

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果報告 期末報告

探討《尤利西斯》意識流中譯本和翻譯目的論—兼論原文語境
及蕭乾的翻譯恐懼感

計畫類別：個別型計畫
計畫編號：MOST 107-2410-H-003-062-
執行期間：107年08月01日至108年07月31日
執行單位：國立臺灣師範大學翻譯研究所

計畫主持人：鄭永康

計畫參與人員：碩士級-專任助理：陳冠瑜

中華民國 108 年 10 月 31 日

中文摘要：本計劃將深入探討蕭乾的《尤利西斯》中文譯本，並將其所採取的意識流文本翻譯策略與喬伊斯撰寫的初衷進行充分比較。蕭乾因顧慮到中國內部保守的政治社會環境而選擇放棄《尤利西斯》原文中關鍵的意識流現代主義表現型式。喬氏對意識流風格的堅持有目共睹，這在與他親友的書信來往及諸多文獻中歷歷可見。相對的，蕭乾與文潔若聯手翻譯該書的當時，中國內部仍處於風聲鶴唳共產主義強權管制的社會氛圍，再加上當初學術圈給現代主義文學套上了資產階級頹廢罪名，使兩位譯者不得不採取了傳統敘述風格完成翻譯，遺棄喬氏所堅持的意識流。

翻譯學學者弗米爾(Hans J. Vermeer)所創立的目的論(Skopos theory)指出譯者可以以最大彈性根據目的(skopos)決定採用適宜的翻譯策略，蕭氏的作法似乎與此吻合。然而喬伊斯研究專家大部分認為文中意識流風格遠比故事情節重要，畢竟《尤利西斯》一書為眾所公認的現代主義文學佼佼者，失去了原有的特質風格其意義何在？其實目的論也接受所謂「文本間相關性」(intertextual coherence)，即在特定文學著作的翻譯，亦適合採取與原文風格一致的翻譯文筆。本計劃將更深入檢視蕭氏選擇與原文不同的文筆風格背後之諸多因素與原由，以便能對當代喬伊斯研究，特別是喬氏著作中文翻譯研究有所貢獻。

中文關鍵詞：尤利西，斯喬伊斯，蕭乾與文潔若，文學翻譯，意識流，翻譯策略，恐懼感，目的論

英文摘要：This proposed study will be a critique of Xiao Qian's Chinese translation of Ulysses from the perspectives of James Joyce's original intention and the translator's own chosen translation strategies. Joyce's intention is evident and well documented in his countless correspondences with contemporaneous writers, declarations and many writings by Joyce scholars such as Richard Ellman, as well as in his many extant notes and in how he revises his writings, oftentimes even meticulously adding alterations to galley proofs following last-minute inspirations. From all these, it can be seen how he insisted on his stream of consciousness and interior monologue modes. Xiao Qian, however, has turned a blind eye on this, but as we shall see below, he was more concerned about another type of context when he decidedly opts to jettison Joyce's psychological modes altogether from his translation. Thus, while James Joyce writes Ulysses in the context of creating tension between creative syntax and expressive form, Xiao, in his turn, follows a more sociopolitical context, adopting instead a politically-

correct, “non-bourgeois” colloquial format by decidedly doing away with the original stream of consciousness and monologue formats of the source text.

Hans Vermeer writes that he translator is supposed to be an expert and it is up to him to decide what role a source text plays in his translational action. Scholars like Umberto Eco, Karen Lawrence and many others have always insisted that form far outweighs story in *Ulysses*. This adamancy on form at the expense of story actually also resonates well with the Skopos theory when Vermeer explains that it is likewise possible to consider “intertextual coherence” between target and source texts when called for. Yet, during the period of Xiao’s translation of the novel, China was still a hardcore police state and Xiao perhaps sensed the need to toe the official line. Vermeer writes that as translator, one must know what one is doing, and what the consequences of such actions are, e. g. what the effect of a text created in that way will be in the target culture. In times of official dislike for bourgeois Modernist styles, Xiao was obviously intimidated. Xiao’s alleged fears and anxieties could be gleaned from the timing of his translation strategy shift in the last episode: When the political situation eased up, Xiao and Wen boldly adopted the quaint format we now observe in their version of “Penelope.” The result is decidedly more Modernist, and sufficiently bolder, than his translation of the previous 17 episodes. It may therefore seem true that when an overall situation changes, skopos too tends to swing direction at will when called for by circumstances, and this could perhaps be the case of Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo. This is something certainly worth looking into. This study will further explore Xiao and Wen’s version, with consideration of the background that affected Xiao’s strategy so as to better shed light on the sociopolitical circumstances that helped shape the translation of this important classic.

英文關鍵詞：Ulysses, James Joyce, Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo, literary translation, stream of consciousness, translation strategy, fear, skopos

This MOST Research Project entitled 探討《尤利西斯》意識流中譯本和翻譯目的論—兼論原文語境及蕭乾的翻譯恐懼感 was completed as scheduled, including the writing of a journal paper that was later accepted by the *SPECTRUM: Studies in Language, Literature, Translation, and Interpretation*, an academic journal listed as one of the publications approved by the College of Liberal Arts at National Taiwan Normal University for teacher research performance evaluation and promotion. The following is the complete journal paper that I have submitted for publication.

恐懼感與翻譯策略：蕭乾和文潔若的尤利西斯中譯本¹
Fear and Strategy: Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo's Chinese Translation
of *Ulysses*
鄭永康*
(Carlos G. Tee)

摘要

意識流為尤利西斯最重要表現風格，蕭乾與文潔若卻採取更為政治正確的翻譯策略，放棄喬伊斯原文關鍵文體表現方法。蕭氏夫婦雖然熟悉意識流，但因時代客觀因素不得不放棄。中國一九三零年代前後文人左右派系鬥爭激烈，使得現代主義文學在中國發展困難重重，甚至無法生根，也負面影響了尤利西斯一書的接受度。後來共產主義崛起，共產黨橫掃中國後迫使知識份子走社會主義路線。無數文學界菁英在文革時代受盡紅衛兵鬥爭迫害，蕭氏夫婦無法倖免。共產黨整風反右，蕭乾被扣上右派罪名抓去勞改，獲釋後並被判不得從事寫作。一九九零年代蕭氏夫婦受託翻譯尤利西斯一書，歷經多年政治破壞，格外小心謹慎，儘管早期喜愛心理敘述表現風格，但最終所採取翻譯策略完全放棄意識流。在她「翻譯與衝突」一書中，夢娜貝克提及「選擇性挪用」(selective appropriation)一詞，指翻譯輸出譯文中因意識形態等原因，譯者刻意增加或省略的作法。透過中國當代歷史演變之探索、兩位譯者論述、以及近代中國學者相關研究，可明顯看出蕭氏夫婦放棄意識流風格正是選擇性挪用典型例子，是二位譯者面對政治現實而自我抑制 (self-censorship) 的必然後果。本文透過文本比

¹ 本論文之產出獲科技部專題研究計畫補助 (計畫編號 107B0248: 107 年 8 月 1 日至 108 年 7 月 31 日)

*國立臺灣師範大學翻譯研究所助理教授。

較探討蕭乾與文潔若如何偏離喬氏原文的意識流風格，並深入分析他們所採取的翻譯策略，及抉擇背後之時代背景和其他關鍵因素。

關鍵詞：蕭乾與文潔若、尤利西斯、文學翻譯、翻譯策略、喬伊斯、夢娜貝克、意識流、恐懼感、現代主義

Fear and Strategy: Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo's Chinese Translation of *Ulysses*

恐懼感與翻譯策略：蕭乾和文潔若的尤利西斯中譯本²

Carlos G. Tee^{*}

(鄭永康)

Abstract

The stream of consciousness mode is a key feature of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, but Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo have turned a blind eye on this as they followed a more socio-political strategy to drop Joyce's psychological modes altogether from their translation. Xiao and Wen have a reason for choosing said strategy despite Xiao's familiarity with the technique. Several factors forced them to drop the stream of consciousness mode in favor of a politically-correct format. After all, historical developments did not allow literary Modernism to thrive and *Ulysses* to be accepted in 20th-century China. The quarrel between the leftists and the rightists among men of literature contributed to this negative atmosphere. Then, the rise of communism made things even worse with the state's subsequent coercion of writers and translators to toe the official line. But perhaps the single most determining factor was the Cultural Revolution and its attendant atrocities. Xiao was labeled a rightist, purged by Mao's Red Guards, banished to a Chinese gulag, and was forbidden from writing after his release. Political persecution made him extra cautious, and their decision to jettison Joyce's stream of consciousness mode is understandable. In *Translation and Conflict*, Mona Baker brings forward the concept of "selective appropriation," which she argues to be evident in patterns of omission and addition that are traceable in the target text itself. Relevant historical events, personal accounts from Xiao and Wen, as well as more recent studies by PRC scholars show that their strategy of purging the stream of consciousness technique altogether from their translation is a classic example of selective appropriation resulting from self-censorship, of adopting a translation strategy in consideration of political reality. This paper examines Xiao and Wen's translation strategy by comparing sample excerpts, and provides a historical account of decisive historical events.

