

Teaching Comparative Literature to Undergraduates Translation and Reader Response Applications

John J. Deeney

ABSTRACT

This essay presents evidence that comparison of translations is a fruitful way of teaching Chinese-English comparative literature to undergraduates. After highlighting the strengths of the comparative literature program at the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the author uses "Reader Response" theory and the late James J.Y. Liu's distinction between "naturalization" (turning Chinese into English) and "barbarization" (twisting English so it becomes Chinese), to examine several undergraduate compositions critiquing various translations of a Chinese poem. Based on his 10 years of experience, the author advises teachers, students, and translators to take a middle-of-the-road approach between "naturalization" and "barbarization" on the one hand, and between the historical and theoretical approaches to translation on the other.

KEY WORDS

Chinese University of Hong Kong
comparative literature
pedagogy
Reader Response theory
undergraduates

translation
James J.Y. Liu
"naturalization"
"barbarization"
influence

The accusation that comparativists teach less and less about more and more (as opposed to the specialists who teach more and more about less and less), is most telling on the undergraduate level.¹ On the other hand, I believe a case can be made for the teaching of comparative literature to undergraduates, at least as it is taught in the second year elective course offered at the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Perhaps the University is unique in that it has the highest concentration of Chinese-Western comparative literature teachers (six doctorates) in the world. The undergraduate course is viewed as a first step in preparing interested students for upper division courses in comparative literature and, eventually, for a select few, as a grounding for the master's or doctorate degrees in our own program or abroad.

Unlike most places in the world, the students who take this course, Introduction to Comparative Literature, are all English Literature majors. Therefore, they have a fairly good foundation in English, to say nothing of their native Chinese. Furthermore, they are constantly exposed to the East-West cosmopolitan atmosphere which is so much part of daily living in Hong Kong.

In addition to these qualified teachers and students, Chinese University undoubtedly has the finest collection of materials, both Chinese and English, directly related to the field of Chinese-Western comparative literature studies. The main problem, from a pedagogical point of view, is to communicate a sense of the whole field through its background history, East and West, as well as to discuss the variety of theoretical and methodological approaches without departing too much from concrete literary texts.

The feasibility of teaching comparative literature to undergraduates has been addressed, in a general way, by the American Comparative Literature Association (ACLA). The various committees organized by the ACLA since 1974, however, have had different emphases when reflecting on this problem. The "Profile 1974" report, for instance, "presented an overview of the structure and requirements of undergraduate curricula for students majoring in our discipline" (ACLA 3). A later committee, established in 1979, decided to place its focus on

the kinds of courses designed to introduce the undergraduate to the theory and practice of comparative literary studies. . . . Equally convinced of the usefulness and feasibility of such an endeavor ["to evolve a methodological course paradigm which

could be generally adopted”], but at the same time directing its sights beyond the typical “methods course,” . . . the present Committee invited Comparative Literature departments or programs at one hundred and ten institutions to send descriptions and syllabi of courses “which serve to *introduce undergraduates to literature from a comparative viewpoint.*” (3)

In analyzing the data received, the committee, while assuming

that every comparative literature course will make its students aware of the nature, purpose, and methods of the comparative approach, the courses examined in the present study tend to be required of all majors and thus occupy the core of the program.

They seem primarily designed to introduce students

- (1) to literary study and a canon of important works of literature,
- (2) to the concepts, terms, and techniques for analysing and comparing the individual works,
- (3) to the traditional concerns and methods of our discipline, and
- (4) to current critical and theoretical issues and positions of literary scholarship. (4)

Naturally, different programs placed different proportional emphases on one or other of these guidelines, and this is reflected in the course descriptions. For those of us used to the benign neglect of the Chinese dimension in comparative literature studies, it is not surprising that among the syllabi surveyed, “little notice is taken of the existence of non-Western literary traditions and conventions” (7)

To remedy this lack as well as many others, among the 1979 committee’s recommendations regarding the students’ general lack of awareness of their own Western theoretical assumptions, was this suggestion: not only to introduce them to primary works as well as theoretical and critical texts from both Western and non-Western traditions (using translations where necessary) but, specifically, to recommend “a one-semester course combining a systematic introduction to the traditional areas and methods of comparative literary studies with the discussion of some of the concerns of contemporary theory and criticism” (11).

