether Beal’s work is a relay or a retranslation. See bibliography for publication details.

26. "Introduction" *Foe Koue Ki, ou Relation des Royaumes Bouddhiques: Voyage dans la Tartarie, dans l'Afghanistan et dans l'Inde, executé a la fin du IVe siècle par Chy Fa Hian. Traduit du chinois et commente par Abel Remusat. Oeuvre posthume revu, complété, et augmenté d'eclairissements nouveaux par MM. Klapoth et Landresse* (Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1836), xii.

27. Ibid, ii.

28. Ibid, viii-ix.

29. Ibid, xxiv-xxv, xxxvii.

30. Ibid, ii, vi.

31. Ibid, xiii.

32. Ibid, xxvii.

33. Ibid, ix-x.

34. Ibid, lxv.

35. "Account of the Foe kúe ki, or Travels of Fa Hian in India, translated from the Chinese by M. Remusat." Reviewed by H. H. Wilson, Director, R.A.S., in *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 5 (1839):111-3, 115, 116, 118-20, 122.

36. On pages 113 and 125. On page 116 Wilson also contends that Faxian has omitted information.

37. See for example his footnotes to the first five chapters, on pages 2-4, 14, 15, 19, 21.

38. Review by H. Giles of *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*, by Dr. Legge, Oxford 1886 in *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* new series 21 (1886): 315-20.

Giles himself had several errors pointed out in a short anonymous review. See *The North China Herald*, July 14, 1877: 33-34.

39. Rémusat, 8; Beal, 6; Giles (1877), 4.

40. Rémusat, 27; Beal, 17; Giles (1877), 12. These examples are culled from a careful comparison of the first five chapters of Rémusat's translation against each subsequent retranslation.

41. *Phou sa* instead of Boddhisatva, for example. Rémusat, 17,

42. Lawrence Venuti, *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation* (London: Routledge, 1995), 8-9, 44-50.

43. Harold Bloom, *The Anxiety of Influence; A Theory of Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1973).

44. For example the relay of *Dream of the Red Chamber* from German into English by the McHugh sisters: *The Dream of the Red Chamber: a Chinese novel of the early Ching period, English translation by Florence and Isabel McHugh based on the German version, Der Traum de roten Kammer* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958).

45. Pekka Kujamäki, "Finnish Comet in German Skies: Translation, Retranslation and Norms" *Target* 13.1 (2001): 45-70.

Bibliography

I. Translations, relays, and adaptations of *Zhao shi gu'er* arranged chronologically

P. Prémare, translator. *Tchao chi con ell, ou, le petit orphelin de Tchao*. Included in Du Halde, J.-B. (Jean-Baptiste), *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'empire de la Chine et de la Tartarie chinoise*. La Haye, 1735, volume 3.

Du Halde, J.-B. (Jean-Baptiste). *The general history of China. Containing a geographical, historical, chronological, political and physical description of the empire of China, Chinese-Tartary, Corea and Thibet. Including an exact and particular account of their customs, manners, ceremonies, religion, arts and sciences. Done from the French of P. Du Halde*. Translated by Richard Brookes. London, J. Watts, 1736.

Du Halde, J.-B. (Jean-Baptiste). *A description of the empire of China and Chinese-Tartary: together with the kingdoms of Korea, and Tibet: containing the geography and history (natural as well as civil) of those countries: in two volumes, from the French of P. J.B. Du Halde, Jesuit; with notes geographical, historical, and critical ; and other improvements, particularly in the maps, by the translator*. London: Printed by T. Gardner for Edward Cave, 1738-1741

Hatchett, William. *The Chinese orphan: an historical tragedy. Alter'd from a specimen of the Chinese tragedy, in Du Halde's History of China. Interspers'd with songs, after the Chinese manner*. London: Printed for Charles Corbett, 1741.

Du Halde, J.-B. (Jean-Baptiste). *Ausführliche Beschreibung des Chinesischen Reichs und der grossen Tartarey, aus dem Französischen mit fleiss übersetztet…*. Rostock, J.C. Koppe, 1747.

