

得魚忘筌，得意忘言？

——淺論白先勇《臺北人》英、日譯本之得與失^{*}

李明哲

台灣師大翻譯研究所博士生

摘要

文學翻譯和源語及譯語所處的語言文化語境息息相關。Alvarez & Vidal 認為文學翻譯勢必受到源語文化脈絡的牽制；Agar 創「言語文化（*linguaculture*）」一詞申論語言與文化之難割難捨，翻譯即「翻異」；Berman、Venuti 和 Ricœur 等人亦認可語言文化的繁複多音性，致力於突顯不同語言文化之間的異質性及翻譯文本的自主性。

白先勇貴為臺灣現代主義文學外譯的首選作家之一，其離散文學代表作《臺北人》先後譯為多國語言出版。本文首先從言語文化面向出發，比較英、日譯本處理專有名詞的譯注差異；其次，援引 Berman 的文本變形理論（*textual deformation*），佐以 Aixelá 的文化詞翻譯對策，多方考察原作之混雜性和異域性（*hybridity & foreignness*），包括粗俗話、個人方言及文化承載詞等，在源語文本的不可譯性（*untranslatability*）阻隔下，如何以世界文學（*World Literature*）之姿，現身或隱身於譯入語文本。

關鍵詞：文化詞、文學翻譯、白先勇、《台北人》、世界文學

* 本文初稿曾宣讀於「第三屆台灣文學外譯國際學術研討會暨台灣文學譯者論壇」（國立政治大學歐語系主辦，2019. 11. 16），感謝講評人徐菊清副教授的指正與建議。承蒙兩位匿名審查委員專業的修改意見，使本文論點更臻周全，謹致謝忱。

The Gain and Loss in Cross-Cultural Translation:

An explorative study of the English & Japanese renditions of Pai Hsien-yung's *Taipei People*

Lee Ming-Che

PhD student
Graduate Institute of Translation and Interpretation
National Taiwan Normal University

Abstract

Literary translation is closely related to linguistic and cultural contexts specific to the source and target literatures. With that view in mind, Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal presuppose that literary translation has to be culture-bound. Linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar coined the term “languaculture,” identifying the inseparability between language and culture, which is what makes translation an act of “rendering foreignness.” Distinguished scholars, such as Antoine Berman, Lawrence Venuti and Paul Ricœur, have agreeably acknowledged linguacultural plurivocity – a concept which highlights the heterogeneity across languages/cultures and the autonomy of translated corpus.

Pai Hsien-yung has topped the list of the most translated modernist writers from Taiwan. His diaspora-themed masterpiece *Taipei People* has been translated into several foreign languages. Based on Agar’s conceptualization of languaculture, this paper first examines the differences in the translator’s notes from the English and Japanese versions of this work with regards to the denoting of conventional proper nouns. Next, it employs Berman’s “textual deformation” approach and J. F. Aixelá’s strategies in rendering culture-specific items (CSIs), seeking to probe into how the source text’s hybridity and foreignness, which are manifested in its vulgar language, idiolects, and culture-loaded expressions involving inextricable untranslatability, have been made visible or invisible once represented within the terrain of World Literature.

Keywords: Culture-Specific Items (CSIs), Literary Translation, Pai Hsien-yung, *Taipei People*, World Literature

The Gain and Loss in Cross-Cultural Translation:

An explorative study of the English & Japanese renditions of Pai Hsien-yung's *Taipei People*

I. Introduction

This paper aims, from a product-oriented DTS (Descriptive Translation Studies) perspective, to analyze and compare the English and Japanese renditions of Pai Hsien-yung's globally-recognized masterpiece *Taipei People* in various aspects. According to *Bibliographical Synopses of Translated Taiwan Literature (1990-2016)*, due to geocultural proximity and reciprocal academic communication, English and Japanese have been the two primary languages for translating and disseminating post-war modern Taiwan literatures.¹ Since the two language translations in question differ a lot at lexical and cultural levels, and the translators' adjustment approaches tailored for their target audiences show a salient distinction in each, an inquiry hereby arises: With what strategies do the English and Japanese translators attenuate linguistic

1 See Li Linpo et al., *Bibliographical Synopses of Translated Taiwan Literature (1990-2016)* (Tainan: National Museum of Taiwan Literature, 2017). According to this book, there were approximately 470 volumes of Taiwanese literature translations published in nine foreign languages under the governmental patronage. Among them, there was a total of 198 English translations published, including 43 separate editions, 112 issues of *The Taipei Chinese Pen: A Quarterly Journal of Contemporary Chinese Literature from Taiwan* [previously known as *The Chinese PEN* before 2007, whose current Chinese title is *Taiwan wenyi*, formerly known as *Dangdai Taiwan wenxue yingyi* (*Contemporary Chinese Literature from Taiwan*) until 2017], 41 issues of *Taiwan wenxue yingyi congkan* (*Taiwan Literature English Translation Series*), and 2 issues of *Taiwen bihui nienkan* (*Taiwanese Pen*) [a yearly journal of native Taiwanese-language literature]. Meanwhile, there was a total of 93 Japanese translations published (all in book form). Simply put, the English and Japanese translations accounted for 62% of the total sum of publications during this period. This national project sponsored by the public sector is dedicated to enhancing the visibility of Taiwan literature as a peripheral global player in the international arena.

and cultural conflicts between the ST (source text) and the TT (target text) to achieve maximum *literary effects* and/or reader-response for each version? A great amount of research attention has been given to Pai Hsien-yung's self-translation in English, while the Japanese translation has been sparingly studied. In a stricter sense, however, the English version in circulation was far from being completed solely by the author himself. Instead, it was a collaborative work engaging Pai's talented co-translator (Patia Yasin) and their prominent bilingual editor (George Kao). On top of that, *Taipei People* includes three stories that had been rendered by other translators prior to the publication of the book's first English version (1982). In other words, it could be deviating or equivocal to approach this serialized fiction as a pure *self-translation* work. Given that, the present study takes a stance dealing with the book as a team-work translation rather than a self-translation, attempting to address certain linguacultural issues stemming from the comparison of the English and Japanese translations. This article first seeks to investigate differences in the translator's notes for denoting conventional proper nouns and secondly, explores how the English and Japanese translators have rendered the linguistic hybridity and exotic alterity of the ST, including vulgar language, idiolects, and culture-specific items (CSIs), by applying Antoine Berman's "textual deformation" approach and Javier F. Aixelá's CSI translation strategies. Findings show that the English version masterly reproduces the foreignness/otherness of the original corpus, while the Japanese counterpart deliberately and/or strategically under-represents it in the TT possibly due to the publisher's patronage, the dominant poetics in the Japanese literary polysystem, or other ideological concerns. The concluding remarks will encapsulate my observations and provide suggestions on translating a canonized work of Taiwan literature such as *Taipei People*.

II. Materials studied and the book's translation history

Comprised of 14 short stories, the book's Chinese original was completed (in the United States) during 1965 to 1971 and was published for the first time in book form (in Taiwan) in 1971 under the ironic title *Taipeiijen* (*Taipei People*). The main characters are set to be wandering mainlanders forcibly expelled out of China (the motherland) to settle in Taipei (a temporary refuge) by the end of the Chinese Civil War in 1949.² The recurring themes of *exile* and *nostalgic mentality*, a stark confrontation between *present* and *past*, have formulated the disillusioning background of *Taipei People*. According to Pai's confession in a number of interviews, his *soul* is unshakably tied to traditional Chinese culture, leading to him being widely considered a representative "émigré writer." In fact, Pai spent his childhood and nonage in mainland China and the rest of his life mostly in the US, with only 11 years in Taiwan from 1952 to 1963 for higher education and work.³ As Pai says inside the front cover of the 1982 edition, this short-story collection is "To the memory of my parents and the time of endless turmoil and anguish through which they lived." *Taipei People* features an imagined "chronotope" mirroring an entangled historical juxtaposition between the identities of Taiwan and China.⁴ This novel has secured a cult status of modernism Chinese-language literature ever since its

2 David D. W. Wang coined the genre "post-loyalist writing" to describe works like *Taipei People*. According to his definition, the characters in *Taipei People* are archetypal "loyalists" lamenting the perishment of a politically and culturally disconnected subjectivity, which suggests an anachronism constituting the psychologically contradictory milieu in *Taipei People*. See David D. W. Wang, *Hou yimin xiezuozuo* (*Post-loyalist Writing*) (Taipei: Rye Field, 2007), pp. 5-7.

3 See Tu Kuo-ch'ing, "Foreword," in *Taiwan Literature: English Translation Series, No. 40 (Special Issue on Pai Hsien-yung)* (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2017), pp. ix-xvii.

4 "Chronotope," literally translated as "time-space," is a theoretical concept developed by Russian literary scholar Mikhail M. Bakhtin in his 1937 essay "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel." Chronotope identifies a specific time-space in which a story unfolds. I use the term here to refer to a specific intrinsic correspondence of temporal and spatial relationships that are artistically woven into the languages and settings of *Taipei People*. See Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2004), pp. 84-258.

publication in 1971.