But too much history and theory tends to become boring for the majority of students who elect the course in order to "do" some practical comparisons. On the other hand, they can hardly be expected to produce a useful and satisfactory result unless they have studied, through a systematic exposition on the part of the teacher, the ways of comparing the literatures as well as the published experience of seasoned practitioners. In the remaining part of this paper, I will try to illustrate a particular method I have worked out over the ten years I have been teaching the course. I believe this method achieves a good balance between the conventional historical approach and more theoretical approaches, along with a proper retention of emphasis on the literary works themselves.

The approach is comparative but focuses on the notion of "cultranslation"; that is, it engages students in some translation exercises, not merely on the linguistic level, but also providing the cultural contexts in order to examine adequately the variety of English translations of and commentaries on a single Chinese literary work. Here, I am basically taking a comparative approach to poetry by examining and comparing various types of translations with the original text and with each other. Both traditional (e.g., influence studies) and modern methodologies are employed for the purposes of comparison and contrast as well as to assess the gains and losses.

Among the modern approaches is my rather general adaptation of a Readers Response approach which seems to be one of the most fruitful ways of bringing modern theoretical thinking to bear on the classroom teaching of comparative literature to undergraduates.² I believe this approach is especially appropriate for many of our students in Hong Kong and, perhaps, in Taiwan as well, to offset their subservient attitude to the authority of their teachers or the printed word of commentators. In fact, I find myself recommending that students consider perpetrating a kind of metaphorical magistricide to offset the licensed manipulation of their minds which goes under the name of much conventional education.

After a brief introduction to the field, I tell the students to select one of their favorite poems from classical Chinese which they examine systematically, in the original language, more or less as a traditional Chinese scholar would, by paying attention to textual detail, accumulated commentary, etc.³ Next, each student picks out several different types of translations, compares them with the original and with each other, according to relevant translation and comparative literature methodologies. This use of a limited number of controlled texts seems to have worked out fairly well as a particular solution

to the general problem of dealing with larger theoretical considerations. In other words, the general theory and methodology problems arise more naturally out of an inductive approach through an examination of particular poems. As a matter of fact, careful attention to the translation of a literary text can recapitulate and reenforce all the major methodologies of comparative literature studies.

In order to demonstrate this practise, I will quote rather extensively from some of the work of my undergraduate students which, I trust, will illustrate concretely the strengths and limitations of such an approach. Although I will not neglect referring to the theory and practice of some established critics, emphasis on student exercises seems more relevant from a pedagogical point of view. In other words, I wish to examine how student comparisons of translations with the original, and various translations with each other, can expose the gains and losses as well as point up the necessity of taking all the major comparative literature methodologies into consideration. An additional advantage of restricting oneself to a concise, substantial poem not only lies in its manageableness, but also because it restrains the comparatist from going off on too many theoretical tangents. This is not to say that the translation approach is narrow, for when done properly, the thorough understanding of a good poem will necessarily lead us into broader considerations. Trained comparatists, therefore, are potentially the best judges of translations in the sense that they have to be critical and creative readers, reconstructing the various interpretations of the translations within their cultural contexts, etc.

At an early stage in teaching this comparative literature course to beginners, certain approaches to stylistic aspects of literary translation are introduced. Generally speaking, there are two extreme positions advocated by translators regarding the style of the language into which one is translating. The late James J.Y. Liu has labeled them, "naturalization" and "barbarization." "By 'naturalization' I mean attempts to turn Chinese poetry into English verse within the existing conventions of the English language, and by 'barbarization' I mean attempts to reshape the English language so that it would conform to the structure and idiom of Chinese" (60). Liu, of course, advocates attempting a middle-of-the-road approach to translation and concludes his essay:

As to how far one should go in either naturalization or barbarization, it depends partly on the poem itself, and partly on the trans-

lator's taste, about which one can't argue. Some prefer chop-suey. But dare I express the pious hope that somewhere between the devil of pidgin English and the deep blue sea of genteel Victorian versifying one might find

The word neither diffident nor ostentatious,
 An easy commerce of the old and the new,
 The common word exact without vulgarity,
 The formal word precise but not pedantic? (67)

In a way, the approach through "barbarization" appeals to our penchant for accuracy and fidelity to the original, not merely on a linguistic level but, as Wai-lim Yip has pointed out in an introduction to his translations, on a cultural level. He writes: "It is these significant differences that we want to highlight, hoping to put the readers out of gear, so to speak, so that they can more enjoy the specific aesthetic horizon of the Chinese" (42).