Keywords: Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo, *Ulysses*, Chinese translation, translation strategy, stream of consciousness, James Joyce, Mona Baker, fear, Modernism

² This paper was completed through a financial grant from the ROC Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) (Research Project No. 107B0248; August 1, 2018 – July 31, 2019).

^{*} Assistant Professor, Graduate Institute of Translation and Interpretation, National Taiwan Normal University.

Introduction

In her book written to celebrate the 100th year of Bloomsday, Nola Tully writes in comment of how *Ulysses* was received initially:

The degree to which reviewers missed Joyce's meaning is in direct proportion to the degree of fame *Ulysses* immediately attracted. The first and least interesting conception was that Joyce had written a book of pornography. Beyond this, an inability to discern a purpose to the structure of *Ulysses* unnerved many readers. This omission was intentional on Joyce's part and although the underlying structures of *Ulysses* are extremely complex—possibly overly systemized, as Joyce himself commented—he kept his scheme secret. He boasted that the unraveling of the themes and structures would occupy scholars and professors for years to come and thus ensure the author's immortality. (Yes 23)

These words underscore the fact that Joyce's deliberately adopted methods of expression to block readers' understanding of his carefully crafted discourse. Tully's words, convincingly emphasizing the significance of the Modernist stylistic character of *Ulysses*, best illustrate how Joyce insisted on his adopted method. This leads us to the issue of how Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo adopted their translation strategies and the crucial factors that led to that choice.

"A gold medal is better than the silver one," Wen Jieruo (Murphy 8) gloats with obvious delight and self-gratification upon finishing the translation of *Ulysses* ahead of Jin Di, the other translator who started much earlier than the husband-and-wife team. Yet while the fable tells us how the hare and the tortoise agreed to compete by traversing across the same distance, Xiao³ and Jin took radically different approaches in translating *Ulysses*. While Jin tried to carefully mimic the often-challenging stream of consciousness poetics of the original, Xiao deliberately deviated from this controversial format for reasons that we will explore in this study. Before doing that, it would be helpful to go back in time and trace the development of this style in Joyce's famous work.

Before he even began writing the novel, James Joyce found the then-existing modes and techniques of representing acts of the mind and matters of the emotion insufficient for writing his long novel. As we very well know, Joyce later adopted the interior monologue and stream of consciousness techniques⁴, to which he assigned the task of portraying the drama of life in the minds and hearts of his characters down to their infinitesimal details. More often than not, these expressions representing human thought are chaotic, at times also "pre-conscious," and follow unconventional laws of association different from common logic as we know it. As Umberto Eco observes, in *Ulysses* what is inessential becomes the center of action, and important things no longer happen in the novel, but a variety of little things thrown in without order or sense of coherence (39).

In the early 20th century, or to be more precise, from the 1910s onward, formal and linguistic experimentations were the call of the day in the literary world. For the writer of

³ In this paper, "Xiao and Wen" is sometimes shortened as "Xiao" for brevity purposes.

⁴ These two similar techniques are often collectively referred to as "stream of consciousness" in this paper.

literature in the Modernist period, it was necessary to innovate, to “make it new,” as Ezra Pound once said. Among James Joyce’s contemporaries in this movement were Virginia Woolf, Franz Kafka, Gertrude Stein, William Faulkner, T.S. Eliot, W.B. Yeats, Marcel Proust and others.

James Joyce didn’t invent these two techniques. They had precursors in previous literary periods, namely in the celebrated works of Austen, Tolstoy, Dostoyevsky, Flaubert and many others. It was opportune that Joyce’s writing career roughly coincided with that period in literary history when authors disdained the omniscient point of view that had traditionally been the staple technique for fiction writing for virtually all earlier novelists (Thornton 25). The disappearance of the omniscient storyteller posed great challenges on the reader, who as Vicki Mahaffey concludes, must pay more attention to style, sound, imagery and form if they are to make out the correct meaning behind literary texts (viii). And yet while Joyce didn’t invent these techniques, he expanded them and brought them to a state of perfection. In adopting these experimental modes, Joyce wanted to achieve certain distinctive effects that best express his deepest artistic intentions (Thornton 1). It is thus often said that what Charles Baudelaire had done for poetry in the nineteenth century, Joyce did for the novel in the century that came after.

In my earlier papers, I have taken note of how Joyce’s techniques served as stumbling blocks in the translatoric transfer of meaning (“Lestrygonians,” “Reading”, “Enigmatic”). We saw in the Chinese versions of the Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo team, and of Jin Di, exactly how James Joyce’s deliberately playful juggling of psycho-narration, narrated monologue, quoted monologue and autonomous monologue techniques veils meaning and thus, contributes to the difficulty of reading and translating Ulyssean text. This goes to say that the linguistic and cultural differences shown in Joyce’s work tied the translator’s hands and s/he is unable to express all the dimensions of the original text in their entirety in another language.

Translators lose and gain in their translation. In *Truth and Method*, Gadamer argues that translators constantly make renunciations, leading to translated versions that are at once clearer and flatter than the original. Responding, as it were, to the unreasonable demands of old-school literature comparatists, Gadamer explains that a result of such renunciations is that even the most masterful translations must lack some overtones vibrating in the original (*Truth* 386). Yet when we apply this view as we look at the Chinese versions of *Ulysses*, which, as we have mentioned above, were translated following divergent strategies, we come eyeball to eyeball with two very different situations. In the case of Jin Di who tries as much as possible to retain the stream of consciousness and monologue formats in his translation, cultural-linguistic factors forced him to make decisions needed to effectively overcome obstacles, solve problems, get rid of discrepancies, and remove polyvalence, approaches Siegfried Schmidt maintains are nothing out of the ordinary among translators of literature (166). All these goals belong to the same category as tone, connotation, rhythm, color, and other features that the old literature comparatists pinpoint as precisely the problematic areas the literary translator often failed to account for (Weisstein 59; Rifaterre 68; Frenz 121). In the case of Xiao Qian, who, for reasons that we will discuss later, practically abandons Joycean stream of consciousness techniques in his translation, the “point of contention” is not so much as those subtle “infidelities” to the original as to the radical change in form. That change is the wholesale replacement of Joyce’s adopted Modernist representation techniques with Xiao’s evidently realist approach. Xiao was not ignorant when it came to Joyce’s Modernist approach and intentions as we shall see later, but he had his own rationale behind that choice.

In the following sections, we shall discuss Xiao and Wen's translation strategies, as well as look into the socio-political and theoretical backdrops behind their adopted decisions.

A Glimpse into Xiao and Wen's Translation of *Ulysses*

Xiao and Wen's failure to render the stylistic features of Joyce's stream of consciousness in their Chinese translation has been well documented in the writings of Wang Yougui, Lin Yuchen and others. I have also elaborated on the team's translation strategy that stripped Joyce's work of its modernist appeal in my previous publications ("Lestrygonians," "Reading", "Enigmatic").

Let us look into some excerpts of Xiao and Wen's version to focus on the loss of the stream of consciousness format that robbed *Ulysses* of its unique poetics. Here's one typical passage from Joyce:

The full moon was the night we were Sunday fortnight exactly there is a new moon.
(Joyce 137)

In this sentence, five quoted monologues were combined into one passage in which Bloom, despite being troubled all day by the idea of his wife's infidelity, reminisced about happier days with Molly.

The full moon/ was the night we were/ Sunday/ fortnight exactly/ there is a new moon. (137; notations mine)

To better understand Xiao and Wen's approach, let us take a look into how Jin translated this confusing passage, viz.:

我們那天晚上是滿月，兩星期前的星期日，現在正是新月了。(Jin, *Ulysses* 380)

Xiao and Wen's version reads:

兩周前的星期日我們在哪兒時是滿月，所以今天應該剛好是新月。(Xiao, *Ulysses* 197)

Notice how Jin Di retained some of the staccato rhythm in the stream of consciousness moieties of the original, leading to a version that does not read smoothly in Chinese. In contrast, Xiao's translation of the same passage no longer reflects the peculiar syntax of the original. We observe that Xiao's version, well rearranged into regular Chinese pattern, reads quite fluently. In that version, all the quoted monologue fragments were fused and transformed into psycho-narration mode that gives explicit interpretations of the vaguely expressive original monologue snippets.