The book's remarkable success immediately incurred positive literary reviews, giving rise to its being rendered into several foreign languages that firmly guaranteed Pai Hsien-yung's status as a major contemporary Chinese-language writer, making his works an integral component of Sinophone literature. *Taipei People* had been, in chronological order, translated into Korean (1978), English (1982/2000), French (2000), Japanese (2008) and Czech (2014). In 1999, the Hong Kong-based *Yazhou zhoukan* (*Asia Weekly*) ranked *Taipei People* seventh on a list of 100 best 20th-century Chinese-language fiction works.⁵ The book's canonized reputation has added conspicuous weight to its two most influential translations: *Taipei People* in English (1982/2000) and *Tai Pei Jen* in Japanese (2008).

The first English translation of *Taipei People* was published by Indiana University Press in 1982 entitled *Youyuan jingmeng* (*Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream*) (the title of the most celebrated story of *Taipei People*), with a subtitle *Tales of Taipei Characters*. The translation is a collaborative labor by the author himself and his polyglot co-translator Patia Yasin,⁶ coupled with the contribution of their eminent bilingual editor George Kao⁷ who has an incredible command of American slangy English and “always finds *le*

5 In 2012, Pai Hsien-yung, as well as his *Taipei People*, was listed among the top 100 people and works of Taiwanese literature. See Wu Dayun, “Expressing the Loneliness of a Whole Generation—Kenneth Hsien-yung Pai and *Taipei People*,” in *Taiwanese Literature Historical Top 100* (Tainan: National Museum of Taiwan Literature, 2012), pp. 110-11.

6 Patia Yasin, daughter of the famous American art critic Harold Rosenberg, got her PhD in ethnomusicology at Wesleyan University. Her amazing mastery in Shakespeare's works and Asian folk songs extensively benefited the rendering of the musicality of *kunqi* 崑曲 (K'un Opera) lyrics prevailing in the story “Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream,” rhymed verses such as Tu Fu's *Denglou Climbing the Tower* and Wang Han's *Liangzhou ci The Song of Liang-chou* in “Liangfu yin [The Dirge of Liang Fu],” as well as several metrical eulogies recited in “Guozang [State Funeral].”

7 George Kao's best-known translations include F. Scott Fitzgerald's *Daheng xiaozhuan* (*The Great Gatsby, Hong Kong, 1971*) and Thomas Wolfe's *Tianshi wang guxiang* (*Look Homeward, Angel, Beijing, 1987*).

mot le plus juste [the right words]”.⁸ The Chinese-English bilingual edition, published by Hong Kong Chinese University Press in 2000, reverted to the book’s authentic title *Taipei People* to retain the irony encrypted in the title per se. The 2000 edition is based on the 1982 edition, in which “Yongyuan de yinxueyan [The Eternal Snow Beauty]” and “Sui chu [New Year’s Eve]” were previously published in *Renditions* No. 5 (1975).⁹ The former was translated by Professor Anthony C. Yu (余國藩) and his student Katherine Carlitz; the latter was contributed by Diana Granat. In addition, “Huaqiao rongji [Glory’s by Blossom Bridge],” translated by William A. Lyell, was first published in the 1982 version. Slightly edited, these three stories were reprinted in the 2000 edition. It should be noted that prior to the 1982 edition, the two stories “Dong ye [Winter Night]” and “Huaqiao rongji” had been translated by Chu Limin for publication under the titles of “One Winter Evening” and “Jung’s by the Blossom Bridge” in *An Anthology of Chinese Literature, Taiwan: 1949-1974* (Seattle, WA: University of Washington Press, 1975). A year later, “Dong ye” was translated again by John Kwan-Terry and Stephen Lacey under the title of “Winter Nights” in *Chinese Stories from Taiwan, 1960-1970* (New York, NJ: Columbia University Press, 1976). To avoid unnecessary confusion, my discussion about this book’s English version throughout this paper exclusively hinges on the 2000 bilingual edition.

In order to “perfect” the bilingual edition “to get the maximum emotional and symbolic impact in English,”¹⁰ Pai’s translation team was determined to make a few changes. For example, after careful cogitation, the term “Chief Army Cook” in “New Year’s Eve” was changed to “Mess

8 Patia Yasin, “A Word from the Co-Translator,” in *Taipei People*, trans. Pai Hsien-yung and Patia Yasin, ed. George Kao (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2000), pp. xxx.

9 *Renditions* is a renowned Chinese-English translation journal founded by George Kao and Sung Kei (宋淇) in 1973 under the Research Centre for Translation at Chinese University of Hong Kong.

10 See note 8, pp. xxx-xxxii.

Sergeant” with the harmonious agreement of the three of them, and the unrhymed verses (all translated by Patia Yasin, such as “Climbing the Tower” and the metrical eulogy in “State Funeral”) in the earlier version were converted into English rhymed versions. However, according to Professor Serena Jin’s (金聖華) memory, Pai’s translation team had to resume a flower’s original name “yujinxiang 鬱金香[tulip]” in the new version in accord with its bilingual layout. “Yujingxiang” was used in “The Eternal Snow Beauty” to denote the female protagonist’s disposition and elegance (In Mandarin, *yu* 鬱 represents melancholy; *jin* 金 symbolizes a noble color/luster; *xiang* 香 brings out a pleasant odor.) In the 1982 edition, the term “yujinxiang [tulip]” was translated as “camellia” for its romantic association and the musicality inherent in its three syllables.¹¹ For Pai, this was an unfortunate but inevitable change made in the 2000 edition.

The Japanese version, on the other hand, is part of the national “Chinese Books Translation and Publishing Project [zhongshu waiyi jihua 中書外譯計畫]” administered and patronized by the Council for Cultural Affairs¹² (hereinafter called CCA), a long-term program primarily aiming to foster global knowledge and appreciation of Taiwan Literature.¹³ Titled “台北人 (*Tai Pei Jen*),” the book was translated by Nihon University professor Yamaguchi Mamoru (山口守), who is one of the most celebrated Taiwan Literature scholars and translators in Japan.¹⁴ His translation was published by

11 See Serena Jin, “Cong yujinxiang shuoqi [To begin with tulips]” in *Qi xiang yidao xing On The Journey towards Translation* (Taipei: San Min, 2008), pp. 73-74.

12 CCA is a Taiwanese administrative body in charge of promoting cultural and creative industries. It was upgraded as the “Ministry of Culture” in May 2012.

13 Since 2011, the National Museum of Taiwan Literature (hereinafter abbreviated as NMTL) took over CCA’s mission by founding the Taiwan Literary Translation Center to translate selected works of Taiwan literature in order to secure a seat for Taiwan literary traditions among World Literatures.

14 Professor Yamaguchi is also the compiler and co-translator of the collection 台北ストーリー (*Taipei Stories*, 1999), in which he first translated “Jindaban de zuihou yiye [The Last Night of Taipan Chin]” titled “最後の夜 [The Last Night],” which is one of the best-known stories of *Taipei People*. The

Kokushokankokai (国書刊行会, National Books Publishing) in collaboration with CCA in 2008. As professor Yamaguchi puts it, Taiwan's modernism literature during the 1960s was an embodiment of liberation from China's May Fourth "New Literature" and the post-colonialism literature after WWII. Pai Hsien-yung's agony over identity transmutation catalyzed his aesthetic achievement in creating *Taipei People* that set him apart from other coetaneous modernist writers. In this regard, Professor Yamaguchi considers Pai a writer of hybrid identities, which is the key catalyst of his translation.¹⁵

The difficulties inherent in reproducing *Taipei People* in another tongue are attributable to the Chinese original's inscrutable language diversity and hybridity (such as the massive use of onomastic allusions, idiolects and the concocted fanciful idiosyncrasies in the speech of the assorted characters), multilayered cultural implications and varied narratives. It shall be legitimate for the translator to literally render the ST for the purpose of achieving verisimilitude. That said, in most cases the translators were bound to recapture the book's luxurious Chinese expressions, which were laden with native symbolism, imagery, and allusiveness, by recreating in the TT a language sufficiently readable and comprehensible for the receiving readership at the expense of the authentic flavor of the ST. As noted by George Kao, his role as an editor was to "help achieve a tone and texture of language at once natural and precise, intelligible in English and faithful to the original."¹⁶ Their teamwork purported to minimize incongruities resulting from over-fidelity to the Chinese text, overuse of American slangs, or vernaculars that

translation and dissemination of modern Taiwan Literature in Japan had been funded by CCA in collaboration with Kokushokankokai since 1999 under the project of 新しい台湾の文学 (Contemporary Taiwan Literature Series). Pai Hsien-yung's another globally-received masterpiece, the gay-themed novel *Niezi Crystal Boys*, was published in 2006 also by Kokushokankokai.

15 Pai Hsien-yung. *Tai Pei Jen (Taipei People)*, trans. Yamaguchi Mamoru (Tokyo: Kokushokankokai Publishing, 2008), pp. 265, 275.