How different is the view of the "naturalizers." They too have a kind of poetics upon which their practice of translation rests. Few have expressed their views more strongly than the late John A. Turner. He insisted that no one could be really faithful to the strict formalism of most Chinese verse and do anything but attempt a counterpart in English verse. Few have matched him in sheer *tour de force* translations from the Chinese into respectable English verse. "Naturalization" at its best, can be found in some excellent examples from Turner's renditions. One of his most remarkable translations is Li Bai's (701-762) "Down from the Mountain" 下終南山過斛斯山人宿置酒, translated into a perfect Shakespearean sonnet. On this poem Turner commented, "So fine and close-knit is Chinese poetic composition that a 14-line poem, with something of a 'kick' in the last two lines, almost inevitably resolves itself in translation into a Sonnet" (6).

Like Liu, my own preference in trying to resolve the dilemma between overly "naturalized" or "barbarized" translations is to seek a happy medium between the two extremes. Students are encouraged to come up with their own "ideal" translation or, at least, to pick out several translations in order to arrive at a kind of composite-compromise solution.

Influence/Imitation Studies are the very heart of comparative literature and the translation process. All comparativists are translators of necessity whether the process is informally mental (the psychological process of transferring the language code of an alien culture into one's own language) or formally scribal (reflecting upon a number of verbal choices and finally

selecting that combination of words which minimizes the losses). Although influence studies initially and conventionally have meant some direct and positively discernible documentation of how one author's work was related to those of another (*rappports de fait*), it has become more broad in scope and now includes a variety of reception studies which involve not only aesthetic concerns, but also social and political as well as psychological and economic ones.

The usefulness of a traditional influence study for comparativists interested in Chinese-English comparative literature is obviously very limited, since there has been relatively little direct influence between the literatures except in modern times. On the other hand, if influence studies are meant to include literary imitations and/or translations of various kinds, then the field is an enormous stretch of virgin territory. The bilateral literary trade between China and the West has been going on for some time through translation and, if the present trend continues, in the not too distant future, there will be a corpus of material which should entice the translator-comparativist to generations of fruitful labor. Fortunately, there is a good deal of on-going research tracing the history of translations from the Chinese as well as books, journals, indices, and bibliographies introducing Chinese literature to the Western world.⁴

Since the field of Chinese-English comparative literature studies is relatively new, one could hardly think of a better place to start than through careful and critical translations. Among the various comparative literature methodologies touched upon so far, an influence study through an examination of translations holds out the greatest promise. As I have already indicated, the opportunities are truly exciting: concentrating on the translation(s) of a single literary work has the advantage of working with something even a beginner can find both challenging and manageable; on the other hand, if the work is systematically and comprehensively translated according to conventional comparative literature methodologies, it can lead one into profound and far-reaching insights into literature. The fact that the two cultures (Chinese and English) are so different underscores the value of such an investigation. English-Chinese or Chinese-English comparisons and translations should nudge us a little closer towards the re-examination of some of our critical concepts and the basic assumptions underlying them throughout different periods of literary history (e.g., mimesis, genre theory, the "well-structured" plot, "round" character development, etc.).

Fortunately, the beginning translator-comparativist can refer to a number

of studies which—if not formally comparative—have, at least, laid the groundwork for such a cross-cultural investigation. Comparative translation often is, in fact, an exercise in examining how readers have been *influenced*—for better or for worse—by a variety of translations. The traditional influence/reception approaches might be given a new life by recent developments in hermeneutics regarding “reception aesthetics” or “reception theory.”⁵ This contemporary preoccupation with reader-response criticism and its emphasis on what aspects of a given text shape a reader’s reactions, has a particular relevance for the translator-comparativist. Translators of Chinese into English, after all, are the first foreign readers through whom other compatriots have some kind of access to the original. In order to bring out the variety of ways in which this special kind of “reader’s response” takes place, I will just refer briefly to two examples. These examples will examine some of the ways translators as readers and other readers relying on their translations, are influenced.

These examples are from two sophomore term papers (slightly edited by me in the interests of correctness and conciseness). They may serve as a useful recapitulation (especially the second one), of how comparative translation exercises are not only an example of a re-vitalized type of influence study, but also touch on other traditional comparative literature methodologies as well.