Erwin Steinberg, who made a comprehensive study of the role of omniscient point of view sentences in *Ulysses*, cites the example of "Lestrygonians" (95). The episode is said to show a strong pattern of psycho-narration sentences appearing at the opening lines of paragraphs, or as paragraphs themselves. In effect, they act like stage directions in a play, orienting readers on what is about to come in any given scene. Let us take a look at the following example from that episode:

As he set foot on O'Connell bridge a puffball of smoke plumed up from the parapet.
Brewery barge with export stout. England. Sea air sours it, I heard... (125)

In the passage above, the opening psycho-narration sentence prepares the reader for the succeeding stream of consciousness bursts that appear in Bloom's mind: Random thoughts about the passing barge, its cargo and its assumed destination. Without the introductory sentence, the succeeding lines would have been difficult to read. Interestingly, Xiao's rendition of the passage is blameless, as follows:

當他來到奧康內爾橋頭時，一大團煙像羽毛般地從欄杆處裊裊升起。那是啤酒廠的一艘駁船，載有供出口的烈性黑啤酒，正駛向英國。我聽說海風會使啤酒變酸的。(386)

Notice, however, that while all the meaning is there, the trademark Ulyssean stream of consciousness mode is all gone in Xiao's translation. Instead, all sentences in the Chinese version are now in third-person narration. Let us examine how Jin Di, the other translator, handles this passage. He translates:

正當他跨上奧康內爾大橋的時候，一大團煙從橋欄杆底下冒了上來。啤酒廠出口裂性黑啤酒的駁船。英國。海上空氣會使它發酸的，我聽人說。(351)

We notice that Jin, after the first sentence in psycho-narration mode, retains the narrated-monologue and quoted-monologue sentences as well as the fragments that came after, just like in Joyce's original text.

Xiao Qian, who in the preface to his translation, sounds to have toed the proletariat line, claims to have been a victim of the excesses of the Cultural Revolution. He is said to have been branded a rightist in 1950 by Mao Zedong's frenzied supporters, spent some time as a political prisoner and later banned altogether from creative writing in 1957 despite his track record of patriotic support for the motherland (Baxter 3). For a man who experienced political persecution, Xiao had reasons to be cautious, and in an air of general suspicion and official dislike of Modernist literature around that period in time in China, not to mention the controversial juridical history of James Joyce's novel, it indeed paid to toe the official line. Thus, while James Joyce writes *Ulysses* in the context of creating tension between creative syntax and expressive form (Gottfried 26), Xiao in turn follows a more socio-political context, adopting instead a politically-correct, "non-bourgeois" colloquial format in his translation by doing away with the trappings of stream of consciousness and monologue modes in the original. Yet, that way Joyce is no longer Joyce. The form of *Ulysses*, often considered the high point of literary Modernism, has been distorted beyond recognition. It was an easy trick for Xiao and Wen to pull on Joyce.

In the run up to the publication of their version, Xiao published some forty articles (Li, "Me" 3) aimed at allaying fears about the banned character of Joyce's controversial original. These articles served as his litmus paper to test the prevailing socio-political air around that time and as his way of generating public discussion of his translation months before its release. In fact, shortly prior to that when the political scene had shown signs of a gradual easing up following a period of more openness and liberalization towards the end of their work, Xiao and Wen boldly adopt a radically different format we now observe in their version of "Penelope." The following is an excerpt from "Penelope":

**take that Mrs Maybrick that poisoned her husband for what I wonder in love with some other man yet it was found out on her wasnt she the downright villain to go and do a thing like that of course some men can be dreadfully aggravating drive you mad and always the worst word in the world what do they ask us to marry them for if were so bad as all that comes to yes because they cant get on without us white Arsenic she put in his tea off flypaper wasnt it I wonder why they call it that if I asked him hed say its from the Greek... (Joyce 6132)

Observe how Xiao rendered the passage into Chinese, and his format:

**就拿那個毒死丈夫的梅布裏克太太來說吧 為的是什麼呢 真奇怪 是不是另外有了情夫呢 對啦 後來敗露啦 居然幹出這等事 難道她不是個地地道道的壞蛋嗎 當然嘍 有些男人就是討厭透頂 簡直能把你逼瘋 滿嘴都是天底下最惡毒的字眼兒 要是我們壞到這個地步 當初他們幹嗎還非要我們嫁給他們不可呢 對啦 那是因為他們沒有我們就過不了日子 她把粘蠅紙上的砒霜刮下來放進他的茶裏了 不就是這樣的嗎 我納悶他們為什麼給起了這麼個名字 [47] 我要是問他 他就會說是從希臘文來的... (1567)

Xiao's language equaled Joyce's fluid English, making his use of blank spaces seem unnecessary. In fact, the segregated format merely functions cosmetically as a style that achieved some distant semblance with Modernist techniques.

Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo's version is replete with examples of how they translated Ulysean stream of consciousness passages into a more realist format, so much so that scholarly critics have voiced strong opinion on their chosen strategy (Lin 1996; Wang 1997).

In my published papers on the translation of *Ulysses*, I discussed how Xiao was often bogged down by interpretation problems of an unmistakably grammatical nature arising out of the very same Joycean thought representation techniques he has rejected. Xiao and Wen's version is said to have sold 85,000 copies in its first edition alone, and even more in its subsequent printings. Yet, as scholars agree, Xiao's version reads more like a reading guide, or at best, a *Ulysses* reference book. The majority of the hundreds of thousands of prospective readers who eagerly bought Xiao's translation, ironically speaking, could therefore find no use for it as a reading guide, for they are unable to read this masterpiece of James Joyce in its bizarre yet brilliant original in the first place.

In the following section we will examine the historical and socio-political backdrop of Xiao and Wen's choice to deviate from Joyce's much-insisted stream of consciousness mode by taking a look at how literary Modernism developed in 20th-century China amidst political upheavals and social turmoil.

Literary Modernism, Communism and Joyce's Reception in China

In her *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*, Mona Baker writes about power, specifically citing the fact that "translation and interpreting are part of the institution of war and hence play a major role in the management of conflict" (2). These words cannot be more relevant in our discussion of Xiao and Wen's translation strategy vis-à-vis *Ulysses*.

But before we proceed to examine the factors of power that helped decide Xiao and Wen's approach, it would be helpful to look into some relevant aspects on the reception of Joyce and the development, or lack thereof, of literary Modernism in China. As in any communist country, the development of literature and the prevailing attitude of writers before and after the 1949 Chinese Revolution were heavily swayed by the dominant Marxist ideology. In fact, the Modernist movement in China developed in a much different way compared to the West: Except for some isolated pockets of writers active in and around Shanghai in the 30s, literary modernism progressed slowly in China owing to the Japanese invasion. Later, before it could recover, the communists took control of the country in 1949, and soon the movement's growth grinded to a halt.

The period from the communist victory to the mid-1970s was characterized by the further rise of war ideology, a virtual extension of the pre-Revolution years that could be traced to as far back as 1937 (Wang, "Ideology" 12). Those were times when political slogans called for protecting the motherland and for safeguarding socialism as the country embarked on its own brand of proletariat social development. What perhaps made it different from previous periods was that it witnessed the total overlapping between the state narrative and mainstream ideology (12). The period that came after, from 1979 to 2000, was a gradual process of opening to the world, highlighted by the rise of realism and modernization, a less-hostile time when being rich was no longer considered sinful nor decadent. In the words of Jin Di, "the opening up of China in the late 1970s brought with it an unprecedented opportunity for the introduction and study of foreign literature" ("Journey" 233).

China's encounter with Modernism began early on, but the first to have such contacts were Chinese students in Europe, from whom the concept of literary modernism trickled down to their compatriots in the late 1920's. Despite the air of negativity arising from the novel's controversial nature and its adverse reception, *Ulysses*, as the most prominent and representative Modernist work known to Chinese intellectuals in that period in time, aroused noticeably avid interest among Chinese writers. Around 1928, writers belonging to such groups as New Moon Literary Circle (*Xinyue pai*) and New Sensation Group (*Xinganjue pai*) already tried their hands on stream of consciousness styles (Xie 63). At one point, there were also intense bickering and debates between leftist and rightist writers in Shanghai, involving famous names like Zhu Guangqian and Shen Congwen, among others. In the later years, as the communist movement grew in its influence on leftist writers, literary realism in the Soviet style rose in prominence among Chinese writers. Being a follower of Shen's group based in Peking, Xiao Qian was said to have been extremely dissatisfied with the politicization of literature by the leftist camp. In direct contrast to followers of the Soviet realist literary movement, Xiao was more inclined towards artistic creativity in literature (Xie 64).