16 George Kao, "Editor's Preface," in *Taipei People*, trans. Pai Hsien-yung and Patia Yasin, ed. George Kao (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2000), p. xxiii.

might generate falsehoods or wrong effects. In a similar vein, Professor Yamaguchi explained in our correspondence that his translation was targeted at young readers who should be less likely to possess profound understanding of Taiwan's historical background and the Chinese culture. As such, he managed to maintain an optimal balance between the tyranny of readability and fidelity in his translation.¹⁷ In the "Epilogue" of *Tai Pei Jen*, Yamaguchi acknowledges that the 1982 and 2000 English versions were handy reference for his translation to minimize the risk of misinterpretation.¹⁸ To summarize, considering the aforementioned difficulties, the translators of *Taipei People* were destined to weather a certain level of loss in language beauty and authenticity. Their shared solution was to flexibly adopt strategic intervention to achieve approximate (instead of equivalent) literary effects (in readers' response) between the opposing polarities of Schleiermacher's dualistic naturalization/alienation spectrum or Venuti's domestication/foreignization model, to prepare a translation in as much accordance with the original's unique language and culture-specific elements as possible.

III. Literature Review

According to my search and *Taiwan xian dangdai zuojia yanju ziliao huibian* (*The Compendium of Researches on Contemporary Writers of Taiwan Literature*), No. 43 (special issue on Pai Hsien-yung),¹⁹ there exist three MA theses produced in China elaborating the English translation of *Taipei People*, including Ye Qiaoli's

17 According to an email dated September 9, 2019, Professor Yamaguchi briefly described the leading concern governing his translation: "My translation is basically targeted at young readers, such as my students, who may not possess a profound understanding of Taiwan's history or the Chinese culture. Some students may start to study Taiwan's history after reading my translation, but you can't expect too much for it to happen. Given that, I'd try my best to keep a balance between preserving the artistry of the Chinese original and seeking the optimal readability in my translation" (trans. by the author).

18 See note 15, p. 259.

19 The project was initiated by NMTL in 2010. Over the course of 2011 to 2013, there was a total of 50 issues published in honor of 50 contemporary writers of Taiwan literature.

Reproduction of Exile Motif in the English Version of Taipei jen (2005), Wu Lin's *Self-translation in Literary Translation: A case study on Pai Hsien-yung's self-translation* (2006), and Liu Honghua's *On Self-translation and Conventional Translation from the Perspective of Functional Equivalence: A case study on Taipei People* (2010). Ye's paper mainly deals with the translation of story titles, characters' names, and culture-laden symbols. She concludes that the English translation succeeds in properly and accurately reproducing the original's theme of *exile*. Wu's paper systematically analyzes Pai Hsien-yung's self-translation of *Taipei People*, disclosing the significance of his self-translation which lies not only in the *representation* of the original, but also in the *explicitation* of the author's authentic intentions. Liu's paper compares the self-translation and conventional translation of certain stories in *Taipei People* on the basis of Eugene Nida's functional equivalence approach.

Nida coined the term *dynamic equivalence* in 1964 as a receptor-oriented approach in favor of the ST structure, with a goal to seek "the closest natural equivalent to the source-language message" to achieve *equivalent naturalness* in readers' response effect.²⁰ Since 1986 onwards, the term has been changed to the more generic *functional equivalence* for communicative purposes. In Liu's paper, she wraps up her research by reaffirming that Pai, as a bilingual author-translator, is more capable of achieving functional equivalence in terms of meaning, style and cultural implication. She argues that it is barely possible for ordinary translators to truly comprehend the original's meaning to attain the desired functional equivalence. I do agree with her at least in part on this matter. However, her conclusion appeared to be rather arbitrary since she failed to provide other full-translations by non-author translators for comparative analysis. As noted by George Kao, "If English is to be their

20 Eugene Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964), p. 166.

medium of expression, then they must be permitted to talk freely in the idiom and idiosyncrasies of that language,” but their translation enterprise should also be subject to intelligibility and faithfulness to the original as a requirement.²¹ By contrast, the Japanese version obviously expands *naturalness* (functional equivalence) over *formal equivalence* in the TL. For me, the ontological mentality behind the English version seems more justifiable in light of World Literature valorization, which I will elaborate later.

The problematized self-translation of *Taipei People*

A few other journal essays (majorly published in China) unanimously center on deliberating issues concerning Pai’s self-translation, among which Wu Bo’s “On the Task of the Translator: A Case Study on the Self-translation of *Taipei People*” stands out by carefully probing into the complex task of the author-translator Pai Hsien-yung. Wu refers to Walter Benjamin’s deconstructionist translation theory and Hans-Georg Gadamer’s hermeneutical arguments to foreground the values of identifying the foreignness in the ST and reproducing it in the TT. Her conclusion recognizes Pai’s contribution in faithfully rendering the original’s exoticism into a reader-oriented language style.²² The notion of *self-translation* (or *auto-translation*) observably plays a critical part in aforesaid papers, thereby begetting the inquiry: Should self-translation be deemed as a “translation” or a “rewriting”? Anton Popovic argues that self-translation “cannot be regarded as a variant of the original but as a true translation.”²³ Should that be true, self-translation and ordinary translation could be considered as two versions of equal artistic

21 See note 16, p. xxii.

22 Wu Bo, “On the Task of the Translator: A Case Study on the Self-translation of *Taipei People*,” *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal* 103 (2004), p. 68.

23 Anton Popovic, *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976), p. 19.

status. In contrast, Werner Koller distinguishes different levels of faithfulness between auto-translation and ordinary translation, because “the author-translator will feel justified in introducing changes into the text where an ‘ordinary’ translator might hesitate to do so.”²⁴ For example, bilingual author-translator like Vladimir Nobokov and Samuel Beckett frequently encountered unsurmountable obstacles when translating their own works into another language. In that case, their self-translation is more likely to become a *re-creation* based on their authentic creation of the original. However, this inclination is vaguely applicable to the translation of *Taipei People*. As Pai deems it, “Being an author, I find my translation somewhat inadequate; Being a translator, however, I suppose translation shall not be confined to calculating gains or losses of every single word when it comes to faithfulness.”²⁵ In this regard, Pai seems to consider himself more as a *translator* than a *rewriter*. For him, the cardinal task of a self-translator is to alleviate the aesthetic reduction in the process of transcoding the original in as much a faithful manner as he could, rather than freely rewriting it simply because the author enjoys the final authority over how to represent their own work in another language. Thus, being faithful to the original meaning, form and language beauty by representing the foreign elements via an understandable/reader-friendly language shapes the fundamental guideline governing his self-translation.

Song and Wang’s essay “An Analysis of the Translation of *Taipei People* from the Perspective of Pierre Bourdieu’s Reflexive Sociology” provides an insightful analysis of the translatorial habitus (a notion closely related

24 Cited in Chiara Montini, “Self Translation,” in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 2010), p. 304.

25 Cited in Xu Jun, “Wenzi de zhuanhuan yu wenhua de boqian: Pai Hsien-yung deng tan Taipeiiren de yingyi [Lexical transmutation and cultural transmission: Pai Hsien-yung and others’ discussion of the English translation of *Taipei People*],” *Chinese Translators Journal* 22.6 (2001), p. 60. (My translation. Pai’s original statement is: 作為作者，我覺得譯文有點意猶未盡。作為譯者，我覺得講忠實，不能拘泥於一字一句的得失)

to Foucault's "discipline"), social/cultural capital, and the dominant literary norms of the United States indicated in the English version. Their paper recognizes Patia Yasin and George Kao's phenomenal harnessing of Shakespearean literary traditions in translating the Ming Dynasty K'un opera romance *Mudanting The Peony Pavilion* by Tang Xianzu (on which the subject matter of the story "Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream" is based) and American colloquialism. As noted in their conclusion, it is Pai's writing/translatorial habitus that steers his strategies in setting the overall tone of his self-translation.²⁶ In other words, Song and Wang attempted to deal with the book's English version through a sociological prism, putting their analysis within a far wider horizon for a translation *proper*.

The translation of vulgar language

According to available literature, Yu Yaorong's 2018 MA thesis appears to be the sole study dedicated to examining the book's Japanese version, which is entitled *A Study on Vulgar Terms and Other Literary Translation Issues in Taipei People*. This paper applies Aoyama Minami's (青山南) translation-analysis approach in his 1996 monograph 英語になったニッポン小説 (*Japanese Novels in English Translation*) to look at multiple language versions of the same literary work from American literary theorist David Damrosch's "World Literature" perspective. This paper investigates a number of literary translation issues concerning how the English and Japanese translators embodied their understanding and interpretation of vulgar terms and diverse regional dialects of China in *Taipei People*. Similar to Liu Honghua's viewpoint that Pai opts for achieving Nida's dynamic/functional equivalence effect in his self-translation,

26 Song Shizhen and Wang Hongtao, "An Analysis of the Translation of *Taipei People* from the Perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's Reflexive Sociology," *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University* 24.4 (2017), pp.17-18.

Yu opines that both the English and Japanese versions prioritize Venuti's domesticating approach to attain compromised readability in the target language. In contrast to that, findings of the present study indicate otherwise. Yu's thesis is worth noting because it is probably the first and only research paper comparing the two foreign-language translations of *Taipei People*, and it is absolutely entertaining to read for it identifies the stark differences in vulgar language rendered in the two versions. Seen in this light, Yu's paper precisely pinpoints the proper meaning and lexical features of the translated "vulgar terms" in *Taipei People*, albeit apparently short of a deeper investigation of the factors involved.

As previously discussed, a vast majority of studies on the translation of *Taipei People* do great justice to Pai's self-translation by recognizing him as a bilingual author-translator. However, little attention has been given to the Japanese version and other language/culture issues related to both translations. As a complement, the present study aims to address those problems left underexplored by providing a profound comparison of translation corpora and translators' strategies employed.