Metastasio. Pietro. *L'eroe cinese*. 1752.

Du Halde, J.-B. (Jean-Baptiste). *Gründlicher unterricht vom seidenbau; oder, Chinesische nachrichten, wie mit dem seiden-und dem dazu nötigen maulbeerbaumbau zu verfahren, welche in dem iiten theil seiner ausführlichen*

beschreibung des chinesischen reichs befindlich, wegen ihrer kürze und wichtigkeit aber absonderlich zum druck befördert, und mit kurzen anmerkungen versehen von einem erfahrnen freunde des seidenbaues im braunschweigischen. Wolfenbüttel, 1753.

Voltaire. *L'orphelin de la Chine: tragédie représentée pour la premiere fois à Paris, le 20 août 1755.* A Paris: Chez Michel Lambert, libraire, 1755.

Murphy, Arthur. *The orphan of China, A tragedy. Translated from the French of M. de Voltaire. First acted at Paris, on the 20th of August, 1755.* Second edtion, carefully corrected. London: R. Baldwin, 1756.

Voltaire. *Der Waise in China, ein Trauerspiel von fünf Aufzügen, aus dem Französischen des Herrn von Voltaire in teutsche Verse übersetzt, und für die k. k. privilegirte teutsche Schaubühne zu Wien eingerichtet von Ludwig Korn.* [Wien]: Gedruckt mit von Ghelischen Schriften, 1761.

Voltaire. *The dramatic works of Mr. de Voltaire, translated by the Rev. Mr. Francklin.* London: Printed for J. Newbery, 1761-71. 7 volumes. [The Orphan of China is in volume 7]

Voltaire, François Marie Arouet de. *De Vorstelyke Wees; of, het veröverd China; treurspel gevolgt [in verse] naar l'Orphelin de la Chine van den H. de Voltaire.* Amsteldam: [n.p.], 1765.

Goethe, Wilhelm von. *Elpenor* 1783.

Winter, Peter von. *Tamerlan; opéra en quatre actes.* Paroles de Morel. Par P. Wintter [sic]. Paris, Naderman [1802?]. [Text by E. Morel de Chédeville, based on Voltaire's Orphelin de la Chine.]

Julien, Stanislas. *Tchao-chi-kou-eul: ou, L'orphelin de la Chine: drame en prose et en vers, accompagné des pièces historiques qui, en ont fourni le sujet de nouvelles et poésies chinoises. Avec spécimen du texte chinois.* Paris: 1834.

Liu, Jung-en, translator and compiler. *Six Yüan plays*; translated with an introd. by Liu Jung-en. Harmondsworth, England: Penguin Books, 1972.

Yunbo, Liu. *Summer Snow and Other Yuan Dynasty Stories*, retold by Liu Yunbo; illustrated by Leong Kum Chuen. Singapore: Federal Publications, 1991.

II. Other Yuan plays translated in the nineteenth century arranged chronologically

Davis, Sir John Francis, translator. *Laou-Seng-urh, or, "An Heir in His Old Age." A chinese Drama.* London: J. Murray, 1817.

Davis, Sir John Francis, translator. *Han Koong Tsew, or, The Sorrows of Han: A Chinese Tragedy. Translated from the original with notes.* London: Printed for the Oriental Translation Fund by A. J. Valpy, 1829.

Julien, Stanislas, translator. *Hoeï-lan-ki; ou, L'histoire du cercle de craie, drame en prose et en vers, traduit du chinois et accompagne de notes par Stanislas Julien.* London, Printed for the Oriental Translation Fund of Great Britain and Ireland, sold by J. Murray, 1832.

Bazin, Antoine Pierre Louis. *Théâtre chinois; ou, Choix de pièces de théâtre, composées sous les empereurs mongols, traduites pour la première fois sur le texte original, précédées d'une introduction et accompagnées de notes, par M. Bazin aîné.* Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1838. [Contains four plays.]