In such a scenario, the reception of Joyce's *Ulysses* among the Chinese intellectuals was rather ambivalent. As already mentioned above, prior to the communist takeover, a number of Chinese writers who had stayed for some time in Europe came to learn about Joyce and the publication of *Ulysses*. In fact, in the years that followed, there have been records of how these Chinese scholars gave their assessments of the controversial work. Chinese intellectuals were first introduced to *Ulysses* as early as 1923 (Tsoi 2). Reception for the novel was ambivalent, largely differing along political lines and conservatism (Tsoi 3) on one hand and openness on the other. One of those who gave favorable comments was the famous Xu Zhimo, who back then was studying in England. In the preface of his published collection of poems, Xu writes:

And there is an Irishman called James Joyce. His name in international literary circles is probably similar to Lenin's in international politics, because he is both worshipped and attacked like him ...Now he has written another book called *Ulysses*. Nobody in Britain and America was willing or daring enough to publish it. Now I believe this book is not only a unique work of this year but will be so for a whole historical period... what great masterly art! (Translated by Jin, *Shamrock* 16)

Another scholar who wrote in favor of *Ulysses* was the celebrated writer Lin Yutang who himself had also done some translation of excerpts from the novel as well as stories from Joyce's earlier work, *Dubliners*.

On the negative side, voices expressing antagonistic views sounded more acerbic though, many of which labeled the novel as “obscene” and “nihilist” (Jin, *Shamrock* 21). In his scathing critique, Zhou Libo, who was popular immediately before and after the Chinese Communist movement swept across China, wrote so vehemently he almost “strangled the life out of Joyce in China” (Tsoi 4). Zhou writes:

Ulysses is a notoriously obscene novel, as well as a notoriously abstruse book, and it was at first banned in Britain... Few other people have been interested in this book, where the reader, cutting through a boundless forest of words, would find nothing but worthless trifles and erratic images... The bizarre formal features of Joyce’s work are closely linked to its empty content. They have nothing to do with literature. (Translated by Jin, *Shamrock* 27-28)

Jin Di observes that in the New China, *Ulysses* was labeled as a novel of poison, full of nihilism, philistinism and obscenity (Shamrock 24-25). In fact, this negative air could be seen when the executive editor of the Joyce Issue of *Western Literature* was “accused of poisoning the youth’s mind and the translation of *Ulysses*, however abridged, was nipped in the frosty climate” (Qing 25). The development of literary modernism in China was turbulent; even more so was the reception of Joyce’s novel.

The Stream of Consciousness Technique and Xiao and Wen’s Translation Strategy

Just like how ambivalent the reception of Joyce and *Ulysses* were in China, Xiao’s attitude on *Ulysses* and Joycean stream of consciousness had also been confusingly erratic as we could glean from his pronouncements and writings at different moments in time.

For one, Cait Murphy recounts Xiao Qian’s visit to James Joyce’s grave in Zurich in 1946 upon which the Chinese translator says: “Here lies the corpse of someone who wasted his great talents writing something very unreadable” (1), and forty-nine years later, during an interview conducted in 1995, Xiao was said to still think Joyce carried his virtuosity too far (Murphy 1). Clearly, Xiao “appeared” unimpressed and was reportedly to have had reservations about Joyce’s stylistic elegance, believing instead that the original author was “arrogant” (Cheu 63).

Similarly, in his paper probing Xiao’s acceptance of the stream of consciousness technique, Xie Nafei reports that Xiao expressed during a press interview in the 1980s his regrets for having been so foolish as to have spent a considerable amount of time studying the technique, which he described as “improper” (63). This contradicts his pronouncement much later after the publication of his translation. In a letter to Li Jingdun, his publisher, Xiao writes that between 1939 and 1945, while working in England covering the war as a news correspondent, he was deeply interested in English psychological novels and had studied *Ulysses* (Li 29).

Xiao was ambivalent as he often appeared to be torn between an avid interest in the psychological style, an attraction which began early on when he was active as a follower of Shen Congwen’s Peking group of rightist intellectuals, and stark political reality in Post-Civil War China.

Xie Nafei in fact claims that under the influence of Shen Congwen and Lin Zhengying, Xiao pursued a hyperrealist form of literary aesthetics and was dissatisfied with the formulaic, conceptualizing attitude that has transformed literature into a mere tool for political struggles (64). In a related article, Li Hui argues that Xiao lamented the futility of the leftist literary movement, which led to much sacrifice but sadly for Xiao, the resulting literary accomplishments were few and far between. Xiao expressed regret that all they have written were mainly aimed

at expressing ideological correctness (83). Xie further argues that it was the realization of this truth that persuaded Xiao to study the stream of consciousness technique, but it was also largely in keeping with his idea that literature must above all stress creativity and the technique concurred well with his creative inclination towards portrayal of a character's inner self. This is corroborated in his letter to Li Jingduan where Xiao mentions that he studied British psychological novels, mainly Joyce's, while stationed in Cambridge (Li, "Feud" 29).

Indeed, Xiao was no stranger to Joyce's stream of consciousness techniques. Even before he left for Europe, Xiao already learned about Joyce's work through a class on Modernist Literature taught by Prof. Yang Zhensheng at Yenjing University in the early 1920's (Xiao, "Encounters" 203). But it was much later on in 1939, soon after he began teaching at the College of Oriental Studies at University of London, that he obtained a two-volume copy of the 1922-edition of *Ulysses* (204). Formal studies on *Ulysses* as an academic field actually began when he was admitted into Cambridge to pursue a degree on British psychological novels (204), but Xiao's avowed favorite was E. M. Forster, one of the first to use the psychological mode in fiction, and with whom Xiao developed cordial friendship during the course of his London stay. Xiao favored readerly fiction over writerly novels. He claimed to have been charmed by Forster's insistence on having a storyline in any work of fiction, which he considered a big departure from Joyce's writing style (204). It is said that Xiao later tinkered with the stream of consciousness technique in some of his works, including his "Beside the Fence" series, among others (Xie 65) and developed his own experimental styles out of this encounter with modernist psychological fiction (Xie 67).

From all these it's rather evident that Xiao was a conservative when it came to literary writing. He writes in 1993 that "as far as China is concerned, I believe that literature must have that verisimilitude, that realistic portrayal of life itself" ("Encounters" 204). Further he comments, "Joyce's style is not my cup of tea, for it is rather dry and quite a challenge to understand" (204). Although at one point in time he opined that *Ulysses* must be translated into Chinese as it would greatly improve Chinese creative writing skills, he later modified this, saying that Joyce's stream of consciousness technique must not be copied hook, line and sinker owing to China's own literary tradition and state of affairs (205). Nonetheless he admitted much later on that he was wrong about his negative comments, citing the fact that *Ulysses* was still going strong fifty years on, with more and more interpretations, annotations and commentaries being made on the novel on a daily basis (204).

In contrast, his translation partner has a different attitude. In an interview, Wen Jieruo says that she adopts her translation styles based on the source text style, for which she had to read works bearing similar stylistics to achieve the desired effects ("Boundless" 211). In translating *Ulysses'* last episode, "Penelope," for example, Wen says that she made sure she first read *Rouputuan*⁵ to better catch that proper ambience (211) before she actually began translating.

In our short intertextual analysis above, we saw how Xiao and Wen's version of *Ulysses* was virtually stripped of the stream of consciousness mode of Joyce's original. What made them do so despite their knowledge of the technique and years of experience in literary translation?

⁵ *Rouputuan*, also known as *Huiquanbao* and *Juehouchan*, and often translated as *The Carnal Prayer Mat* or *The Before Midnight Scholar*, is a 17th-century Chinese erotic novel attributed to Li Yu. "Penelope" is the most erotic episode in *Ulysses*.

Ideological Factors Behind Xiao and Wen's Adopted Strategy

Xiao and Wen were both prolific writers and translators who, in addition to writing many literary pieces, also translated countless books and plays, including those by William Shakespeare, Stephen Leacock and Henrik Ibsen prior to accepting the *Ulysses* translation project. Having said that, one would expect them to have tackled *Ulysses* in a manner that perhaps better reflected their writing experiences, his profound knowledge of the stream of consciousness techniques and their many sojourns into the realm of literary translation.