EXAMPLE NUMBER ONE: “the everyday Way”

In the first example, readers may not entirely agree with the student’s choice of poem or even his critical remarks, but it is interesting to observe the manner in which he went about doing a comparative-translation study of the following untitled poem by Han Shan (Tang Dynasty, dates unknown), translated and annotated by Burton Watson:

Zi le ping sheng dao
Yan luo shi dong jian
Ye qing duo fang kuang
Chang ban bai yun xian
Chang lu bu tong shi
Wu xin shu ke pan
Shi chuang gu ye zuo
Yuan yue shang Han Shan

自樂平生道
 煙蘿石洞間
 野情多放曠
 長伴白雲閑
 長路不通世
 無心孰可攀
 石床孤夜坐
 圓月上寒山

As for me, I delight in the everyday Way,*
 Among mist-wrapped vines and rocky caves.
 Here in the wilderness I am completely free,
 With my friends, the white clouds, idling forever.
 There are roads, but they do not reach the world;
 Since I am mindless,⁺ who can rouse my thoughts?
 On a bed of stone I sit, alone in the night,
 While the round moon climbs up Cold Mountain.

- * A reference perhaps to the words attributed to the Zen Master Ma-tsu Tao-i (707-786): "The everyday mind—that is the Way."
 + *Wu-hsin*, a Buddhist term indicating the state in which all ordinary processes of discriminatory thinking have been stilled (67).

What follows is the student's commentary:

Some of the losses and gains in Watson's translation can be summed up on cultural and linguistic levels. As for the cultural dimension, he misinterprets certain terms; e.g., *xian* 閑 (line 4) as "idling." *Xian* means to be at rest and to enjoy one's self in a peaceful state. "Idling," on the other hand, is derogatory, a kind of *ennui*, killing time. . . .

Watson can be forgiven for translating *wu-xin* 無心 (line 6) as "mindless," since even most dictionaries of Buddhist terms give this rather facile translation. Even though Watson supplies an explanation in a note to the word, "mindless," it is again derogatory; the opposite of "mindful." "Mindless" means not having the need or power of thinking; stupid; not paying attention; have no mind; uncontrolled by mind. In fact, the term *wu-xin* should be translated as "non-conscious," a kind of attitude which says, "I am not interested in thinking about it. . . ."

On the more strictly linguistic level, Watson translates *shou*

(line 6) as “who.” In fact, *shou* is a question word that can mean “who” or “which” or “what.” Since “what” semantically embraces “who” and “which,” it is better to translate *shou* as “what.” Watson is too busy with subjects, verbs, connectives and punctuation though they are all syntactically justified. The addition of subjects and verbs damages the aptness of direct encounter between man and objects. The connectives and punctuation suggest a sense of causality and finality which is deliberately shunned in much Chan Buddhist poetry. . . .

It is unfair just to pinpoint the losses in Watson’s translation. There are also some positive gains in his rendering. For instance, on the cultural level, his translation of *ping-sheng-dao* 平生道 (the Way through ordinary life) as a short, direct “every-day Way” (line 1), is a witty and wonderful manifestation of his ingeniousness in translation.⁶

EXAMPLE NUMBER TWO: “Joy at Meeting”

Another student did an even more impressive piece of comparative-translation when she compared five translations of a *ci* type of poem by Li Yu (937-978) following the tune-title, “Joy at Meeting,” and, finally, offered her own version which follows:

Wu yan du shang xi lou
Yue ru gou
Ji mo wutong shen yuan suo qing qiu
Jian bu duan
Li hai luan
Shi li chou
Bei shi yi ban zi wei zai xin tou

無言獨上西樓
 月如鉤
 寂寞梧桐深院鎖清秋
 剪不斷
 理還亂
 是離愁
 別是一般滋味在心頭

Wordless, alone I go up the Western Chamber
 A sickle moon lingers.

Lonely Wu-tung trees lock clear autumn in the court.
 Sever yet inseparable,
 Ravel yet entangle:
 This the pain of parting —
 With a special savour in the core.

Even in the summary-paraphrase of her analysis which follows, the reader will discover that she has systematically touched on many comparative literature methodologies.

