Compilation and Translation Review
Vol. 11, No. 2 (September 2018), 99-128

Translators' Collaboration and Decision-Making in the Case of Bai Hua's *The Remote Country of Women*

Tzu-yi Elaine Lee

In translation studies, primary sources are often unavailable and are therefore overlooked. Nevertheless, translators' manuscripts are an important example of a type of first-hand source that can be used for studying decision-making processes in the course of doing a translation. *The Remote Country of Women* is considered a powerful feminist utopian novel, but it has received little critical attention and remains under-researched in the literature. This study investigates the translators' decision-making process by comparing and contrasting the original manuscript of the translation, which will have its problems and limitations, with the final product. To do this, the study probes the evolution of the translated text based on the translators' selection of particular words/terms, and evaluates the immediacy and vividness of the final translation. Moreover, one of the translators was interviewed, and Howard Goldblatt, the General Editor of the series *Fiction from Modern China* which now includes the newly-translated *The Remote Country of Women*, was contacted for publication details. Finally, the study discusses these translators' specific workflow, power, and capital they may have had in the translation field.

Keywords: decision-making process, the translator's manuscript, *The Remote Country of Women*, presentation of speech and thought, translators' collaborative process

Received: October 11, 2017
Revised: January 26, 2018, April 10, 2018, June 24, 2018
Accepted: June 27, 2018

Tzu-yi Elaine Lee, Assistant Professor, Department of Applied Linguistics and Language Studies, Chung Yuan Christian University, E-mail: bluestone1207@gmail.com

編譯論叢
第十一卷　第二期（2018年9月），99—128

譯者決策過程及合作模式之探討——以白樺的《遠方有個女兒國》為例

李姿儀

在翻譯研究中，譯者手稿是研究譯者決策過程的最佳來源，但譯者手稿等第一手資料，卻常因無法取得而受到忽略。中國作家白樺的《遠方有個女兒國》，一般被認為是帶有強烈女性主義烏托邦色彩的小說，但受到政治因素影響，此作品鮮為人知，更鮮少作為研究素材。本研究的重點是從《遠方有個女兒國》的譯者手稿以及出版譯作，來探討譯者的決策過程。筆者在有限的手稿中進行分析比較，討論譯者從一開始與最後定稿選用的字詞，如何影響段落話語與思想的表達方式，並影響英譯本的生動程度。除了譯本分析之外，筆者更進一步親自訪談譯者，理解兩位譯者的合作模式，並聯繫收錄《遠方有個女兒國》英譯本的《現代中國小說叢書》（*Fictions from Modern China*）總審定葛浩文（Howard Goldblatt）先生，了解此書出版流程。最後，本論文探討譯者分工模式以及在翻譯場域裡擁有的權力及資本。

關鍵詞：決策過程、譯者手稿、《遠方有個女兒國》、話語與思想表達方式、譯者合作模式

收件：2017年10月11日
修改：2018年1月26日、2018年4月10日、2018年6月24日
接受：2018年6月27日

李姿儀，中原大學應用外國語文學系助理教授，E-mail: bluestone1207@gmail.com。

Introduction

Although the translator's decision-making process may be subjective and intuitive (e.g., Komissarov, 2009, p. 523), translation scholars maintain that this process is ultimately governed by correlated linguistic and cognitive patterns in both the source and target languages (e.g., Englund Dimitrova, 2005; Toury, 1995). To understand translators' decision-making processes in this endeavour, the study of primary sources, that is, the analysis of literary translators' manuscripts, can be implemented, although this has long been overlooked in translation studies (Munday, 2013). According to Munday (2013), the main reason for this oversight is that, unless the translator is a well-known author and/or particularly prefers to document and preserve his or her own writing, early drafts are not often readily available. Translators' manuscripts are typically discarded after the translations are published.