A number of incidents and pronouncements suggest Xiao to be undecided when it came to observing the original author's writing style in his translation. In an address he made during a conference on literary translation held in Taipei, Xiao talked about the need to emphasize both tone and style in translating literature (Xiao, Random 88), citing the example of Arthur Waley's faithful renditions of Tang poetry. He lauded Waley, commending him for successfully avoiding to turn good wine into plain water. During the same occasion, he expressed conviction that a good translator must look into the artistic intention of the original text, and must mentally reconstruct its original image and context, before "recreating" it in another language (88). Alluding to his own translation of *Ulysses*, Xiao comments that "if the author deliberately hides things, a translator must turn every stone to expose what have been hidden" (89). This is yet one instance showing Xiao didn't think it was necessary to reflect the original style in the translation, in this case, Joyce's technique of veiling meaning in his well-engineered poetics. Yet in his article "*On the Translation of Literature*," published in 1982, Xiao recounts how in 1933, Edgar Snow told him that "a translation must be as close to the original as possible" (Xiao, "Translation" 69). He was then helping Snow translate "*Living China*" (*Huode zhongguo*), the very first time Xiao worked into English. Xiao's attitude in maintaining Joyce's modernist style swung erratically in both directions.

Again, in 1979, during an academic conference held in the University of Iowa, an American scholar asked him about his views on translating style. Xiao responded by comparing translation to walking on a tightrope. "Making it too smooth would mean a distortion of the original, and if one were to be too loyal, the translation would sound too rough" (69).

From the above, we realize that Xiao and Wen seemed unsure about the need to faithfully translate the stream of consciousness style in Joyce's masterpiece. We have discussed above how Xiao studied British psychological novels in the 20s and 30s and how he didn't really appreciate Joyce's meticulously adopted style although he was convinced of its literary significance. In turn, his wife, who was more experienced in professional translation, knew that the retention of stylistic features in original texts is of paramount importance in translating literature. From all these, we realize that Xiao and Wen were keenly aware of the requirements for proper translation, and that the translated version must grasp the spirit of the original (70). That he chose, despite all these, to translate *Ulysses* without reflecting the stream of consciousness style of Joyce's original therefore is quite bewildering.

Several clues point to political reasons behind their chosen approach. Xiao and Wen accepted the commission to translate *Ulysses* in September 1990 after much procrastination, Xiao having been intimidated by the obvious difficulty of the book and his advanced age (Wen, "Why" 1). It was barely a year after the bloody June 4th Tiananmen Incident occurred. The timing was too sensitive. It was not the opportune time to openly flaunt a "decadent" western literary

style, what with the condemnation of Modernist styles and James Joyce just several decades ago still fresh in the Chinese intellectuals' minds.

Speaking about political repression of literary movements in communist China was, until recently, a big taboo. And when people talk about how the state's *longa manus* takes control of and manipulates literary activities, they tend to speak in a subdued tone. This brings to mind what Li Kenan was alluding to when he quotes Yu Jing, as follows:

Different texts, different times, different readers dictate different ways of translating. Of course, adopting which method sometimes is not a prerogative of the translator. Instead, it's a choice made after considering objective conditions in the surrounding environment. If we look at Xiao Qian's method of cutting and pruning here and there as his own personal choice, we will perhaps be reminded of Zhang Guroo who, in the 1950s, abandoned his usual semantics-based translation method in favor of verbatim translation. We could only conclude that it is a direct consequence of external political interference. (qtd. in Li Kenan 47).

The above statement is one of the most candid yet also the most indirect answer to the question of why Xiao and Wen deviated from Joyce's modernist style. Xiao and Wen's stance in translating *Ulysses* reminds us of what Mona Baker said in her book:

But translators may also be loyal to dissident ideologies internal to a culture, or to affiliations and agendas external to a culture, and this may lead them to position themselves differently... (36)

The only difference is that Xiao and Wen were not motivated by loyalty but instead by fear of reprisal.

In my doctoral dissertation, I voiced strong doubts that Xiao and Wen were very likely too intimidated to shadow Joyce's Modernist stylistics in their version of the first seventeen chapters. Xiao was, after all, a victim of the excesses of the Cultural Revolution and condemned to do forced labor in a Chinese gulag. In my paper on the couple's translation of the last episode, "Penelope," I write:

In fact, prior to that when the political scene had shown signs of a gradual easing up following more openness and official policies of liberalization towards the end of their work, Xiao and Wen boldly adopted the quaint format of their version of "Penelope," the one and only episode in their translation where Joyce's playfulness with stylistics is somehow mirrored, in their case, the use of blank spaces to orthographically indicate rests and stops (Tee, "Enigmatic" 204).

Xiao and Wen were deeply aware of the political ramifications of deviating from the official line. After the victory of the Chinese Communist Party in 1949, and in the tumultuous decades that followed, literary translation became a worrisome endeavor for many of the Chinese translators of that time. In his review of the role of ideology in the history of literary translation in 20th-century China, Wang Yougui writes, for instance, that between 1950 and 1976 was a period of quasi-wartime ideology. This period in time was characterized by an emphasis on the socialist road, individual reform (especially of intellectuals), anti-imperialism and class struggle (Wang, "Ideology" 12). It was a period in history when the state narrative and mainstream ideology intertwined. By no means just a coincidence, this period (1957-1979) roughly overlapped with Xiao's banishment to a labor camp and the subsequent prohibition to continue writing (Wen, "Heavenly" 1).

State censorship was another issue. The Chinese government has always maintained a tight hold on publication, banning books that ran contrary to communist social goals. Tan Zaixi reports in 2015 that following more than 30 years of open-door policy, the PRC government has introduced many changes in the way it handles censorship (5), including the adoption of more transparent policies. Yet, to this day, in keeping with the promulgation of the *Regulations on the Administration of Publication*, the Chinese Communist Party continues to uphold the so-called Four Cardinal Principles which put above all things the attainment of the country's socialist goals and the unchallenged leadership of the party.

In addition to government censorship, "there is also what can be called 'self-censorship' operating to effect translation in the PRC" (Tan 8). Translators, publishers or patrons of translation projects may consciously or subconsciously "avoid selecting certain types of material for translation or avoid faithfully translating certain 'sensitive' parts of a chosen text" (8). It is a voluntary act resulting from fear of reprisal.

Interestingly, Perry Link made similar observations. In his assessment of Mo Yan's Nobel Prize win, he addresses the issue of author self-censorship. He writes:

Writers like Mo Yan are clear about the regime's strategy, and may not like it, but they accept compromises in how to put things... Chinese writers today, whether inside the 'system' or not, all must choose how they will relate to their country's authoritarian government. (56)

In such similar dire scenarios, did Xiao and Wen decide their non-stream of consciousness rendition of *Ulysses* in consideration of the risks involved back in the early 1990s just so as to fit into that "system"? Given that Xiao was branded as a rightist in the 1950s and subsequently persecuted, it was extremely probable that the couple was afraid of any government reprisal for introducing a "decadent" Western literary work like *Ulysses* with all its modernist trappings.

Speaking about Chinese dislike for "decadent" western literature, Don Gifford had these words to say:

...Much of the delay can be attributed to the antipathy of the Chinese Communists toward bourgeois liberal Western culture. Joyce's work became caught in the Chinese government's straitened view of literature's role--that it should extol the morally upright deeds of workers, peasants, and soldiers. *Ulysses*—bawdy, irreverent, and anti-heroic—hardly suits. Nor did the Maoist cultural commissars appreciate the literary merits of *Ulysses*, considering it too pessimistic, subjective, and personal. And perhaps worst of all, it was not concerned nearly enough with the great theme of class struggle. (qtd. from Murphy 1)

Despite how the Chinese were tightlipped on official censorship of literature in Post-revolution China, it remains possible to discern signs that jump out between the lines. Just by looking at Xiao's preface to his translation we see some of these telltale signs. There, he sounded to have toed the proletariat line, such as siding with Joyce on the latter's anti-clericalism. In that period in time, the Catholic church in China was constantly persecuted by the Chinese government, reflecting tense relations as the Chinese authorities put a tight clamp on religious practices and in the absence of diplomatic ties with the Vatican, which favored China's Nationalist rivals in Taiwan. Xiao had to prove his loyalty to the motherland. After all, as a boy, Xiao went to a school run by European missionaries and later studied at Fu Jen Catholic University. Elsewhere in his preface he writes: "...the translations of *Ulysses* reflect the reform and openness in

literature and art in China (Xiao, "Preface" 25)," indirectly alluding to more liberal government policies. We could surmise that professing his stand was his way of declaring loyalty to the motherland and doing that in the book's preface makes it stand out even more. For a man regarded by the party as a member of the right wing for which he was banished to the countryside during the Cultural Revolution, and who later tried to commit suicide in 1968, such a wary reaction bordering on trepidation was perfectly understandable.