Julien, Stanislas, translator. *Si-siang-ki: ou, l'histoire du pavillon d'occident: comédie en seize actes traduite du chinois. Extrait de l'Atsume Gusa.* Genève: H. Georg-Th-Mueller; Paris: Ernest Leroux; London: Trubner and Co., 1872-80.

Stanton, William, editor. *The Chinese drama.* By William Stanton. Hongkong [etc.]: Printed by Kelly & Walsh, 1899. [Contains three plays.]

III. Translations of Chinese drama, 1967-2000 arranged chronologically

Scott, A. C. (Adolphe Clarence), compiler. *Traditional Chinese plays; translated, described, and annotated by A. C. Scott.* Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press, 1967. [Contains six plays.]

Meserve, Walter J., compiler. *Modern drama from Communist China.* New York: New York University Press, 1970. [Includes one Yuan drama.]

Hung, Josephine Huang. *Classical Chinese Plays*. Taipei: Mei Ya Publications, 1971. Second edition: London: Vision Press, 1972. [Contains five plays

Four plays of the Yuan drama, translated with introduction and annotations by Richard F. S. Yang. Taipei: China Post, [1972]. [Contains four plays.]

Wang, Yao-Ching. *The jewel bag: a traditional Chinese play, translated and adapted with an introduction and stage directions by Josephine Huang Hung*. Taipei: Mei Ya Publications, 1974.

Hayden, George A. *Crime and Punishment in Medieval Chinese Drama: Three Judge Pao Plays*. Cambridge, MA: Council on East Asian Studies, Harvard University; distributed by Harvard University Press, 1978. [Contains three plays.]

Eight Chinese plays from the thirteenth century to the present, translated with an introduction by William Dolby. New York: Columbia University Press, 1978.

Chinesische Dramen der Yüan-Dynastie: 10 nachgelassene Übers. Von Alfred Forke. Wiesbaden: Steiner, 1978.

Coyaud, Maurice. *Les opéras des bords de l'eau: théâtre Yuan, XIIIe-XIVe siècles*, [trans.] Maurice R. Coyaud, Angela K. Leung, Alain Peyraube. Paris: Pour l'analyse du folklore, 1983.

Crump, J. I. (James Irving). *Chinese theater in the days of Kublai Khan*. Ann Arbor, MI: Center for Chinese Studies, University of Michigan, 1990. [Includes English translations of three Chinese plays.]

Ellis, Myra, translator. *The heroine*. Singapore: Federal Publications, 1990.

Elf chinesische Singspieltexte aus neuerer Zeit: nebst zwei Dramen in westlicher Manier, übersetzt von Alfred Forke; bearbeitet und ergänzt von Martin Gimm. Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1993.

IV. Translations of *Hao qiu zhuan* arranged chronologically

[Percy, Thomas, translator and editor.] *Hau kiou choaan, or the pleasing history.* 4 vols. London: R. and J. Dodsley, 1761. [Second edition 1774.]

_____. *Hau kiou Choaan, histoire chinoise*, traduite de l'anglois [sic], par Mxxx. [A. Eidous]. 4 vols. Lyon: 1766.

_____. *Haoh kjoh tschwen, d.i. Die angenehme Geschichte des Haoh Kjoh; ein chinesischer Roman. Aus dem Chinesischen in das englische, und aus diesem in das Deutsche ubersetzet; nebst Anmerkungen, mit dem Inhalte eines chinesischen Schauspiels, einer Abhandlung von der Dichtkunst, wie auch von den Spruchwortern der Chineser, und einem Versuche einer chinesischen Sprachlehre fur die Deutschen.* Translated by Christoph Gottlieb von Murr. Leipzig: bey Johann Friedrich Junius, 1766.

_____. *Chineesche Geschiedenis, behelzende de gevallen van den Heer Tieh Chung-u en de Jongvrouw Shuey Ping-sin. Nevens het kort begrip van een Chineesch tooneelspel, eenige Chineesche dichtstukjes, en eene verzmeling van spreekwoorden der Chineezen.* Amsterdam, 1767.