The Remote Country of Women was first published in 1988. This novel was the first work by Bai Hua (白樺), who is recognized as a major contemporary Chinese writer. Bai Hua was born in a small city in Henan Province in 1930 and was named Chen Youhua (陳佑華) (he later chose Bai Hua as his pseudonym). Bai Hua's poetic sensitivity and love for literature were first shaped by his mother's folk songs and by her poor and illiterate friends' devotional Buddhist songs (Wu, 1991). In 1947, Bai Hua joined the People's Liberation Army; in 1951, he began to write poems, short stories, and screenplays. He began his career as a fiction writer in 1964 and has resided in Shanghai since 1985. Political issues and language barriers meant that *The Remote Country of Women* received little critical attention both at home and abroad; thus, his feminist utopian novel has been largely unnoticed (Wu, 1991, p. 198). As Bai Hua states in the introduction to the Taiwanese edition of the book, the author's intention

is to "use the past as a mirror to see the present" (Bai, 1988, p. 1), and to use matrilineal values to challenge our traditional views of the primitive versus the modern, the barbaric versus the civilized, and the monogamous versus the promiscuous. Two translators, Wu Qingyun (武慶雲) and Thomas O. Beebee, the latter a native English speaker, worked together to translate the novel into English in 1994. The translated version is part of the *Fiction from Modern China* series; the General Editor of that anthology, Howard Goldblatt, proclaimed the novel to be one of the "boldest new voices in China" (Goldblatt, 1994, p. III).

The story, originally published in China in 1988, contains two antithetical narratives that converge in the final chapters (Twitchell, 1995). One describes a utopian world and focuses on Sunamei, a young woman of the Moso, a subgroup of the Naxi nationality, in a remote but beautiful area at the border of Yunnan and Sichuan provinces in southwest China. In alternating chapters, we follow the male protagonist, Liang Rui, through the Cultural Revolution to experience a labour camp and a prison from his perspective. The story shuttles back and forth from utopia to dystopia, presenting the conflicts in the two worlds in which the characters live; Sunamei lives in a matriarchal society in which women freely take lovers and are responsible for home and family, and Liang Rui lives under political and emotional repression in a patriarchal society. Sunamei's happy growth and innocent questioning reveal an organic social system embodied in matrilineality, which contrasts sharply with Liang Rui's imprisonment, his ironic observations, and the absurdity and horror lurking behind socialist China's revolutionary slogans. When Sunamei is nearly 13 years old, she undergoes the rituals of "Changing into Dress" and worshipping the Goddess Ganmu (干木女神), which marks her growth into a full-fledged, independent woman. She later has free sexual relationships with two men, Long Bu and Ying Zhi, before she joins a Dancing and Singing Troupe in the modern city. In the other narrative, after his release from prison, Liang Rui

discovers that his girlfriend has abandoned him. Out of frustration, and seeking isolation, he volunteers to go to one of the most remote and untouched areas of China. He then receives a post as a handyman, or a jack-of-all-trades, at a cinema in a county close to the Moso Community. There he meets Sunamei, who is reviled by the town due to the Moso women's penchant and reputation for promiscuity; however, Liang Rui boldly marries her nonetheless. From this point forward, Liang Rui transforms into a stereotypical patriarchal man attempting to possess his wife, constrain her with their marriage certificate, and master her. While visiting the Moso Community, Liang Rui catches Sunamei with her former lover, Ying Zhi, and becomes violently angry. As a result, Sunamei and the entire Moso Community banish him.

This study was prompted by the discovery of parts of Wu Qingyun's PhD dissertation drafts. Wu was one of the translators of *The Remote Country of Women*. In her dissertation, Wu (1991) presents thorough research on the transformation of female rules in utopian novels, including Bai Hua's *The Remote Country of Women*, and Wu introduces and compares several utopian literary works in English and in Chinese. The most "illuminating" part of her dissertation noted by Wong (1996) is the comparison of *The Remote Country of Women* to Ursula K. Le Guin's *The Dispossessed* (published in 1974), because it offers insights into modern conceptions of utopian society (p. 358). Indeed, her analysis is very important to this study because literature addressing the work remains rather scarce. It is reasonable to assume that the English drafts were first made by Wu, because there was no English translation of the novel while she was writing her PhD dissertation at Pennsylvania State University. Therefore, Wu likely translated certain passages on her own to analyse the work. Because textual genetics, the concept this study follows, regards authorial drafts, notes, or documents preceding the published text as manuscripts, passages translated in Wu's (1991) PhD dissertation could be considered her manuscript.