IV. Translating the foreign: in view of languaculture

In his 2003 monumental book *What is World Literature?*, David Damrosch unremittingly asserts that World Literature is "a mode of writing" that "gains in translation."²⁷ In Damrosch's parlance, "works become world literature when they gain on balance in translation, stylistic losses offset by an expansion in depth as they increase their range."²⁸ Following in that vein, he avers that the transmigration of one linguistic thesaurus into another is contingent on *translation*. In order to gain readers from the dominant-language

27 David Damrosch, *What is World Literatures?* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003), p. 281.

28 David Damrosch, *How to Read World Literature* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), p. 289.

markets, the translation of *Taipei People* must surmount the text's linguistic and cultural barriers. Given that language and culture are inseparable and mutually indispensable, it is their interdependency that draws boundaries between the ST and the TT, making translation essentially *culture-bound*.²⁹ Even Damrosch himself cannot deny the fact that some literary works are inextricably connected to their original language and affective cultural power. Thus, translation is viewed as a refractive form of *cultural transfer*, or a *cross-cultural event*,³⁰ particularly in the literary domain where translation, either being a reliable mediator or a disloyal middleman, entails a certain level of losses in meaning or aesthetics. The very notion of *losses in translation*, as argued by Nicholas Harrison, is deeply associated with the *untranslatability* and *unparaphrasability* inherent in texts rich in literariness. For him, reading translation as literature “involves a certain tolerance or valorization of polysemy an openness to interpretation.”³¹ I do agree with Harrison in that a text's literary qualities cannot be fully summoned in the “paraphrased” translation, but I also believe the task of a translator should not be rigidly tied to the integrity of the original, especially when it comes to the circulation of peripheral literatures. For me, translating world literature is destined to depart from the scope of the inalterability of the original, so as to form a Benjaminian “afterlife” in the foreign proper. As response, I will address this conflicting issue by examining the multifarious operation of *languaculture* in various aspects of the English and Japanese versions.

Domestication/foreignization based on “languaculture”

29 Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal, eds. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), p. 2.

30 Mary Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988), p. 39.

31 Nicolas Harrison, “World Literature: What Gets Lost in Translation?,” *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 49.3 (2014), p. 418.

American linguistic anthropologist Michael Agar coined the term *languaculture* in his 1994 landmark book *Language Shock: Understanding the Culture of Conversation*, to elucidate how deeply a language is rooted in culture (and vice versa) while underlining how such lingua-cultural gaps (or culture-specificity) could result in moments of incompatibility and incomprehension. In this regard, the act of translating is more of a matter of adjustment or manipulation of the ST so as to run in line with the norms, ideologies and values of the TT's literary polysystem. Venuti argues that the translator is never innocent, because s/he enjoys the final authority of creating an illusion defining translation as a perfect replica of the original by *domesticating* the foreign corpus, "making it intelligible and even familiar to the target-language reader, providing him or her with narcissistic experience of recognizing his or her own cultural other."³² Engaged in the post-colonial cultural shift in translation studies, Venuti found world literatures inevitably subordinate to the ethnocentrism of the dominant cultures (most notably the Anglo-American sphere). Due to their asymmetrical power relations, translated literature usually has to expropriate itself with its *foreignness/otherness* being arbitrarily appropriated or eliminated in pursuance of the hegemonic TL literary paradigm. For example, George Kao states that, in the story "Sijiu fu [Ode to Bygone Days]," the translators purposefully adopted the vernacular used by Black helpers commonly observable in Southern Literature (like the slave servant "Mammy" in *Gone with the Wind*) to "represent the homespun talk of two old women lamenting the decline of the once-great house in which they served," to conjure up "the vestiges of an old culture in which the master-servant relationship played a strong role."³³ With that view in mind,

32 Lawrence Venuti, "Introduction," in *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 1992), p. 5.

33 See note 16, p. xxv.

the translators need to “remove only a few of the more jarring regionalism” and replace it with a “universal vernacular [shijiexing de baihua 世界性的白話]” making the characters in *Taipei People* “readily and vividly realized in English.”³⁴ Kao’s definition of *universal vernacular* can be understood in Roman Jakobson’s theorized perception of the *cognitive function* of languages—a universal capacity in languages allowing for cognitive expressiveness based on “metalinguistic operations,” which may bring forth a general translatability between distinctive languages regardless of the linguistic confinements of the translating and translated Saussurean *langues*.³⁵ In other cases of the English version, rendering a foreign vernacular (usually in the form of *non-standard language* with a social identity associated with uneducated/underprivileged usage) by a local one refers to a compromise in the interest of the target readability. By contrast, the Japanese version deploys a homogenizing approach by downplaying the dialectical register and regionalism (the *plurilingual diversity*) of the dialogues between the two nanny servants in standard Japanese. The following example fairly demonstrates this difference:

Table 1

Translation Comparison of The Nanny Servants’ Talk in “Ode To Bygone Days”

Original	English version
[羅伯娘：] 今年年頭，小姐和一個有老婆的男人搞上了，弄大了肚子，和長官吵著就要出去，長官當場打得她賊死，臉都打腫了。那個女孩子好狠，眼淚也沒一滴。(p. 189)	[Mamma Lo:] At the very beginning of this year, Young Miss got stuck with some man with a wife to home, and she <u>done got</u> bigbellied; and she and the General had a terrible fight when she told him she was leaving home. The General beat her ‘most to death right there, beat her till her face got all swollen up. That <u>gal ain’t got</u> no heart at all, she didn’t let one tear fall! (p. 188)

34 See note 33.

35 Boris Buden, Stefan Nowotny, Sherry Simon, Ashok Bery and Michael Cronin, “Cultural Translation: An Introduction to the Problem, and Responses,” *Translation Studies* 2.2 (2009), p. 202; Roman Jakobson, “On Linguistic Aspects of Translation,” in Vol. 2 of *Selected Writings by Roman Jakobson* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), p. 265.

	Japanese version
	<p>[羅伯娘:] 今年の年初め、お嬢様は女房のいる男とできてしまって、腹が大きくなり、旦那様と出て行くのなんのって大喧嘩だっただよ。旦那様はその場で死ぬほどお嬢様を殴り、顔が腫れ上がるほどだった。あの娘はひどいもので、涙ひとつ見せず。(p. 110)</p> <p>Earlier this year, Young Miss unfortunately got stuck with a guy with a wife, and she got big-bellied. She had a terrible fight with the Master whenever she told him she was leaving home to meet the guy. The Master would beat her almost to death right there, until her face got swollen up. That girl's temper was so sullen that she wouldn't let even one teardrop be seen! [trans. by the author]</p>

Note: Compiled by the author.

The underlined words showcase how Black English in the American South (instead of standard English) is used as an equivalent in the English version to replicate the *tone* of the Chinese original. In comparison, the same passage is reproduced in the Japanese version with ordinary/standard conversational Japanese which barely indicates dialectical regionalism. The question is: Which strategy suits the SL text in a manner more conforming to World Literature expectations?

The translation of non-standard language is fundamentally a tug-of-war negotiation between *authenticity* and *artificiality*. Georgina Collins and María L. Ponz broach the subject that the “dialect for dialect” approach can play the role of “an initiative that allows their speakers to read literary texts in their own language,” which “endows these non-standard varieties with a certain visibility and authority.”³⁶ However, when coping with non-standard linguistic varieties, there exists a globalized trend towards the standardization of texts “in order to better sell a translation in a foreign market.”³⁷ This *non-*

36 Georgina Collins and María López Ponz, “Translation, Hybridity and Borderlands: Translating Non-standard Language,” in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, eds. Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi C. Cortés, 1st ed. (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2018), p. 403.

37 See note 36, p. 408.

dynamic-equivalence approach particularly holds true for the Japanese version in meeting the readers' expectations on quality and comprehensibility. To put it another way, the Japanese translator has "hijacked" the ST by preparing a text readily accessible for the Japanese readers without trying to indigenize the dominant tongue.

Translators' notes for conventional proper nouns

Translators' extratextual gloss (usually in the form of footnote or endnote, as suggested in Nida's *gloss translation* and Appiah's *thick translation*) are used to provide clarifying/expounding information pertaining to the cultural backdrop of the ST's conventional proper nouns in the target copy. As noted by Michael Riffaterre, translation can only become an effective tool when translated works are sufficiently rendered via commentary glosses, otherwise the conventional translations will fail to be "a reliable index of cultural difference."³⁸ Although both the English and Japanese versions are primarily targeted at undergraduate readers, they are apparently executed in different scenarios. In the Japanese version, the translator appears relatively "invisible" by retaining the ST's self-sufficiency given that Chinese and Japanese are etymologically and culturally akin. For example, the Buddhist funeral service *chuqi* 初七 is literally translated as "First Seven" with a lengthy expository endnote in the English version, while the Japanese translator preserves the original term 初七 because it is also a common religious practice in Japan.³⁹ Another noticeable feature of the Japanese version lies in its concise notes in parentheses (or zero notes) attached to selected proper nouns with complex

38 Michael Riffaterre, "On the Complementarity of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies," in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, ed. Charles Berhnheimer (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1994), p. 68.