Neither Xiao nor Wen have openly addressed the issue of fear for possible political reprisal had they adopted the "decadent" stream of consciousness style in their translation. But some two decades after they had published their work, Wen finally made public a matter that deeply troubled Xiao: At the height of the Cultural Revolution, his many years of work studying *Ulysses* and other psychological novels, including notes he took, cards and letters, and his unfinished MA thesis written at the Imperial College all had to be burned in those most difficult of times ("Boundless" 212). The "booty" was previously stashed in a relative's house as the Red Guards committed their excesses during the Cultural Revolution. Such was the fear instilled by the Cultural Revolution in the hearts of Xiao and Wen who were branded as "reactionaries," purged and subjected to intense public criticism repeatedly for many years (Wen, "Heavenly" 2). Lin Kenan reports about the extreme way in which translation censorship was carried out in 1950s Post-Revolution China. He writes:

China belonged to the Socialist camp, and it naturally follows that translators were encouraged or only permitted to translate literary works of the socialist countries, especially those of the Soviet Union. The choice for translators was limited regarding what to translate and sometimes even how to translate. From our current perspective, extreme manipulation of source texts ensued, with political criteria, for example the class struggle, determining the representations of translations. (166)

Although it was decades later that Xiao and Wen completed their translation, the political criteria and the need to manipulate translation texts seemed to have remained ingrained in the minds of these two translators.

Conclusion

Let us take yet one more look at Xiao and Wen's translated version. While the old literature comparatists lament the loss of subtle features such as tone, color and symbolism in translated literature, in the case of Xiao's, the translated text has virtually been divested of the characteristic stream of consciousness and monologue formats of the original. Some people compare translation with cloning, again perhaps reflecting subconsciously the haunting concept of translation equivalence that just refuses to go. Yet if we pamper ourselves by just making a step backwards and, for a few fleeting moments, borrow this idea to look at Xiao's version, it would be easy to realize that Xiao has cloned a Merino lamb from Shetland sheep. Xiao's wholesale watering down of Ulyssean styles has virtually removed vestiges of Modernist format from Joyce's work considered by many as the high point of literary Modernism. Readers of Xiao's translation, therefore, are seriously deprived of the "pleasure of the text" as Roland Barthes would have it, and hundreds of thousands of Chinese readers of Xiao's version have now perhaps

conjured up a mistaken impression of Modernist fiction as being at once bland and tepid, and James Joyce a pitifully third-rate storyteller.

Richard Ellman, biographer of James Joyce, writes about Joyce's feverish penchant for his wanted styles as could be seen in his many extant notes and in how he revised his writings, oftentimes even meticulously adding alterations to galley proofs following last-minute inspirations. Ellman also tells us how James Joyce was highly concerned about the way in which his original phrasings were rendered into foreign languages, such as his participation in or the overseeing of the translation of *Ulysses* into French by his hired team of translators who, partly because of Joyce's characteristic fastidiousness, quarreled among themselves and engaged in professional feuds (Ellman, *James Joyce* 600-607). From all these, it can be seen how the stream of consciousness mode is a crucial feature Joyce made sure he was meticulous about. This must be one of the Jakobsonian contexts that should have facilitated decision-making in translation, notably in so far as fictional technique is concerned. Xiao and Wen, however, have turned a blind eye on this, and as we have seen above, they were concerned about a more socio-political context when they decidedly opted to jettison Joyce's psychological modes altogether from their version. No wonder Lin Yu-chen comments, after meticulous comparison of the two versions, that Xiao's translation of *Ulysses* functions more like a reading guide (166) and that it could serve well as a Chinese primer on Joyce's work (169).

In her book, Mona Baker brings up the concept of "selective appropriation," which she argues to be "evident in patterns of omission and addition that are traceable in the text itself" (114). Baker cites several examples including those whose motivations hinge on racial lines and ethnic self-determination, religious censorship, sexual prudence, national independence movements, slavery and other issues. In terms of selective appropriation within the text, she cites among others patterns of omission that result from the exercise of censorship, including self-censorship (115). From our discussion above, it would be prudent to conclude that Xiao and Wen's strategy of purging the stream of consciousness technique out of their translation of Joyce's *Ulysses* to be a classic example of selective appropriation resulting from self-censorship.

Lin Kenan summarizes this dilemma faced by Chinese translators under the Communist regime. He writes:

Because political considerations were given priority, other functions of literature such as aesthetics and entertainment were given little consideration. Translation, like other forms of literary writing, was supposed to serve the primary purpose of educating the people ideologically, imbuing them with patriotic and communist ideals. (167)

We have seen above how the buildup of factors detrimental to the preservation of Modernist expressive elements in their translation somehow forced Xiao and Wen to abandon the stream of consciousness mode in favor of a politically-correct format. From the overall vantage point, historical developments did not allow literary Modernism to thrive in 20th-century China. The quarrel between the leftists and the rightists among the men of literature of that period in time—a representative microcosm of what was happening in 1930s Chinese society as a whole—contributed to this negative atmosphere. Then, the rise of communism made things even worse with the state's subsequent coercion of scholars and writers to toe the official line. Indeed, it was a difficult period for writers like Xiao who put literary freedom and creativity at the very top of their list of priorities. But perhaps the single most determining factor in their

choice of translation strategy was the Cultural Revolution and its attendant outrages. Xiao was labeled a rightist and was purged by Mao's Red Guards, banished to a labor camp for more than three years and was subsequently forbidden from writing after his release. Political persecution made him extra cautious, and their decision to jettison Joyce's stream of consciousness style despite his interest in the psychological mode is perfectly understandable, especially considering the many decades of official dislike for Modernist literature in China, not to mention the controversial reputation of James Joyce and his novel.

Somehow this choice of strategy by Xiao and Wen, and the unhappy circumstances that made them do so can be poignantly described using Victor Hugo's words a century ago: "When you offer a translation to a nation, that nation will almost always look on the translation as an act of violence against itself" (As cited in Lefevere, *History* 14).

Indeed, history repeats itself, with vengeance.

Works Cited

- Baker, Mona. *Translation and Conflict: A Narrative Account*. London: Routledge, 2006.
- Baxter, Lew. "Joyce Blooms in Beijing." *The Scotsman* 26 June 1995, pp. 1-3.
- Cheu, Hoi Fung. "Translation, Transubstantiation, Joyce: Two Chinese Versions of *Ulysses*." *JJQ*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1997, pp. 59-70.
- Eco, Umberto. *The Aesthetics of Chaosmos: The Middle Ages of James Joyce*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1982.
- Ellman, Richard. *James Joyce*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1982.
- Frenz, Horst. "The Art of Translation." *Comparative Literature: Method and Perspective*, edited by Newton P. Stallknecht and Horst Frenz. Rev. Ed. Carbondale: Southern Illinois UP, 1971, pp. 98-121.
- Gadamer Hans-Georg. *Truth and Method*. 2nd revised ed., translated by Joel Weinsheimer and Donald Marshall, NY: Crossroad, 1992.
- Gottfried, Roy K. *The Art of Joyce's Syntax in Ulysses*. Athens: U of Georgia P, 1980.
- Jin Di. *A Probe into Equivalent Effect*. Revised ed., 等效翻譯探索增訂版 Beijing: China Translation Corp., 1998.
- *In Search of the Principle of Equivalent Effect*. Beijing: China Translation & Publishing Corp., 1998.
- . *Ulysses* 尤里西斯. Taipei: Jiuko Press. 台北:九歌出版社, 1993.
- . "Shamrocks and Chopsticks: The Blooms' Long Journey East: A Chronicle: 1922-1996." *JJQ*, vol. 36, no. 2, Winter 1999, pp. 230-239.
- . *Shamrock and Chopsticks: James Joyce in China*. HK: City U of HK P.
- Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. NY: Vintage Books, 1984.
- Lefevere, Andre. *Translation/History/Culture: A Sourcebook*. London: Routledge, 1992.
- Li, Hui 李輝. *A Biography of Xiao Qian* 蕭乾傳. Nanjing: Jiangsu Cultural Publications, 1993.
- Li, Jingduan 李景端. "The Xiao Qian-Jin Di Feud Over the Translation of *Ulysses*." 蕭乾與金隄翻譯尤利西斯的恩怨. *Tracing Past Events*. vol. 4, 2004, pp. 28-31.
- . "Me and the Chinese Translation of *Ulysses*" 我与《尤利西斯》中译本. *Guangming Daily News* 光明日报. 20 January, 2009. Web, 16 December 2012.
- Li, Kenan. "Toward Methodological Diversity in Literary Translation: Xiao Qian as an Exemplar" 增亦翻譯,減亦翻譯-蕭乾自譯文學作品啓示錄. *Chinese Translators Journal*, vol. 26, no. 3, May 2005, pp. 44-47.
- Lin Kenan. "Translation as a Catalyst for Social Change in China." *Translation and Power*, edited by Maria Tymoczko and Edwin Gentzler. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2002, pp. 160-183.
- Lin, Yu-chen. "On the Two Chinese Versions of *Ulysses*" 評《尤利西斯》中譯兩種. Review of *Ulysses* 尤利西斯, by James Joyce, translated by Jin Di 金隄 and *Ulysses* 尤利西斯, by James Joyce, translated by Xiao Qian & Wen Jieruo 蕭乾·文潔若. *Chung Wai Literary Monthly* 中外文學, vol. 24, no. 12, 1996, pp. 165-170.
- Link, Perry. *The Uses of Literature: Life in the Socialist Chinese Literary System*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2000.
- Ma Huijuan. "Exploring the differences between Jin Di's Translation theory and Eugene A. Nida's Translation theory." *Babel*, vol. 53, no. 2, 2007, pp. 98-111.