Indeed, the manuscript in her PhD dissertation could be described in this study as phases of textual evolution that are very suitable for investigating "critical points" to seek where the translators' input is most revealing (Munday, 2013). Moreover, the pieces of translation drafts found in her dissertation are important because they can be compared with the published version to explore both Wu's ideas alone and her ideas in collaboration with the other translator, Thomas O. Beebee, in the decision-making process. In addition, the translation drafts in Wu's dissertation involve speech and thought presentations, an important topic that we will investigate more deeply in the following section. Nonetheless, since Wu only selected a few passages for translation to support her arguments, the text that can be discussed in this study is rather limited. Additionally, the translation activity occurred some time ago; therefore, no other drafts are available for investigation, according to the interview (T. O. Beebee, personal communication, May 20, 2016). Such a limitation speaks to Munday's (2013) comments regarding the extreme difficulty of obtaining translators' manuscripts.

The other translator, a native English speaker as well as Wu's dissertation co-advisor, Thomas O. Beebee, was interviewed in person for this study. His valuable comments recounted the workflow, the division of the translation job between the two translators, and other aspects of the decision-making process. According to Beebee (personal communication, May 20, 2016), Wu first finished a draft of the entire story and then sent it to him to "novelize" it for target readers. Surprisingly, Beebee does not speak or read Chinese; therefore, he did not read the original story. Instead, he modified Wu's manuscript to seem more "English." During the modification process, Beebee collected linguistic items to be discussed with Wu, and they produced a third version together, which was eventually published. Beebee's comments indicated that Wu always had the final say as to the linguistic items they discussed because she

was "strong-minded" and had read the original story (personal communication, May 20, 2016). Thus, we can now explore the draft and final versions at different stages of both translators' decision-making processes.

Studies on Translators' Manuscripts as Part of Their Decision-making Process

There is little literature in translation studies that discusses translators' manuscripts. Nonetheless, a small group of researchers has been working on genetic translation studies over a decade, led by Hulle (2004), who first published his genetic study of late manuscripts by Joyce, Proust, and Mann. Genetic translation studies aim to analyse the practices of working translators and the evolution, or genesis, of the translated texts, such as translators' manuscripts, drafts and other working documents. A vital concept is to consider the published text as simply one phase in the text's evolution (Cordingley & Montini, 2015) and to map out and understand the different phrases of its composition (Deppman, Ferrer, & Groden, 2004). One of the great strengths for such a consideration is to problematize the concept of the translator's "agency" because translators are often assumed to consciously adopt a position or strategy to which they remain committed throughout the translation activity; however, by investigating the creative process of a translation's multiple compositions, we may find translators exercising greater "agency" to intervene in the text, especially at the later revision phases. They may also change to an opposing strategy or position, especially for works that may be censored from the market. Indeed, according to Cordingley and Montini (2015), to simply claim that translators are exercising certain "agency" in the published text only partially reflects the nature of their work.

Among the scant research on translators' manuscripts, some (Bush,

2006; Filippakopoulou, 2008; Jones, 2006) look at the translators' own drafts. Bush (2006) describes the evolution of a paragraph between the first, sixth, and eighth drafts in the opening of his own translation of Spanish novelist Juan Goytisolo's autobiography. He voices the opinion that the translator's emotional and intellectual involvement is the most complicated act of human communication. To demonstrate, he reports grappling already in the first draft with the need to address wordplay and facing the losses and gains inherent in translation. At this stage, proper names are left untranslated. By the sixth draft, the entire text is compressed, and superfluous adjectives or adverbs are removed, rendering the text much tighter and denser. In addition, a more sensible and reasonable solution is found for translating the names. At this stage, decisions are focused on strategic matters such as how to address heteroglossia (French and Latin) in the original (Spanish). Bush's account of his motivations helps us understand the reasoning behind certain decisions, such as deliberately highlighting alliteration. While Bush's report is more like an account of the translation process, Jones (2006) applies the think-aloud protocol (TAP) to study himself translating a Serbo-Croatian poem over the course of four drafts, and adds open-ended interviews with five poetry translators to learn more about their cognitive processes. The think-aloud protocol reveals that Jones himself shifted the focus between drafts: from lexis form in Draft one to rhythm, rhyme, and poetic form in Draft two, to a more holistic revision in Drafts three and four.