39 The endnote in the English version reads: *The Buddhist funeral service lasts forty-nine days. During the first forty-nine days after death, the soul is undergoing a period of transition before incarnation, a period of judgment which determines the next state of the deceased. Sutras are chanted for the*

cultural association to benefit a smooth reading experience. For example, the appellation *shih-niang* 師娘 (a term denoting “a witch doctor” in classical Chinese texts and “a master’s wife” in modern Chinese texts) in the story “Yiba qing [A Touch of Green]” is transliterated in the English version with an explanatory endnote to create an alienating effect. The endnote reads “Shih-niang is a term of affection and esteem used by students to address the wife of their teacher” (p. 78). Again, the Japanese version replaces it with a simple equivalent “奥さん” (p. 26), a common term used in Japan as a respectful reference to a teacher’s wife. Equivalent terms like “初七” and “奥さん” are frequently used in the Japanese version to efficiently enhance the readability of the TT.⁴⁰ By contrast, the English version abounds with lengthy endnotes to expound certain significant proper nouns, culture-laden terms, and sophisticated allusions for the Anglo-American reader’s comprehension. The best example is the title translation of the story “Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream.” An endnote that spans slightly more than an entire page (pp. 382-383) is appended in the English version to introduce (a) the origins and history of the K’un opera as an art form for aristocratic connoisseurs; (b) the features of the K’un opera and the way it shall be performed; (c) a detailed account of a perennial favorite of the K’un opera, *Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream*, which is adapted from the classic

dead every seventh day of this period, seven times until the Seventh Seventh Day. It is the family’s obligation to observe the proper rites to help the soul overcome the perils of judgment and transition (p. 196). The term “初七” refers to the seventh day of one’s death in China, which equals in meaning to “*touqi* [頭七]” in Taiwan and “初七日 [しよなのか]” in Japan.

- 40 This tendency is reversed in translating terms with less cultural association. For example, in the story “Mantianli liangjingjing de xingxing [A Sky Full of Bright, Twinkling Stars],” the Japanese version provides background information for terms like “《三笑》 [the film classic *Three Smiles*, p. 314] and “上海大光明 [the Grand Theater in Shanghai, p. 319]” in parenthesized notes as “一九二六年天一影片公司の《唐伯虎点秋香》か [it probably refers to the movie *Flirting Scholar* produced by Tianyi Film Company in 1926, p.180]” and “一九二八年開業、三二年再建の映画館 [the Grand Theater opened in 1928 and was rebuilt in 1932, p. 183].” The English version sparingly provides background information as such probably because the translators deem it unnecessary or redundant while the Japanese translator thinks otherwise.

Ming drama *The Peony Pavilion*, a story lamenting the devastating juxtaposition between “past” and “present” as well as the transience of life. Compared with its Japanese counterpart, this lengthy endnote might be helpful for TL readers to quickly grasp the subject matter of the story title intertwined with the story content. Table 2 provides the parenthesized note of the Japanese translation of the title *Youyuan Jingmeng* and the translation comparison of a particular toponym to illustrate the differences in the translators’ notes for denoting conventional proper nouns:

Table 2

Translation Comparison for Denoting Conventional Proper Nouns

Original	Note in parentheses [Japanese version]
遊園驚夢 [<i>Youyuan Jingmeng</i>]	《遊園驚夢》は、明代の湯顯祖作の戯曲《牡丹亭還魂記》を元にした崑劇の伝統演目 (p. 189) <i>Wandering in the Garden, Waking from a Dream</i> , a masterwork of the traditional K'un opera repertoire, is based on Ming drama playwright Tang Xianzu's masterpiece <i>The Return of Soul at the Peony Pavilion</i> [trans. by the author].
黃埔灘 [Huangputan]	Note in parentheses [Japanese version] 上海租界が黄浦江岸の外灘から発展したことによる呼称 (p. 6) The Shanghai foreign settlement, which had developed along the outer beach of the Huangpu River [trans. by the author].
	Endnote [English version] One of the colloquial names for Shanghai was Huang-p'u t'an [Whangpoo beach], named after the Yangtze tributary on whose muddy banks had sprung up the cosmopolitan city that used to be known to the world as a “paradise for adventurers” (p. 34).

Note: Compiled by the author.

Translation: the experience and trial of the foreign

Borrowing Schleiermacher's preferred “alienation” strategy (valorization of the foreign) in his 1813 seminal lecture “On the Different Methods of

Translating,”⁴¹ French philosopher-translator Antoine Berman looks at translation in a double sense. In the first place, translation seeks to “open up the foreign work to us in its utter foreignness.” In the second place, since the foreign work is “uprooted from its own language-ground [*sol-de-langue*],” the power of translating shall foremost be exhibited by means of “liberating” and “accentuating” the “strangeness.”⁴² For Berman, literary translation texts are “so bound to their language that the translating act inevitably becomes a manipulation of signifiers.”⁴³ In a similar vein, Paul Ricoeur’s critical argument, following Berman’s emphasis on representing the ST’s strangeness, suffices to transpire that a translation text gains *autonomy* where the estrangement of meaning occurs.⁴⁴ According to Berman’s ethics about translation, naturalized/domesticated translation would usurp or repress the original meaning, thereby generating skewed and/or perverted translated corpora. For Berman, there is no absolute locus or obligatory method for translators to cling to over the course of reproducing the *poeticity* of a given text. What determines the translator’s triumph is whether or not the translated output has been grounded on coherent aesthetic principles. The translator, therefore, should not be understood as a passive relay of the receiving cultural and literary norms, but as an active and formative influencer practicing translatorial intervention. More precisely, Berman took a resolute position against ethnocentrism and groundless reduction and/or idealization in translation. He problematized this issue by specifying twelve “deforming

41 Friedrich Schleiermacher, “On the Different Methods of Translating,” trans. Susan Bernofsky, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed. (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2012), pp. 43-63.

42 Antoine Berman, “Translation and the Trials of the Foreign,” trans. Lawrence Venuti, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), pp. 240-241.

43 See note 42, p. 241.

44 Richard Kearney, “Introduction: Ricoeur’s Philosophy of Translation,” trans. Eileen Brennan, in *On Translation* (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2006), p. xviii.

tendencies” that might bereave translated texts of the ST’s aesthetic foreignness:⁴⁵

1. Rationalization
2. Clarification
3. Expansion
4. Ennoblement and popularization
5. Qualitative impoverishment
6. Quantitative impoverishment
7. The destruction of rhythms
8. The destruction of underlying networks of signification
9. The destruction of linguistic patternings
10. The destruction of vernacular networks or their exoticization
11. The destruction of expressions and idioms
12. The effacement of the superimposition of languages

Rationalization annihilates the syntactical elements of the original by recomposing sentences in accordance with a discursive order; *Clarification* refers to the degree of “explicitation” in rendering clear what wishes to stay opaque in the original; *Expansion* concerns the oft-inflated translation (over-translation); *Ennoblement* aims to produce an “elegant” rewriting at the expense of the original deemed clumsy or complex; *Qualitative impoverishment* means a reductive translation that tones down the rhetorical richness of the original; *Quantitative impoverishment* denotes a lexical depletion; The other six forms of destruction indicate the inclination to efface the iconic features of literary works, including the musicality of rhymed verses, the asystematicity of textual

45 See note 42, p. 244.

networking and linguistic patterning, the injured orality of vernaculars, as well as the homogenization in translation that threatens the multiplicity of expressions, idioms and superimposed languages of the original.⁴⁶ Thus understood, in Berman's resonant definition, translation is presupposed to be *l'épreuve de l'étranger* (the experience of the foreign).⁴⁷

Ricœur's ontological textual hermeneutics, from a different perspective, stresses it is the ST that sets out the parameters for any arbitrary interpretations made by the translator. For him, the double duty of translation is to "make one's language put on the stranger's clothes" while inviting the stranger to "step into the fabric of his own speech."⁴⁸ In a nutshell, not only does he acknowledge the finitude of language and linguistic pluralism, he also points out that translation entails an exposure to the *otherness* of the foreign, and it is a common experience for the translator to undergo *creative tension*. In the following discussion, I will examine whether the aforementioned tendencies have been realized in the English and Japanese versions, and in what manner the otherness of the Chinese original is represented (or under-represented) through the rendering of idiolects and CSIs.

Translation of idiolects

The term *idiolect* is a variant of language unique to an individual, reflecting his/her distinctive usage of speech, including vocabulary, grammar, and pronunciation. According to Kirk Hazen's definition in *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, idiolect predominantly refers to (a) the sum total of language of

46 See note 42, pp. 245-253.

47 Berman's 1984 book *L'Épreuve de l'étranger: Culture et traduction dans l'Allemagne romantique* was translated into English by Stefan Heyvaert for publication in 1992 under the title of *The Experience of the Foreign: Culture and Translation in Romantic Germany*. Venuti translated his cardinal concepts in this book and combined them with Berman's another journal essay *La traduction comme épreuve de l'étranger* (1985) under the title of "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign" in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 2000), pp. 284-297.