Period/Movement. For instance, she starts off by describing the younger Li Yu and his life of frivolity and license; she goes on to say that many of his early poems matched his life-style in their artificiality and floweriness. Then, after commenting on Li Yu's tragic fall from power as the last and deposed ruler of his dynasty, she adds:

Li Yu changed the *ci* from descriptive to lyric, and from a grand ornamented style into simple narrative. He gave new strength and direction to the decaying genre of *ci*. Li Yu's impact on the Sung poets like Su Shi and Liu Yong (987-1053) was apparent. Li Yu also raised the quality and status of the genre, *ci*; as Wang Guowei (1877-1927) remarked:

Not until Li Yu's time was the view of *ci* broadened and its passions deepened. Li Yu turned the *ci* of the lower class musicians into the *ci* of the scholars.

Genre/Style. Next, the student touches on the peculiar features of this poetic form, referring to its structural components, its tonal patterns, and its rhyme scheme (aaabbaa), etc. Then she criticizes two of the translators for their choice of words in the third line:

ji mo wu tong shen yuan suo qing qiu
 寂 寞 梧 桐 深 院 鎖 清 秋

The low rising in the word *suo* 鎖 (lock) has a sudden drop in the tone. It gives weight to the word and deepens the sorrow of captivity. Physically, Li Yu was locked up by the guards, and mentally, his grief locked up his happiness. T.C. Lai did not translate the word "lock." John A. Turner translated the word *suo* as "lapped." Both of them lost the richness of the word and missed the profundity of this image.

The student then makes a special point about rhyme:

Out of the five translations, three of them did not rhyme. The rhyming pattern in Lai's version was incomplete. Only Turner's rendition rhymed successfully (aababbcc), even though it lacked the echoing effect of the original. When I translated the poem myself, I also found that to rhyme and to be faithful to the original at the same time was very difficult. Turner succeeded in the first half, but committed a fatal mistake in the second: he mistranslated Li Yu's pain of separating from his kingdom exclusively as the sorrow of lovers when they separated.

Theme/Myth. The student next took up questions about the poem's content, insisting that the political disgrace theme was inseparably intertwined with the personal love theme:

After the fall of the nation, Little Empress Zhou was demoted to the title of The Lady of Zheng, and had to greet the Emperor of Sung whenever she was summoned. Each time she entered the palace, she was treated harshly by the cruel Emperor. However, she was still allowed to live with Li Yu. Perhaps it was on this occasion when he wrote the "Joy at Meeting" poem. Yet many critics believe that this poem was written as a nostalgic lament about his past glory and his happier hours. Contrarily, another opinion states that the poem was written when the lovers were separated. In any case, this poem shows that Li Yu was able to transcend his personal feelings in a universal sense. He wrote the poem with a patriotic kind of passion. But his feelings were so tender and subtle that the poem might be misunderstood to resemble simply an affection between lovers.

As a creative kind of recapitulation of all her efforts, the student explained her own attempt at translation which manifests an unusual consciousness and sensitivity about poetic rhythms and metrics:

My translation is inevitably influenced by the five other translations I have read. However I have tried to be faithful (to Li Yu) and to be original (to myself) at the same time. It was difficult but exciting. In content, I aimed at including all the words or meanings of the original without distorting them. As for tech-

nique, I wished to build up the mood, the tone and the speed which most closely resembled the original. My version is only loosely rhymed. I imitated the parallel structure of the original work in lines 6 and 7, and employed some alliteration in order to increase the musical effect. The trochaic stresses in "Chamber" and "lingers" (lines 1 and 2) were used to produce a lengthening effect and to slow down the tempo of the poem. In my translation, the metric pattern of the last four lines are as follows:

4. Sever yet inseparable,
5. Ravel yet entangle:
6. Tis the pain of parting –
7. With a special savour in the core.

I tried to speed up the lines and build up a climax in line 6 where the three consecutive trochees intensify the tension of the exclamation. Lastly, the anapest, "in the core" (line 7) echoes the same metric foot in line 3, "in the court."

As a final touch, the student not only produced the poem on a large poster in a fine calligraphic hand, but also carried comparative thematology a step further by comparing and contrasting Li Yu's poem with Byron's famous lyric, "When We Two Parted." She found some similarities at the pain of separation Byron experienced, for not only was he exiled from his country but also from his wife and beloved half-sister. She also found many significant differences, especially in light of the interdisciplinary dimension she applied to the biographical/historical backgrounds of the two poems.⁷

To sum up, as we have seen from all the translation examples I have examined, the translator is a kind of interlocutor, making any translated author, of whatever age, almost contemporaneous to our times. It is through translation that we can overcome historical and, to some extent, even artistic limitations, depending on the ingenuity of the translator. Although some may regret the limited number of direct influence studies that might be pursued in conventional studies of Chinese-English comparative literature, the translation exercises I am proposing are a useful continuation of this tradition. In a real sense, the literary translator becomes the original Western "author" who is directly influenced by the ancient Chinese writer and we, in turn, are influenced for better or worse by the translation. In short, the

translator can become for us a mediator between past and present, between China and the West.