In an attempt to avoid the "hazards of verbalization" associated with the use of the think-aloud protocol, Filippakopoulou (2008) explores the drafts, and reflective comments of an English translation of Aziz Chouaki's novel by two collaborating contemporary literary translators, Schwartz and Norman. Filippakopoulou (2008) found the translators' prescriptive quest for linguistic accuracy and the retrospective texts' reflection of "the emotive experience that

arguably is the enterprise of translation" (p. 34) in their revisions. Moreover, while highlighting the major flaws and limitations of draft examination, she argues that drafts are materials for recording the translator's "evolving perception" of the source text and "different materializations" of the target (Filippakopoulou, 2008, p. 20). A later study by Munday (2013) suggests a thorough analysis of textual shifts (changes in word order, verb perspective, conjunction replacements, etc.) between multiple drafts to understand the translator's decisions at different points in the process. Adopting the corpus- and process-based approaches proposed by Alves, Pagano, Neumann, Steiner and Hansen-Schirra (2010), Munday's (2013) study looked at David Bello's three drafts and the published version of Georges Perec's work *Les Choses: Une Histoire des Années Soixante* (published in 1965). His results correspond to Jones's (2006) report that the translator's focus shifts from lexical problems in the earliest drafts, to form and structure, and then to a holistic evaluation in later or final drafts. Although Munday (2013) does not, in fact, seem to analyse the translator's cognitive aspects, as he claims in the beginning of his study, he does evaluate the research methodology and stresses the value of investigating translator drafts, and in this regard, his study inspires further investigation of the translators' decision-making process in this study.

On the Presentation of Speech and Thoughts in English

A substantial body of scholarship by literary theorists and linguists has focused on fictional narratives and the various modes of thought and speech presentation they depict, especially free indirect discourse (e.g., Gharaei & Dastjerdi, 2012; Gunn, 2004; Klitgård, 2004). Levenston and Sonnenschein (1986) and Rouhiainen (2000) introduce the concept of narratology to

translation studies. By analysing French and Hebrew translations of English prose texts, Levenston and Sonnenschein (1986) highlight linguistic markers of focalization, which they recommend should be preserved or compensated for in translation; otherwise, there is a risk of losing the irony conveyed in the original language. By contrast, Rouhiainen (2000) focuses on the translation of free indirect discourse in D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love* into Finnish, noting that Finnish translators must handle the problem of the absence of equivalent literary norms in the target culture.

According to Leech and Short (1982), different types of discourse can be regarded as stylistic variants of the same position, which forms a cline of speech representation, suggesting the narrator's control in the absence of the narrator's apparent control (p. 320). Five types of discourse on this continuum are often mentioned for speech/thought presentation. Narrative Report of Speech Acts, which is "more indirect than indirect speech" (Leech & Short, 1982, p. 323), reflects the narrator's apparent control. The next three in the middle, showing the narrator in partial control of the report, are Indirect Speech, Free Indirect Speech, and Direct Speech. Free Direct Speech appears not to be under the narrator's control because the character can speak to the readers more immediately without the narrator as an intermediary (Bosseaux, 2007, p. 57). In other words, if the characters provide verbatim thoughts, the narrator is required to intervene less. As the counterpart of Free Direct Speech, the use of Free Direct Thought allows readers to instantly watch the character's thoughts change through a very notable mode of stream of consciousness (Toolan, 1988, p. 122).

Shen (1991) contributes an ambiguous mode of blending Direct and Indirect Speech into the continuum, along with noting the five types of discourse categorized by Leech and Short (1982), especially when transferring speech modes from Chinese narrative fiction into English. She terms the