48 See note 44, p. xvi.

an individual, including all possible utterances, and (b) the linguistic patterns of an individual that distinguish him/her from others.⁴⁹ Translating idiolects is considered a daunting challenge for translators, for a character's peculiar way of speech can be overwhelmingly embodied in cultural implications, in register, or in tone. Among the countless characters with distinctive idiolects in *Taipei People*, Taipan Chin (Jindaban 金大班) is probably the one that best crystallizes Pai Hsien-yung's character setting. Taipan Chin is a domineering dancehall hostess in the story "The Last Night of Taipan Chin," who, according to George Kao, "should not be made to speak standard English" or be "given the spurious accents of a Dragon Lady."⁵⁰ She is definitely one of the protagonists with whom the author can play word games and metaphors in a pedantic fashion. The way she delivers herself unwittingly reflects her judgmental personality, inferior social status, and cynical awareness of the cruel reality. The following example bespeaks how the English and Japanese versions reproduce her idiosyncratic *idiolect*.

Table 3

Translation Comparison of Taipan Chin's Idiolect in "The Last night of Taipan Chin"

Original	English version
玩是玩，耍是耍，貨腰孃第一大忌是讓人家睡大肚皮。舞客裡那個不是狼心狗肺？那怕你紅遍了半邊天，一知道你給人睡壞了，一個個都捏起鼻子鬼一樣的跑了，就好像你身上沾了雞屎似的。(p. 129)	Fun is fun, a game's a game. But the number one <u>no-no</u> for a <u>taxi dancer</u> is to get knocked up. Can you name me one guest who isn't a wolf or a dog? No matter how big a star you are, the minute they know you're in trouble they'll <u>run like hell</u> , one after the other, holding their noses <u>as if you are smeared all over chicken shit</u> . (p. 128)

49 Kirk Hazen, "Idiolect," in Vol. 5 of *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Elsevier, 2006), p. 512.

50 "Dragon Lady" became an American slangy term in the 1930s, usually referring to a stereotyped East Asian woman who is powerful, prickly, and deceitful. See note 16, p. xxii.

Japanese version	
	<p>しんだって遊んだっていいけど、<u>ダンサーの最大のタブーは男と寝て妊娠させられること</u>。客なんてみんな冷酷なものよ。どれだけ人気があっても、<u>妊娠したと知ったら、まるであんなの体に糞でもついているようにみんな鼻をつもんで逃げ出すわ</u>。(p. 75)</p> <p>Having fun or playing games is just fine, but the number one <u>taboo</u> for a paid dancer is to sleep with a man and <u>get pregnant by him</u>. There is no client who is not <u>ruthless!</u> No matter how big a star you are, the minute they know you are pregnant they'll <u>take to their heels</u>, holding their noses <u>as if you've got poop stains all over your body</u> [trans. by the author].</p>

Note: Compiled by the author.

As can be observed, the English translators endeavored to faithfully and precisely represent the wit and acerbity of Taipan Chin's idiolect as in the original without sacrificing the form (syntax, such as “fun is fun, a game's a game”), the color (figure of speech, such as “run like hell”), and the register (such as “no-no”). However, the English version's absolute fidelity to the original, such as “a wolf or a dog [langxin goufei 狼心狗肺],” a four-character idiom denoting someone ungrateful and unscrupulous, may jeopardize the fluency and rationality the English version (albeit the native-speaking reader's potential ability to figure out what this phrase actually means from the context). Based on my close reading, it is perhaps for brevity and ease of understanding that the English version was created in favor of *foreignization*, which might incur approximate reading experience among the TL audience as what the SL readers could have. By contrast, professor Yamaguchi to certain extent smoothed out the ST's exoticism by composing a naturalized translation readily accessible for Japanese readers in case it could “interrupt” their reading. In other words, his translation was subject to Berman's destruction of linguistic exoticization tendency by mitigating confounding linguacultural expressions to benefit the accessibility of the TT. For example, verb phrases like “妊娠させられる[to get pregnant by] and 逃げ出す[to take

to one's heels],” the noun “タブー[taboo], and the adjective “冷酷な[ruthless, a substitute for the four-character idiom *langxin goufei*]” are common Japanese expressions barely sufficient in revealing Taipan Chin's extraordinary idiolect. This naturalization inclination can be identified here and there in the Japanese version.

V. Translating CSIs

As discussed previously, languages have deep roots in their cultures, making the act of translating inseparable from the referential values of the source and target cultures. The parameters of culture-specific items (CSIs) hence leave a space open for flexible interpretations. According to Spanish scholar Javier. F. Aixelá, CSIs are usually “expressed in a text by means of objects and of systems of classification and measurement whose use is restricted to the source culture.”⁵¹ For him, cultural opacities in translation are most likely to arise in two archetypal categories: *proper nouns* and *common expressions*. Drawing on Theo Hermans' taxonomy, there are two types of proper nouns: (a) *conventional proper nouns*, whose denotative meanings do not carry salient significance in the ST, and (b) *loaded proper names*, including fictional and non-fictional names/nicknames in terms of alignment with “certain historical or cultural associations.”⁵² Despite the fact that CSIs defy translation because they denote items specific to a given language and culture, many translation theorists have suggested pragmatic solutions to rendering them, which can be generalized into two main groups: (a) *Repetition/Conservation* (including transcription, transliteration, linguistic translation and gloss for untranslatable implications of CSIs) and (b) *Substitution or Functional*

51 Javier. F. Aixelá, “Culture-specific Items in Translation,” in Translation, Power, Subversion, ed. Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), p. 56.

52 See note 51, p. 59.

Equivalence (including universalization, naturalization, deletion, compensation and creative insertion)⁵³. The CSI translation examples provided in the following passages may sketch out the disparities between the English and Japanese reproductions and the strategies applied based on the degree of intercultural assimilation, manipulation, and distortion.

Translation of fictional names/nicknames

Let me use the translation of loaded fictional names and nicknames for starters:

Table 4

Examples of Loaded Fictional Names in *Taipei People / Tai Pei Jen*

Strategy	ST [Chinese]	TT 1 [English]	TT 2 [Japanese]
Interpretive translation	尹雪艷	Snow Beauty Yin Hsueh-yen	尹雪艷
	朱鳳	Phoenix	朱鳳
	月月紅	Red Red Rose	月月紅
Hybrid translation	朱青	Verdancy Chu	朱青
	金大班/金兆麗	Taipan Chin/Jolie Chin	金兆麗
	劉騷包 [family name + nickname]	Smarty Liu [adj. + family name]	お調子者劉 [Liu the frivolous luck- pusher]
	秦癡子 [family name + nickname]	Crazy Chin [adj. + family name]	色ボケ秦 [Chin obsessed with sex]

Note: Compiled by the author (Specification or translation in brackets mine).

Literary fictional names are sometimes highly suggestive or expressive, around which foreshadowing associations may accrue in the context. The characters' names are mostly transliterated in the English version with a few exceptions being rendered in other ways. The Japanese version enjoys

53 See note 51, pp. 61-64.

the privilege to “repeat” the original Chinese names, which is known as “transcription.” In particular cases, the English version employs *interpretive translation* to unveil the meanings of the names. For example, the character *Yin Hsueh-yen* is depicted as a popular courtesan in old Shanghai who possesses frosty and captivating beauty. Her name is intermittently transliterated as Yin Hsueh-yen or interpretatively translated as “Snow Beauty.” The latter is a complementary translation indicating her gorgeous appearance while implying her doomed fate like a fascinating falling snowflake which would eventually vanish into the air. In other cases, both language versions opt for *hybrid translation* to signify the denotative and/or connotative meaning of the given names or nicknames while preserving their transliterated family names. For example, the French female given name “Jolie” is used in place of Zhaoli 兆麗 because the French name’s pronunciation sounds nearly identical to its counterpart in Shanghainese. In addition, “Jolie” in French means “pretty” and “joyful,” which suggests what kind of woman Taipan Chin is—she is a charming pander with mastery of seducing wealthy and powerful clients for prostitutes working for her. As for the interpretive translation of given nicknames, the Japanese renditions of Liu Saobao 劉騷包 and Qin Dianzi 秦癡子 straightforwardly specify their personalities, while the English version chooses to retain the euphemism in their Chinese originals.