- Mahaffey, Vicki. *Modernist Literature: Challenging Fictions*. Malden: Blackwell Publishing, 2007.
- Murphy, Cait. "Ulysses in Chinese." *The Atlantic Monthly*. Sept. 1995, pp. 1-11. Web. 16 June 2019.
- Qing, Wang. "Ulysses: The Novel, the Author and the Translators." *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, vol. 1, no. 1, Jan. 2011, pp. 21-27.
- Riffaterre, Michael. "On the Complementarity of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies." *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, edited by Charles Bernheimer. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 1994, pp. 66-73.
- Schmidt, Siegfried J. *Foundation for the Empirical Study of Literature: The Components of a Basic Theory*. Translated by Robert de Beaugrande. Hamburg: Buske, 1982.
- Steinberg, Erwin R. *The Stream of Consciousness and Beyond in Ulysses*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburg P, 1973.
- Tan, Zaixi. "Censorship in Translation: The Case of the People's Republic of China." *Neohelicon*, vol. 42, no. 1, 2015, pp. 313-339.
- Tee, Carlos G. "Yes The Enigmatic Molly Bloom: Reading and Translating Joycean Autonomous Monologue." *Compilation and Translation Review*, vol. 10, no. 2, 2017, pp. 153-188.
- . "Stream of Consciousness, Peristalsis and Translation: 'Lestrygonians' from the Narratological Perspective." *NTU Studies in Language and Literature*, vol. 29, June 2013, pp. 53-85.
- . "Reading and Translating Stream of Consciousness in *Ulysses*." *Studies of Translation and Interpretation*, vol. 17, 2013, pp. 17-40.
- . *Reading Ulysses, Translating Stream of Consciousness: A Hermeneutic View*. Fu Jen Catholic U, PhD Dissertation, 2013.
- Thornton, Weldon. *Voice and Values in Joyce's Ulysses*. Gainesville: UP of Florida, 2000.
- Tsoi, Pablo Sze-pang. "Joyce and China: A Mode of Intertextuality – The Legitimacy of Reading and Translating Joyce." *LEWI Working Papers*, vol. 61, March 2007, pp. 1-21.
- Tully, Nola. *Yes I said yes I will Yes: A Celebration of James Joyce, Ulysses and 100 Years of Bloomsday*. NY: Vintage Books, 2004.
- Wang, Yougui. "Ideology and the History of Literary Translation in 20th Century China." *Chinese Translators Journal*, vol. 24, no. 5, Sept. 2003, pp. 11-15.
- . "Translations of the Century: A Careful Reading of Two Chinese Versions of *Ulysses*." *JJQ*, vol. 35, no. 1, 1997, pp. 269-79.
- Wang, Zhenping. 王振平 "The Way to Translate *Ulysses*: An Interview with Professor Jin Di" 論翻譯之道,說尤利西斯:金隄教授訪談錄. *Chinese Translators Journal*, vol. 1, 2000, pp. 56-58.
- and Yang Jiaojiao. "On Subjectivity an Inter-Subjectivity in the Translation of *Ulysses* by Jin Di." *Journal of Zhejiang International Studies University*, vol. 3, 2017, pp. 84-89.
- Weisstein, Ulrich. "Reception and Survival." *Comparative Literature and Literary Theory: Survey and Introduction*, translated by William Rigan & Ulrich Weisstein. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1973, pp. 48-65.
- Wen, Jieruo. "Translating A Heavenly Book and Real Feelings." Edited by Han Xue. http://www.ts.cn/special/content/2006-12/11/content_1470223.htm
- . "Why Xiao Qian and I Co-translated *Ulysses*." *China Reading Weekly*, 11 Jul. 2002, <http://site.douban.com/widget/notes/134616/note/99803299/>

- Xiao Qian. "My Encounters with James Joyce: To Comrade Lin Jingduan." *China Academic Journal*, June 1993, pp. 203-205.
- . "Random Notes on Literary Translation" 文學翻譯瑣議. *Reading 讀書*, July 1994, pp. 1-4.
- . "On the Translation of Literature." *Yangcheng Evening News*, 9 April 1982. Print.
- and Wen Jieruo. 蕭乾·文潔若譯. *Ulysses* 尤利西斯. Taipei: Times Publications. 台北:時報出版, 1995. Print.
- , Wen Jieruo and Zhang Hui. "Translation and Creative Writing Are Boundless." *Random Talk on Translation* 翻譯漫談, no. 1, 1999, pp. 210-215.
- Xie Nafei. "A Probe into Xiao Qian's Acceptance of the Literary Stream of Consciousness" 試論蕭乾對意識流文學的接受. *Journal of Guangxi Teachers College (Social Sciences Edition)*, vol. 22, no. 2, Apr. 2001, pp. 63-68.
- Yu Jing. "Twentieth Century Literary Translation in China: Domestication and Zhang Guroo's Translations in Different Periods." MA thesis. Hangzhou Dianzi University, 2002.
-

The research work as specified in my plan of study was followed rigorously, leading to the accumulation of a large body of valuable information on the approved topic. However, owing to the enormous body of information collected, it was not viable to include all the relevant data in just one academic paper as originally defined in the MOST plan. For this reason, in the research paper I have submitted above, focus was more on the issue of fear that led to Xiao and Wen's adoption of a politically correct translation strategy. This strategy could be well explained by Mona Baker's theory of selective appropriation in translation, which provided the theoretical backbone of my discussion in said paper. As a consequence of this revision in focus, the journal article was given an adjusted title that now reads: *Fear and Strategy: Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo's Chinese Translation of Ulysses*

The research done, with the help of my research assistant, yielded enough information on the skopos or intention as circumscribed in Vermeer's skopos theory. The data compiled included a rich treasure trove of data on the historical issues that swayed the translator's intention in addition to fear of state reprisal had they mirrored Joyce's "decadent" modernist styles in the Chinese translation, as well as more personal issues that led to Xiao and Wen's

decision, including professional and personal intrigues between Xiao and Jin Di, the other translator, as well as issues on beating the other team to the publication of their translations, involving Xiao's publisher. These information promises a very substantial and informative treatment of factors in Xiao and Wen's adopted translation strategy in a separate paper. Similarly, enough material on Jin Di's translation approach centering on dynamic equivalence have also been collected. These information, recorded in later interviews given by Jin Di, have never before been covered in Jin's previous book publications expounding his approach in translating *Ulysses*. This could be a third paper that may be derived out of this study.

This project offers, especially through the paper I have attached above, some insights and contributions on the background historical period of the Chinese translations, and more, importantly, the factors leading to the couple's translation strategy. The academic journal paper resulting from this study exposes, to the western reader who otherwise has little access to Chinese-language first-hand information, the factors and socio-political backdrop behind Xiao and Wen's stylistic choice in handling Ulyssean Modernist poetics. This represents a very positive contribution to translation studies research on James Joyce's novel.

One of the sub-goals in this project is the training of the assigned research assistant. Mr. Vincent Chen Kuan-yu, a graduate student at my department, proved to be an efficient collaborator in finding relevant information related to my topics. Attached below is his report and recommendations.