By way of conclusion, I should just like to summarize my ideas about how translation can be a fruitful way of teaching Chinese-English comparative literature, by quoting from the assignment description which stimulated these sophomores to turn in—at this early stage of their training—such fine work.

DIRECTIONS FOR “TRANSLATION AND COMPARATIVE LITERATURE” ASSIGNMENT

- 1) Select a classical Chinese poem and study it carefully *as a Chinese poem* according to its pertinent cultural backgrounds (e.g., Biography, History, Literary School, etc.), its Chinese commentators, and its *textual and philological difficulties* (if any).
- 2) Locate at least three English translations representing:
 - a) Barbarization (e.g., Yip)
 - b) Naturalization (e.g., Turner)
 - c) Middle-of-the Road (e.g., Liu)

NB: Place yourself in the shoes of the reader who knows little if any Chinese. Realize that the translator has, in a sense, been influenced by the original author and that we the readers of the translation(s) are, in turn, influenced for better or worse by the adequacy or inadequacy of the translation(s).
- 3) Examine and compare (contrast) the original Chinese poem with its translations according to the traditional methodologies of Comparative Literature:
 - a) How has the original *influenced* the various translations; i.e., how much of the original purity has “flowed-into” the translation? On the contrary, how do you gauge the “contamination” dimension? Deliberate omissions? Additions? Does the translator foster a *mirage* kind of imagology (i.e., false images fostered by poor translations or imitations)?
 - b) Do the translators carry over into their versions the spirit of the *period/movement* in which it was written? Note the significance of both historical and literary allusions here and in c). A broad sense of history (and often, biography) is of crucial importance.

- c) To what extent have the translators carried over the *stylistic* features and the characteristics of the original *genre*? captured its subtle tone? adhered to its modes (e.g., ironic)? its conventions (e.g., pastoral)? Comment on the aesthetic *function* of semantic, syntactic, rhetorical, and prosodic features.
 - d) How successfully have the translators grasped the underlying *theme* of the original? Try to locate an English poem with the same or a similar theme in order to detect differences between the Chinese and English expressions of that theme.
 - e) If there are any *other disciplines* which might help you probe more deeply into understanding and appreciating the poems and their translations, try to indicate precisely how they do so; e.g., literary criticism, linguistics, other arts (e.g., music, painting, calligraphy), psychology, sociology, etc.
- 4) By way of conclusion, summarize the *gains and losses* of the translations *by comparing them as translations*. Pay attention to both the positive successes as well as the negative failures.
 - 5) Attempt a kind of back-translation into Chinese (unless you are too familiar with the original) and then give *your own "final" version* in order to demonstrate the "ideal" translation.
 - 6) For background reading, consult Roger Moore's article, "Introducing Translation: The Comparative Approach" (a brief summary follows):
 In the comparative approach to translation, outstanding literary texts from the target language are compared, literally word for word, with a number of competent, published translations. This highly successful method, which must be tried to be truly appreciated, has four immediate, relevant results:
 - a. Students gain a vastly improved understanding of the shades of possible meaning within the original text.
 - b. They gain a better working knowledge of the subtleties of their own language.
 - c. Students and teacher are made to realize the extent to which misunderstanding and even error can be present in a translated text.
 - d. Students are better able to understand the vital differences between creative writing, simple translation of meaning, and the incredibly difficult task of re-creating an artistic text in another language. (10)

Once one has conscientiously gone through this comparison-translation approach step-by-step, even beginners in Chinese-English translation can experience a double satisfaction. First of all, there will be an enormous intellectual pleasure in discovering their own ability to teach and develop themselves through self-study. Secondly, serious translator-comparativists will feel privileged that their individual efforts will have helped to correct distorted and misleading interpretations of literary masterpieces; finally, they will have contributed, through more correct and accurate renderings, to better inter-cultural understanding by breathing new life into literatures that would otherwise remain forever alien.