Translation of vulgar language

Vulgar language is omnipresent in *Taipei People*, which can be classified into four categories: *regional dialects* (usually in the form of *foul language*), *terms related to prostitution*, *derogative appellations*, and *ethnic slurs*:

Table 5

Examples of Vulgar Language in *Taipei People / Tai Pei Jen*

Category	ST [Chinese]	TT 1 [English]	TT 2 [Japanese]
Regional dialects [foul language]	娘個冬采 [Shanghainese for 'Damn it' or 'To hell with it!']	Up his mother's!	クソツタレ [Fuck! Shit! That sucks!]
	偏他娘的 (Blast it!)	Sonuvabitch [son of a bitch] Fuck it all! Damn it all!	あいにく、ああ [unfortunately, too bad]
	幹伊娘 [Kàn lín-niá]	Damn your mother's soul! Fuck off!	ばかやろう くそつたれ [bastard, asshole, shit]
	考背 [khàu-pē]	Rot your parents!	くそつたれ
	幹你老母機歪 [Kàn-lín-lāu-bú-tsi-bai]	Fuck your mother's!	このくそ野郎 [bastard/asshole]
Terms related to prostitution	野雞 [chippy]	hooker	売春婦 [prostitute /hooker/whore]
	貨腰孃 [Shanghainese for a taxi dancer]	taxi dancer [a female dancer paid to offer special services or commercial sex]	ダンサー [a female dancer paid to offer special services for her patron]
	媽那個巴子的 [a fucking slut]	That bitch	売女 [streetwalker/hooker/ whore]
	老龜公 [an old procurer]	Old reptile of a pimp	例の古いぼれ亀こと [a dotard turtle guy]
Derogative appellations	壽頭 [a gullible guy]	Stupid-head	ばかな子 [an idiot]
	老殺胚 [a damn fucker]	Old motherfucker damn	古いぼれ [a dotard]
	赤老 [a slur against soldiers]	Creep [a flatter]	大馬鹿者 [an absolute fool]
	挨刀的 [a heartless scoundrel]	gallows-bird [a person who deserves condemnation]	太刀を浴びせるような(人) [a person who deserves to be slashed by a sword]
Ethnic slurs	日本鬼	Japs	日本軍 / 日本のやつら [Japanese soldiers / Japanese chaps or bastards]
	東洋婆	Nipponese wench	日本女 [Japanese woman]
	臺灣婆	Taiwanese trollop ['trollop' is as insulting as 'slut']	台灣女 [Taiwanese woman]

Note: Compiled by the author (Specification and translation in brackets mine).

A common strategy for translating the first three types of vulgar language is *substitution*,⁵⁴ which is highly similar to Peter Newmark's *functional equivalent* and *synonymy* approaches. Substitution is used when the translator resorts to synonyms or parallel references in the TL to avoid repetition. Functional equivalent refers to replacing the nearly untranslatable ST region-specific derogative terms (such as *huoyaoniang* 貨腰孃, *shoutou* 壽頭, *chilao* 赤老) and dialectical slurs (such as the three Taiwanese Hokkien phrases *Kàn lín-niâ* 幹伊娘, *khàu-pē* 考背, *Kàn-lín-lāu-bú-tsi-bai* 幹你老母機歪) with culture-free or generalized TL equivalents. For example, the phrase *ai dao de* 挨刀的, describing someone who is mean or villainous, is substituted by a functional equivalent "gallows-bird" in the English version and "太刀を浴びせるような人" in the Japanese version, respectively. The Japanese version fulfills the image of the Chinese original by creating a functional equivalent phrase to replace it. Synonymy is usually used in translation for economy over precision. For example, "that bitch" and "売女" are used to render *ma nage bazi de* 媽那個巴子的, an expression literally meaning "that damn-fucking pussy" for brevity. However, these translation examples are unavoidably conducted at the expense of the original's dialectical features and lexical stylistics, except one particular term *laogui Gong* 老龜公, which literally means "an old tortoise master." This dialectical term refers to an experienced pimp who gets customers for the prostitutes working in a brothel under his control. The English version makes plain the meaning of this term while retaining its Chinese image (reptile/tortoise). The Japanese version, on the other hand, annuls the Chinese signifier's cultural implication (*guigong* 龜公 = a pimp) to "例の老いぼれ亀こと[a dotard turtle guy]," but it still manages to preserve the original's tortoise image as a guarantor of the text's recalcitrant alterity. As far as ethnic slurs

54 See note 51, p. 63.

are concerned, unlike their faithful English counterparts, their Japanese renditions are conducted in a reductive manner, which is possibly based on the TL translation norms as noted by André Lefevere. For him, the *rewriting* formula in translation is intertwined with sociopolitical factors in power, such as ideology, patronage, and aesthetic poetics of the receiving literary system, which would “manipulate literature to function in a given society in a given way.”⁵⁵

Translation of culture-specific expressions

Table 6 illustrates the differences in translating culture-specific expressions in the two language versions:

Table 6

Examples of Culture-specific Expression in Taipei People / Tai Pei Jen

Category	ST [Chinese]	TT 1 [English]	TT 2 [Japanese]
Religious expressions	在苦海裡普渡眾生	on the <u>Sea of Bitterness</u> redeeming those poor souls	苦界で衆生を濟度している [to ferry sentient beings in <u>an abyss of misery</u> towards divine salvation]
	到那十八層地獄去 嘗嘗那上刀山下油 鍋的滋味去	to head straight down for <u>the eighteenth level of Hell</u> and get to know what it is like <u>climbing the Knife Mountain and diving into the Boiling Oilpot</u>	十八層地獄へ行って劍山に登ったり、煮えたぎった油鍋に入れられる苦しみを味わえばいいのだ [to head down to <u>the eighteenth level of Hell</u> to get a taste of the bitterness of <u>climbing a mountain of swords and being thrown into a boiling oilpot</u>]
Cultural expressions	釣到一條千年大金龜	She's hooked herself a <u>thousand-year-old gold turtle!</u>	千年物の黄金の龜を釣りあげたわけね [a thousand-year-old gold turtle]

55 Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere, ed. *Translation, History and Culture* (London: Cassel, 1995), p. ix.

Category	ST [Chinese]	TT 1 [English]	TT 2 [Japanese]
	個個去捧塊棺材板 [literal: to grab a piece of coffin board]	all of you ready to <u>grab any old bird with one foot in the grave!</u>	あんたたちみたいに棺桶に片足を突っ込んでいる人間を追いかける [to pursue a man with one foot in the coffin]
	原來是打翻了醋罈子 [literal: to knock over a vinegar jar]	So the <u>grapes have turned sour.</u>	あら、焼きもちを焼いていたの [You are jealous!]
Prostitution references	皮肉錢 [literal: skin-flesh money]	flesh-peddling money	体で稼いだ金 [prostitution earning]
	點大蠟燭 [literal: to light a big candle]	Initiation [to deflower a young woman]	最初の客 [the first benefactor]
Four-character idioms	狼心狗肺	a wolf or a dog / wolf-hearted, dog-gutted traitors	冷酷なもの / 恩知らず [unscrupulous/ungrateful]
	天打雷劈	May Heaven smite them! May Thunder strike them!	罰当たりには天罰が下がる [one's sins will incur divine punishment]
	披麻戴孝	(a) man dressed in traditional white hemp-woven mourning	白い麻の喪服を着て [dressed in white-hemp mourning apparel]

Note: Compiled by the author (Specification or translation in brackets mine).

When translating culture-specific expressions of the first three categories, namely *religious expressions*, *cultural expressions*, and *prostitution references*, both English and Japanese versions incline to *foreignize* them, such as *diaodao yitiao qiannian dajingui* 釣到一條千年大金龜 and *peng quai guancaiban* 捧塊棺材板 unless their functionally equal expressions exist in the TL. For example, the Chinese utterance *yanlai shi dafan le cutanzi* 原來是打翻了醋罈子 is rendered as “So the grapes have turned sour” and “あら、焼きもちを焼いていたの [a metaphor of facial expression for enviousness].” One particular exception in Table 6 is the translation of *dian dalazhu* 點大蠟燭, because it is virtually impossible to reproduce the Chinese original’s image and connotative

meaning in the TT. Due to its lexical, cultural and semantic ambiguity, both TL versions, based on the *Explicitation Hypothesis* proposed by Shoshana Blum-Kulka in her seminal paper “Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation.” She considers translations generally more explicit than their source texts, noting that “explicitation is a universal strategy inherent in the process of language mediation.”⁵⁶ She prioritizes *pragmatic explicitation* technique⁵⁷ using cohesive markers to disambiguate opaque information in the TT that is implicit in the ST. As for the translation of four-character idioms, the Japanese version tends to adopt paraphrases while the English version hinges on reproducing the foreignness of the original text without sacrificing their connotative meanings at large.

In a nutshell, if we compare the English and Japanese versions under Berman’s textual deformation model, it is not difficult to locate certain deforming tendencies in each version. First, both versions display the tendencies of “the destruction of vernacular networks” and “the destruction of the multiplicity of expressions,” which are, however, an eclectic compromise in striking a balance between maximizing the TT’s readability and transcoding the ST’s exoticism. In general, whereas the English version slightly deviates from the original by producing a relatively “ennobled” text, it shall be justifiable because literary translation is extensively culture-bound that prompts the translator, in John Dryden’s metaphor, to dance on ropes with fettered legs. Overall, when compared with the Japanese version, the English version prepares a translation with unparalleled reverence and

56 Shoshana Blum-Kulka, “Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation,” in *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, eds. Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (Tübingen: Narr, 1986), p. 21.

57 Klaudy distinguishes four types of explicitation in translation: *obligatory explicitation*, *optional explicitation*, *pragmatic explicitation*, and *translation-inherent explicitation*. She argues that pragmatic explicitation is prompted by variances in cultural subtlety and world views shared by the SL and TL speakers. See Kinga Klaudy, “Explicitation,” in *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, eds. Mona Baker and Gabriela Saldanha (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 82-83.

fidelity to the Chinese original by representing the *otherness* of the source text at multiple levels, which is in fact a reciprocal agreement between the author and the translator (since the bilingual edition of *Taipei People* is widely regarded as a “self-translation”). On the other hand, it is perhaps the translation norms reigning the TL literary system that have urged the Japanese translator to cling to the “qualitative impoverishment” tendency by effacing the rich rhetoricity and the colorful culture-loaded plurality of the original, which ends up as a naturalized copy readily accessible for the receptor readership.