_____. *Hau-Kiu-Choaan, ou l'union bien assortie, roman chinois.* 1828.

Davis, Sir John Francis, translator. *The Fortunate Union, a romance, translated from the Chinese original, with notes and illustrations. To which is added, a Chinese tragedy.* 2 vols. London: Printed for the Oriental Translation Fund, and sold by J. Murray, 1829.

Arcy, Guillard d'. *Hao-khieou-tchouan, ou la femme accomplie. Roman chinois.* Paris: B. Duprat, 1842.

Anonymous. *Tieh und Pinsing, ein Chinesischer Familien-roman in Funf Buchem, von Haoh Kjeoh*, 1869.

Anonymous. *Shueypingsin: a story made from the Chinese romance Haoukewchuen by an Englishman.* London: K. Paul, Trench, Truber & Co., 1899.

Baller, Frederick, editor. *The Fortunate Union,* Hao qiu zhuan. Edited with notes. Shanghai: Mei-hua, 1904.

_____. Second edition, with additional notes, 1911.

Soulié de Morant, Georges. *La brise au clair de lune, "Le deuxième livre de génie," roman chinois traduit par George Soulie de Morant.* Paris: B. Grasset, 1925.

_____. *Haou k'ew chuan. The Breeze in the Moonlight*, translated from the Chinese by Charles George Soulié de Morant and done into English by Henry Bedford-Jones. NY and London: G. P. Putnam's sons, 1926.

Brueggman, H. *Die Geschichte einer vollkommenen Liebe*, 1926. [Reprinted 1944]

Kuhn, Franz. *Eisherz und Edeljaspis oder die Geschichte einer glucklichen Gattenwahl, ein Roman aus der Ming Zeit.* Leipzig: Insel-Verlag, 1927. [Reprinted 1935, 1936, and 1947]

V. Translations of *Fo guo ji* arranged chronologically

Rémusat, M. Abel Jean-Pierre. *Foe Koue Ki, ou Relation des Royaumes Bouddhiques: Voyage dans la Tartarie, dans l'Afghanistan et dans l'Inde, exécuté à la fin du IVe siècle par Chy Fa Hian. Traduit du chinois et commenté par Abel Remusat. Oeuvre posthume revue, complétée, et augmentée d'eclairissements nouveaux par MM. Klapoth et Landresse.* Paris: L'Imprimerie Royale, 1836.

Laidlay, J. W. *The pilgrimage of Fa Hian: from the French ed. of the Foe koue ki of MM. Remusat, Klaproth, and Landresse; with additional notes and illustrations.* Calcutta: Printed by J. Thomas, Baptist Mission Press, 1848.

Beal, Samuel. *Travels of Fah-Hian and Sung-Yun, Buddhist pilgrims, from China to India (400 A. D. and 518 A. D.)* London: Trubner & Co., 1869.

Giles, Herbert A. *Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms.* London: Trubner & Co., 1877.

Legge, James. *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms; Being an Account by the Chinese Monk Fâ-hien of his travels in India and Ceylon (A. D. 399-414) in Search of the Buddhist Books of Discipline. Translated and annotated with a Corean recension of the Chinese text by James Legge.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1886.

Giles, Herbert A. *The Travels of Fa-hsien (399-414 A.D.), or Record of the Buddhistic Kingdoms. Re-translated by H. A. Giles.* Cambridge: Cambridge U. Press, 1923.

VI. Translations of texts relating to Xuanzang arranged chronologically

Julien, Stanislas. *Histoire de la vie de Hiouen-Thsang et de ses voyages dans l'Inde, depuis l'an 629 jusqu'en 645, par Hoei-li et Yen -thsong. Suivie de documents et d'eclaircissements geographiques tires de la relation originale de Hiouen-*Thsang, traduite du chinois par Stanislas Julien. Paris: Imprimerie. imperiale, 1853.