Notes

1. A much longer version of this paper was first presented during the "Conference on Translation Today," held at Hong Kong University from December 17-21, 1987, and subsequently published as chapter four of my *Comparative Literature from Chinese Perspectives* (Shenyang: Liaoning University Press, 1990).
2. I have also found Readers Response theory useful in teaching both Shakespeare and Chinese-American literature to my undergraduates, and I am preparing papers for publication on both subjects.
3. Genres other than poetry present special problems and their discussion would go beyond the scope of this paper. A number of recent publications on translation with a comparative slant treat these problems, however, and can be found in my recent bibliography: "Chinese-English Comparative Literature Bibliography—Part II of a Pedagogical Arrangement of Sources in English (1982-1987)," *Tamkang Review*, 17.4 (Summer 1987): 325-331. When the proceedings of the conference on "Translation Today: Culture and Information Interflow" (Hong Kong December 17-21, 1987) are published, Bonnie McDougall's "Genre-specific Problems and Approaches in the Translation of Poetry, Fiction, Drama and Film," will be of special interest.
4. For a convenient list of some representative reference works, see my lengthy n. 36 in chapter four of my *Comparative Literature from Chinese Perspectives*, pp. 175-176.
5. For a useful article see Tam Kwok-kan, "Issues in Reception Theory and Chinese-Western Comparative Literature," *Tamkang Review* 16.4 (Summer 1986): 325-341. Also of interest is Eugene Eoyang's "The Malajusted Messenger: *Rezeptionas-thetik* in Translation," in *Literatures, Histories, and Literary Histories*, ed. Zhouhan Yang and Daiyun Yue (Shenyang: Liaoning UP, 1989), 158-87.
6. Unpublished term paper by Chin Wan Kan, English Department, The Chinese U of Hong Kong, 1984. Also instructive is David Hawkes's review of Watson's translation of Han Shan (*Journal of the American Oriental Society*, 82.4 ([1962]), as well as his essay comparing translations of the *Book of Songs* by Waley and Pound (*Encounter*, 5.1 (July 1955)). Both essays have been reprinted in *David Hawkes—Classical, Modern and Humane: Essays in Chinese Literature*, ed. John Minford and Siu-kit Wong (Hong Kong: The Chinese UP, 1989) 249-252 and 231-236,

respectively.

7. Unpublished term paper by Chan Man Fang, English Department, The Chinese U of Hong Kong, 1984. Of course, there are many essays which compare translations but do not necessarily follow comparative literature methodologies as Chan Man Fang has attempted to do. See, for instance, Herbert V. Fackler, "Three English Versions of Han-Shan's Cold Mountain Poems," *Literature: East and West* 15.2 (1971): 269-278; Peter Dragin and Paul Dresman, "Forms of Open Form: A Comparison of English Translations of Li Ch'ing Chao," *Tamkang Review*, 15.1-4 (Autumn 1984-Summer 1985): 285-306; Wong Siu-kit and Shi Kar-shu, "Three English Translations of the *Shijing*," *Renditions* 25 (Spring 1986): 113-139; and Paul Kahn, "Han Shan in English," *Renditions* 25 (Spring 1986): 140-173.

Works Cited

- ACLA [American Comparative Literature Association] Newsletter* 13.1-2 (Spring & Fall, 1981): 1-23.
- Liu, James Jo-yu. "Polarity of Aims and Methods: Naturalization and Barbarization?" *Yearbook of Comparative and General Literature*, No. 24 (1975): 60-68.
- Moore, Roger. "Introducing Translation: The Comparative Approach." *The Canadian Modern Languages Review* 38.1 (Autumn 1981): 10-18.
- Turner, John A. *A Golden Treasury of Chinese Poetry: 121 Classical Poems*, comp. and ed. John J. Deeney (Hong Kong: The Chinese U of Hong Kong, 1976). A new paperback edition appeared in 1989.
- Watson, Burton, trans. *Cold Mountain: 100 Poems by the Tang Poet Han Shan* (New York: Grove Press, Inc., 1962).
- Yip, Wai-lim. "Translating Chinese Poetry: The Convergence of Languages and Poetics—A Radical Introduction," *Chinese Poetry: Major Modes and Genres*, ed. and trans. Wai-lim Yip (Berkeley: U of California p. 1976), 1-41.