Concluding Remarks

The present study offers an overview of Berman’s textual deformation tendencies and compares different translation strategies (as proposed by Aixelá) regarding loaded proper nouns, idiolects and CSIs in rendering *Taipei People*, a canonized Chinese-language modernism masterwork from Taiwan, in two dominant receptor languages (English and Japanese) that have vastly influenced the promotion and world knowledge of Taiwan modernism literature.

According to Susan Bassnett in her edited book *Translation Studies* (3rd ed., 2002), translation is a dynamic operation dealing with a wide set of extralinguistic criteria, such as cultural distances derived from the distinct languaculture (as specified by Michael Agar) inherent in different languages. Given that, literary translation is universally considered culture-bound, and the task of the translator is therefore to detect and bridge such cultural gaps in order to minimize the TL reader’s misperception or misinterpretation. Findings of this study show that, compared with the English-Chinese bilingual version which faithfully represents the foreignness of the original in tone and/or texture of language, the Japanese rendition provides a much more accessible/domesticated translation that divests the exotic features of

the original to achieve greater intelligibility. However, I agree with Andrew Chesterman's 2001 proposal for a "hieronymic oath"⁵⁸ that impinges on the translator's professional ethics—When it comes to literary translation, the translator's commitment to the "ethics of representation" is based on the loyalty to the "source text, or the source author's intention, or even the source culture, faithfully and truly, like a mirror."⁵⁹ He argues the ethical dimension in translation practices is no longer restricted to linguistic or textual equivalence or loyalty to the ST. Rather, it is dependent on universal values and is subservient to specific cultural location and situation. On the grounds of his argument, I figure to represent the *other* in literary translation deserves exceptional attention because the *literary translation proper* must not be based disproportionately on the TL languacultural norms. Instead, the translator's duty is to optimize cross-cultural understanding at the least expense of the multiplicity of the foreign, which is perhaps too lofty an ideal to achieve but still worth trying. It can be concluded that the present study centering around the translation strategies applied in the English and Japanese renditions of Pai Hsien-yung's *Taipei People* unmask the key problems and opens a window to observing how the translating manipulation operates in rendering a text replete with foreignness. As Pai and his *Taipei People* continue to attain international stardom through *translation* in the World Literature terrain, even at the cost of *losses* in language diversities, or on the shoulder of *gains* in reaching a broader readership worldwide, the English and Japanese translations of *Taipei People* have shed valuable light on the potentiality of rendering a foreign canon.

58 Andrew Chesterman, "Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath," in *The Return to Ethics: Special Issue of The Translator* 7.2, ed. Anthony Pym (2001), pp. 152-53.

59 See note 58, p. 140.

References

- Andrew Chesterman, "Proposal for a Hieronymic Oath," in *The Return to Ethics: Special Issue of The Translator* 7.2, ed. Anthony Pym (2001), pp. 139-154.
- Antoine Berman, "Translation and the Trials of the Foreign," trans. Lawrence Venuti, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London and New York: Routledge, 2012), pp. 240-253.
- Anton Popovic, *A Dictionary for the Analysis of Literary Translation* (Edmonton: University of Alberta, 1976).
- Boris Buden, Stefan Nowotny, Sherry Simon, Ashok Bery and Michael Cronin, "Cultural Translation: An Introduction to the Problem, and Responses," *Translation Studies* 2.2 (2009), pp. 196-219, doi:10.1080/14781700902937730
- Chiara Montini, "Self Translation," in *Handbook of Translation Studies*, ed. Yves Gambier and Luc van Doorslaer (Amsterdam: John Benjamin, 2010), pp. 306-08.
- David Damrosch, *What Is World Literatures?* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2003).
- David Damrosch, *How to Read World Literature* (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009).
- David Der-wei Wang, *Hou yimin xiezuozuo (Post-Loyalist Writing)* (Taipei: Rye Field Publishing, 2007).
- Eugene Nida, *Towards a Science of Translating* (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1964).
- Friedrich Schleiermacher, "On the Different Methods of Translating," trans. Susan Bernofsky, in *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 3rd ed. (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2012), pp. 43-63.
- George Kao, "Editor's Preface," in *Taipei People*, trans. Pai Hsien-yung and Patia Yasin, ed. George Kao (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2000), pp. xiv-xxvii.
- Georgina Collins and María López Ponz, "Translation, Hybridity and Borderlands: Translating Non-standard Language," in *The Routledge Handbook of Translation and Culture*, eds. Sue-Ann Harding and Ovidi C. Cortés, 1st ed. (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2018), pp. 398-414.

- Javier. F. Aixelá, "Culture-specific Items in Translation," in *Translation, Power, Subversion*, ed. Roman Alvarez and M. Carmen-Africa Vidal (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996), pp. 52-78.
- Kinga Klaudy, "Explicitation," in *Encyclopaedia of Translation Studies*, eds. M. Baker and G. Saldhana (London: Routledge, 1998), pp. 80-84.
- Kirk Hazen, "Idiolect," in Vol. 5 of *Encyclopedia of Language & Linguistics*, ed. Keith Brown, 2nd ed. (Oxford: Elsevier, 2006), pp. 512-13.
- Lawrence Venuti, "Introduction," in *Rethinking Translation: Discourse, Subjectivity, Ideology*, ed. Lawrence Venuti (London: Routledge, 1992), pp. 1-17.
- Li Linpo et al., *Bibliographical Synopses of Translated Taiwan Literature (1990-2016)* (Tainan: National Museum of Taiwan Literature, 2017).
- Mary Snell-Hornby, *Translation Studies: An Integrated Approach* (Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1988).
- Michael Riffaterre, "On the Complementarity of Comparative Literature and Cultural Studies," in *Comparative Literature in the Age of Multiculturalism*, ed. Charles Berhnheimer (Baltimore, MD: John Hopkins University Press, 1994), pp. 66-73.
- Mikhail Bakhtin, "Forms of Time and of the Chronotope in the Novel: Notes toward a Historical Poetics," in *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*, trans. Caryl Emerson and Michael Holquist (Austin, TX: University of Texas Press, 2004), pp. 84-258.
- Nicolas Harrison, "World Literature: What Gets Lost in Translation?," *The Journal of Commonwealth Literature* 49.3 (2014), pp. 411-426.
- Pai Hsien-yung. *Tai Pei Jen (Taipei People)*, trans. Yamaguchi Mamoru (Tokyo: Kokushokankokai Publishing, 2008).
- Patia Yasin, "A Word from the Co-Translator," in *Taipei People*, trans. Pai Hsien-yung and Patia Yasin, ed. George Kao (Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press, 2000), pp. xxviii-xxxiii.
- Richard Kearney, "Introduction: Ricoeur's Philosophy of Translation," trans. Eileen Brennan, in *On Translation* (New York, NJ: Routledge, 2006), pp. vii-xx.
- Roman Alvarez & M. Carmen-Africa Vidal, eds. *Translation, Power, Subversion*. (Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1996).

- Roman Jakobson, "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation," in Vol. 2 of *Selected Writings by Roman Jakobson* (The Hague: Mouton, 1971), pp. 260-66.
- Serena Jin, "Cong yujinxiang shuoqi" (Talking of the tulip), in *Qi xiang yidao xing* (On the journey towards translation) (Taipei: San Min, 2008), pp. 73-77.
- Shoshana Blum-Kulka, "Shifts of Cohesion and Coherence in Translation," in *Interlingual and Intercultural Communication*, eds. Juliane House and Shoshana Blum-Kulka (Tübingen: Narr, 1986), pp. 17-35.
- Song Shizhen & Wang Hongtao, "Budie shehuixue lilun shijiaosha Taibeiren de yingyi ji chuanbo tanxi" (An Analysis of the Translation of *Taipei People* from the Perspective of Pierre Bourdieu's Reflexive Sociology), *Journal of Tianjin Foreign Studies University* 24,4 (2017), pp.14-20.
- Susan Bassnett and André Levefere, ed. *Translation, History and Culture* (London: Cassel, 1995).
- Tu Kuo-ch'ing, "Foreword," in *Taiwan Literature: English Translation Series, No. 40 (Special Issue on Pai Hsien-yung)* (Taipei: National Taiwan University Press, 2017), pp. vii-xix.
- Wu Bo, "Cong ziyi kan yizhe de renwu: yi Taibeiren de fanyi wei gean" (On the Task of the Translator: A Case Study on the Self-translation of Taipei People), *Shandong Foreign Language Teaching Journal* 103 (2004), pp. 65-68, doi: 10.16482/j.sdwy37-1026.2004.06.001
- Wu Dayun, "Expressing the Loneliness of a Whole Generation—Kenneth Hsien-yung Pai and *Taipei People*," in *Taiwanese Literature Historical Top 100* (Tainan: National Museum of Taiwan Literature, 2012), pp. 110-11.
- Xu Jun, "Wenzi de zhuanhuan yu wenhua de boqian: Pai Hsien-yung deng tan Taibeiren de yingyi" (Lexical transmutation and cultrual transmission: Pai Hsien-yung and others' discussion of the English translation of *Taipei People*), *Chinese Translators Journal* 22.6 (2001), pp. 58-60.