_____. *Mémoires sur les contrées occidentales, traduits du sanscrit en chinois, en l'an 648, par Hiouen-thsang, et du chinois en francais par m. Stanislas Julien.* Paris, L'Imprimerie impériale, 1857-1858.

Beal, Samuel. *The Life of Hiuen-Tsiang by the shaman Hwui Li with an introduction containing an account of the works of I-tsing.* London: Trubner & Co., 1888.

_____. Si-yu-ki. *Buddhist records of the western world. Translated from the Chinese of Hiuen Tsiang (A.D. 629) by Samuel Beal.* London: K. Paul, Trench, Trübner & Co., Ltd., [188-?].

VII. Translations of Chinese travel literature/literature pertaining to foreigners in China arranged alphabetically by translator

Cordier, Henri. *Une mission chinoise en Annam (1840-1841) Traduit du Chinois par feu Henri Fontanier. Relation inédite publiée par H. Cordier.* Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1903.

Douglas, Robert K. *The Life of Jenghiz Khan. Translated from the Chinese, with an introduction. Translated from the* Yuen she*, or "The History of the Yuen Dynasty", by Sung Leen; the* Yuen she luy peen*, or "The History of the Yuen*

dynasty classified and arranged", by Shaou Yuen-ping; and the She wei*, or "The Woof of History" by Chin Yun-se ih.* London: Trubner & Co., 1877.

Hervey de Saint-Denys, Léon, Marquis d'. *Ethnographie des peuples étrangers à la Chine: ouvrage composé au XIIIe siècle de notre ère, par Ma-Touan-Lin; traduit pour la première fois du Chinois avec un commentaire perpétuel par le marquis d'Hervey de Saint-Denys.* 2 vols. Geneva: H. Georg; Paris: E. Leroux; London: Trubner, 1876-83.

_____. *Mémoire sur le pays connu des anciens chinois sous le nom de Fou-Sang: et sur quelques documents inédits pouvant servir à l'identifier.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1876.

_____. *Mémoire sur l'histoire ancienne du Japon: d'après le* Ouen Hien Tong Kao *de Ma-Touan-Lin, par le marquis d'Hervey de Saint-Denys.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1872.

Julien, Stanislas. *Les Avadânas; Contes et apologues indiens inconnus jusqu'à ce jour, suivis de fables et de poésies chinoises; traduction de m. Stanislas Julien.* 2 vols. Paris, L. Hachette et cie.,1860.

_____. *Documents historiques sur les Tou-Kioue (Turcs) traduit du chinois par Stanislas Julien.* Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1877.

_____. *Examen critique de quelques pages de chinois relatives à l'Inde, traduites par M. G. Pauthier; accompagne de discussions grammaticales sur certaines règles de position, qui, en chinois, jouent le même role que les inflexions dans les autres langues; par M. Stanislas Julien, de l'Institut.* Paris: Imprimerie royale, 1841.

_____. *Melanges de geographie asiatique et de philologie sinico indienne, extraits des livres chinois.* Paris: Imprimerie Imperiale, 1864.

Legge, James. *The Nestorian monument of Hsi-an fu in Shenhsi, China: relating to the diffusion of Christianity in China in the seventh and eighth centuries, with the Chinese text of the inscription, a translation, and notes, and a lecture on the monument, with a sketch of subsequent Christian missions in China and their present state, by James Legge.* London: Trubner & Co., 1888.

Rémusat, M. Abel Jean-Pierre. *Description du royaume de Camboge, par un voyageur chinois qui a visité cette contrée a la fin du XIIIe siècle; précédée d'une notice chronologique sur le même pays, extraite des Annales de la Chine; traduite du chinois par M. Abel-Rémusat.* Paris: Imprimerie de J. Smith, 1819.

_____. *Histoire de la ville de Khotan, tirée des annales de la Chine et traduite du chinois; suivie de Recherches sur la substance minerale appelée par les Chinois pierre de iu, et sur le jaspe des anciens.* Paris: Imprimerie de Doublet, 1820.