研究助理科技部研究計畫結案報告

計畫名稱：探討《尤利西斯》意識流中譯本和翻譯目的論—兼論原文語境及蕭乾的翻譯恐懼感

計畫主持：鄭永康

研究助理：陳冠瑜

在這次的研究計畫中，我負責協助計畫主持人查找相關資料、採購書籍以及管理經費，以下首先簡略列出工作期間學習到的知識與技巧，再分項詳細探討收穫與心得。

學習&工作項目	搜集計畫資料	採購參考書籍	管理研究經費
I.	工具網站的應用	背景知識架構	熟悉報帳流程
II.	關鍵字查找	管理資料的技巧	
III.	檔案格式轉換		

(1) 工具網站的應用：在瀏覽台灣/中國網站的時候常常會遇到許多問題，不管是搜尋筆數太少、關鍵詞輸入不當，或是採集資料之範圍太廣，都會大大影響搜集資料的過程。剛開始採集資料的時候，都會先透過台灣碩博士論文加值系統搜尋關鍵字，再從關鍵字找到特定的文章，最後縮小範圍，把最符合教授研究需求的文章整理到資料夾。這樣的流程進行兩次後我才發現，因為研究資料大多來自中國的碩博期刊論文，而這些文件主要可以在在中國知網（CNKI）購買或取得，所以才慢慢調整，將中國知網以及特定幾個中國圖書資料庫作為主要搜尋管道。

(2) 關鍵字查找：確立了搜尋資料的管道，接下來會遇到的問題是，關鍵字到底該怎麼輸入，才能有效率的搜尋到教授需要的研究資料。我在查找資料的時候主要是輸入人名與研究領域，等到連結到特定網站後，再挑選出需要的研究論文進一步搜尋。在這個過程中我發現有幾個小技巧。其一，雖然同樣的一個關鍵字可以找到簡繁兩種的內容，但因為中文編碼有自己的一套運算方式，只要關鍵字有一兩個字的差別，就很可能就會因此找不到資料；為了避免這種情況，我在搜尋資料的時候都盡量先將繁體轉換成簡體，再用找到的簡

體關鍵字搜尋簡體內容，如此一來就能縮小搜尋範圍，減少誤差的機率。其二，關於特定西方文學的術語及作家譯名需得特別注意，因為兩岸譯名有所差異，如果一個作者譯名行不通，得到的資料筆數過少，就要馬上想到可能是譯名差異，要用另外一組關鍵字才能找到需要的資料。舉例而言，Ulysses可能譯成尤利西斯或是尤里西斯，翻譯家文潔若的名字，有部分資料會改稱文杰若或文傑若，很多時候幾種版本的排列組合都要試過。

(3) 檔案格式轉換：找到資料以後會遇到另一個問題，那就是檔案該怎麼下載、儲存與管理？下載方面，由於師大或台大的網域都和中國知網有合作，因此只要進入校園網站就能夠取得上面的學術資料，只有少數情況下某些期刊論文並沒有電子檔的版本，必須再跑一趟圖書館才能取得紙本館藏內容。儲存方面多以word或pdf檔案為主，但有些時候從中國知網下載的文件會以中國獨有的檔案格式儲存，這時候就必須要再下載相關閱讀器進行轉檔，才能方便管理和閱讀。另外就是，教授曾經有跟我反映研究參考資料有時候會缺字，後來發現原因在於微軟和蘋果電腦使用不同的編碼，因此必要的時候某些文章需要採用雲端檢視才能維持穩定性。

(4) 管理資料的技巧：管理資料的時候，因為教授很可能在之後一兩個月突然又會使用到之前查過但沒下載的資料，所以我在每一次的查索過程中都會建檔登記，把任何適合的文章都放上去，再由教授篩選後設法取得。在整理的檔案裡面，我主要會先將文章分門別類、標明來源、日期以及取得方式、售價等細節，最後定期統合，以備不時之需。另一件很重要的事情就是要隨時記錄進度，因為下一次工作的時候，由於資料太雜太繁瑣，很可能會忘記原本的進度到哪裡。

(5) 背景知識架構：在查找尤利西斯相關資料的時候，必須要對其在中國的翻譯背景有粗略的認知，才好下手搜尋。首先要知道的是尤利西斯的譯者有兩組，其一為蕭乾文潔若夫婦，其二為金隄，兩者屬於競爭關係。接下來，由於是中國的翻譯環境，我們還必須要考慮到，在該時代背景之下，創作與翻譯都會受到嚴格審查制度的影響，而這也間接導致我在搜索資料時必須要拼湊出零碎的資料，才能整個概念有比較通盤的理解。另外就是，查找的資料不應侷限於書面，許多影片、訪談都是很重要的研究資源。

(6) 熟悉報帳流程：最後的部分是報帳流程，在採買了研究設備、書籍之後，研究助理需要將每個月的每筆開銷確實紀錄、管理，再找校內的出納組跑報帳手續。這部分其實最為

耗心耗神，為了確保報帳流程的順暢，不僅需要和校內窗口進行協調溝通，還需要填寫大量的資料並檢附證明，才能算是完成報帳的第一步。只要任何一個步驟的承辦人員發現資料有不清楚的部分，後續都會馬上聯絡經手人（研究助理），這時候我就必須趕回學校重跑流程，有時候一筆款項從申請到放款都會花上一兩個月的時間。因此，後來我就學會必須提早報帳才不會讓流程跑得太趕。

以上便是研究助理在本次科技部計畫中的大致所學，供科技部人員參考研究使用。

Lastly, after an analysis and review of this project, I recommend that future studies be devoted to the writing of a paper comparing the different strategies adopted by the two groups of translators. Yet another promising topic will be a probe into more details about the sudden change of translation style in the last episode of Xiao and Wen's translation. As I have surmised in my submitted journal paper, the couple adopted the no-punctuation mark, space-segregated style in their rendition of Molly's soliloquy in the last episode when Xiao and Wen were emboldened by the liberalization and opening in Chinese politics and society as they winded up their work on the last episode.

The project has been a fruitful and rewarding experience. Let me again express my sincere gratitude to the Ministry of Science and Technology and to reviewers of my proposal as well. I have learned much from this experience and look forward to more research projects in the years ahead.

107年度專題研究計畫成果彙整表

計畫主持人：鄭永康			計畫編號：107-2410-H-003-062-				
計畫名稱：探討《尤利西斯》意識流中譯本和翻譯目的論—兼論原文語境及蕭乾的翻譯恐懼感							
成果項目			量化	單位	質化 (說明：各成果項目請附佐證資料或細項說明，如期刊名稱、年份、卷期、起訖頁數、證號...等)		
國內	學術性論文	期刊論文		1	篇	(已接受刊登，有接收函) Spectrum: Studies in Language, Literature, Translation and Interpretation, vol. 15 issue 2, pp. 22	
		研討會論文		0			
		專書		0		本	
		專書論文		0		章	
		技術報告		0		篇	
		其他		0		篇	
	智慧財產權及成果	專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			
		著作權		0			
		品種權		0			
		其他		0			
	技術移轉	件數		0	件		
		收入		0	千元		
	國外	學術性論文	期刊論文		0	篇	
			研討會論文		0		
			專書		0		本
專書論文			0	章			
技術報告			0	篇			
其他			0	篇			
智慧財產權及成果		專利權	發明專利	申請中	0	件	
				已獲得	0		
			新型/設計專利		0		
		商標權		0			
		營業秘密		0			
		積體電路電路布局權		0			

		著作權	0		
		品種權	0		
		其他	0		
	技術移轉	件數	0	件	
		收入	0	千元	
參與計畫人力	本國籍	大專生	0	人次	
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士級研究人員	0		
		專任人員	0		
	非本國籍	大專生	0		
		碩士生	0		
		博士生	0		
		博士級研究人員	0		
		專任人員	0		
其他成果 (無法以量化表達之成果如辦理學術活動、獲得獎項、重要國際合作、研究成果國際影響力及其他協助產業技術發展之具體效益事項等，請以文字敘述填列。)					

科技部補助專題研究計畫成果自評表

請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況、研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性）、是否適合在學術期刊發表或申請專利、主要發現（簡要敘述成果是否具有政策應用參考價值及具影響公共利益之重大發現）或其他有關價值等，作一綜合評估。

1. 請就研究內容與原計畫相符程度、達成預期目標情況作一綜合評估

達成目標

未達成目標（請說明，以100字為限）

實驗失敗

因故實驗中斷

其他原因

說明：

2. 研究成果在學術期刊發表或申請專利等情形（請於其他欄註明專利及技轉之證號、合約、申請及洽談等詳細資訊）

論文： 已發表 未發表之文稿 撰寫中 無

專利： 已獲得 申請中 無

技轉： 已技轉 洽談中 無

其他：（以200字為限）

Journal paper based on this research project has been accepted for publication by "SPECTRUM: Studies in Language, Literature, Translation, and Interpretation."

3. 請依學術成就、技術創新、社會影響等方面，評估研究成果之學術或應用價值（簡要敘述成果所代表之意義、價值、影響或進一步發展之可能性，以500字為限）

This project, specifically the paper based on it, is a fairly excellent study on the historical background of Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo's Chinese translation of Ulysses. The English paper I have written offers a comprehensive discussion of the strategy of fear that the translators have adopted in the face of historical and political difficulties in China, where forces unfriendly to Modernist literary works, especially James Joyce's Ulysses, remained active in the course of their translation.

4. 主要發現

本研究具有政策應用參考價值： 否 是，建議提供機關

（勾選「是」者，請列舉建議可提供施政參考之業務主管機關）

本研究具影響公共利益之重大發現： 否 是

說明：（以150字為限）

This study has no findings significant to public welfare policy making.