Staunton, Sir George Thomas. *Narrative of the Chinese Embassy to the Khan of the Tourgouth Toulais: in the years 1712, 13, 14, and 15. By the Chinese Ambassador; translations by Sir George Thomas Staunton.* London: J. Murray 1821.

Weston, Stephen. *The Conquest of the Miao-tse; an Imperial Poem, by Kien-Lung, entitled, A Choral Song of Harmony for the first Part of the Spring. By Stephen Weston, F. R. S. S. A. From the Chinese.* [London]: Baldwins, 1810.

VIII. For strange/weird news reports, see the short translations passim in these two periodicals:

The Indo-Chinese Gleaner: Containing miscellaneous communications on the literature, history, philosophy, mythology, &c. of the Indo-Chinese nations, drawn chiefly from the native languages. Malacca: 1817-1822.

The "Asiatic Intelligence' section of the *Asiatic Journal and Monthly Register*. London: Parbury, Allen, and Company, 1816-1845.

IX. Other texts cited

Anonymous review of *Jerusalem Delivered,* translated by J. H. Wiffen. *Quarterly Review* 34.67 (Jun, 1826): 1-19.

Anonymous review of *Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms* by H. G. Giles. The *North China Herald*. July 14, 1877: 33-34

Anonymous review of *Laou-Seng-urh, or 'An Heir in His Old Age', A Chinese Drama* by John Davis. *Quarterly Review* 16.32 (Jan 1817): 396-415.

Anonymous review of *Translations from the Chinese* by Robert Morrison and John Davis. *Quarterly Review* 13.26 (Jul 1815): 408-18.

Anson, George. *A Voyage Round the World in the Years 1710-14*. London: Printed for W. Bowyer and J. Nichols, 1776.

Bloom, Harold. *The Anxiety of Influence; A Theory of Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1973.

Chen, Shouyi. "The Chinese Orphan: A Yuan Play. It's Influence on European Drama of the Eighteenth Century". *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Edited by Adrian Hsia. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998,

_____. "Thomas Percy and His Chinese Studies". *The Vision of China in the English Literature of the Seventeenth and Eighteenth Centuries*. Edited by Adrian Hsia. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 1998,

Fan, T. C. "Sir William Jones's Chinese Studies." *Review of English Studies* 22 (1946): 304-314.

Gambier, Yves. "La Retraduction, Retour et Détour." *META* 39.3 (Sept 1994): 413-7.

Giles, H. Review of *A Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms*, by Dr. Legge, Oxford 1886. *Journal of the North China Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* new series 21 (1886): 315-20.

Kujamäki, Pekka. "Finnish Comet in German Skies: Translation, Retranslation and Norms." *Target* 13.1 (2001): 45-70.

Mchught, Florence and Isabel. *The Dream of the Red Chamber: a Chinese novel of the early Ching period, English translation by Florence and Isabel McHugh based on the German version, Der Traum de roten Kammer.* London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1958.

Morse, Hosea Ballou. (1926-1929). The Chronicles of the East India Company, Trading to China, 1635-1834. 4 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pauthier, G. Review of Dictionnaire Français-Latin-Chinois de la langue Mandarine parlée, par Paul Perny. Journal Asiatique sixth series, 17 (Mar-Apr 1871): 353-60.

St. André, James. "Xianzai fanyi lilun yu guoqu fanyi shijian: yi *Hao qiu zhuan* wei li" (Modern translation theory and past translation practice: European translations of the *Hao qiu zhuan*). *Chung-wai Literary Monthly* 29.5 (October 2000): 105-129.

Venuti, Lawrence. *The Translator's Invisibility: A History of Translation.* London: Routledge, 1995.

Wilson, H. H. "Account of the Foe kúe ki, or Travels of Fa Hian in India, translated from the Chinese by M. Remusat". *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 5 (1839): 108-40.