mode "Blend in Chinese," which lends itself to at least two interpretations that might pose a dilemma for translators. This blend can occur in both direct and indirect modes and, according to Shen (1991), has the advantage of connoting immediacy instead of hindering the narrative's smooth flow. Nonetheless, when translating Chinese blends into English, the translators' dilemmas frequently occur because of the absence of tense indicators in the original text. If the translators attempt to preserve the immediacy of speech by using the present tense, they might lift the speech out of the narrative plane; however, keeping the speech in the past tense, and therefore on the narrative plane, might detract from the vividness and immediacy of the speech. In other words, although both voices in the blend are meant to be indistinguishable from one another in regard to linguistic criteria, one of the voices is favoured at the expense of the other. In Shen's (1991) view, the presentation of direct speech without quotes in English seems rather rare. Nonetheless, Chinese direct speech is frequently featured with no quotation marks, no commas or full stops, no punctuation, and no paragraph divisions. The two translators must decide specifically whether to distinguish the character's actual words from a narrative report, which will be discussed in the textual analysis that follows.

Textual Analysis

In the following textual analysis, we select fragments of the draft found in Wu's (1991) PhD dissertation and compare them to the final published translation. Notably, while issues of availability prevent us from comparing the different drafts, which is a strategy employed in the works of Bush (2006), Jones (2006), and Munday (2012), this study's main purpose is to illustrate what these comparisons can tell us about the translator's decision-making process, rather than to provide a full overview of the results.

Criticizing Monogamy

Depictions of feminist utopias typically judge and criticize patriarchal dominance and oppression in society. In *The Remote Country of Women*, Mosonian sexual freedom is regarded as an emancipatory symbol that Bai Hua highlights to cast the protagonist Liang Rui in a harsh light. Although he fights against mechanized modern society, Liang Rui is nonetheless unable to suppress his own chauvinist ego. When he finds his wife with her former lover, Ying Zhi, he bursts into outrage as follows:

> 我衝過去狠狠地抽了她兩個耳光。……用身子擋住她，大聲斥責我。我聽不懂他的話，但我知道他的用意。我怎麼能容忍一個污辱了我的人來斥責我呢？……**你有甚麼權利！你這個壞蛋！趁我不在時溜進我的房子，爬上我的床，引誘我的妻子，我要狠狠地懲罰你！** [emphasis added] ……我正要用全力舉起那劈柴的一剎那，蘇納美大叫了一聲。這聲音很陌生，是一種撕裂心脾的叫，像野獸的叫聲。她拉著英至就往門外衝去。……帶火的柴棒全都飛上了屋頂，一下子就著火了。(Bai, 1988, p. 458)

This study examines and discusses two versions of this passage: one from the draft in Wu's PhD dissertation and the other from the final version of the story published in 1994. By comparing the two versions shown in Table 1, we can examine particular linguistic items and identify differences in speech or thought presentations. In this manner, we can discuss the potential effects of these differences on the translator's decision-making process. As confirmed by Professor Beebee (personal communication, May 20, 2016), the native English–speaking translator, Wu finished the translation draft and submitted it to him for "novelization," which may have included revisions and potential adaptations in more formal English for native readers. Because Beebee did not preserve the

second translated version he revised and novelized, the researcher could only reference the very limited manuscripts in Wu's PhD dissertation during the discussion. Together, they created the third draft, which was the final published version. Therefore, the textual analysis compares the first and third drafts of the English translation.

Table 1

Example 1 in Draft and Final Versions

Draft	Final
I rushed over and slapped her face fiercely. . . . Ying Zhi protected her with his body and began to reproach me. I could not understand his words. What right have you! You dirty dog! To steal into ***My*** room, get into ***My*** bed, seduce ***My*** wife. I will punish him! I picked up a large piece of firewood. . . . The next moment I was striking at Ying Zhi, *Sunamei screamed like a wild beast* [emphasis added]. She grasped Ying Zhi and dashed out . . . the kindled wood flew to the roof, the whole building was *swallowed* [emphasis added] by tongues of flame. . . . (Wu, 1991, p. 212)	I dashed over and slapped her. . . . he protected her with his body and yelled at me. I could not understand his words, *What right do you have, you scoundrel? What right do you have to steal into my room, to get into my bed, and to seduce my wife* [emphasis added]? I will punish *you* [emphasis added] mercilessly. I picked up a piece of oak. . . . As I lifted it to strike at Ying Zhi, *Sunamei uttered a scream, a strange scream, a soultearing cry like that of a wounded beast* [emphasis added]. She grabbed Ying Zhi and dashed out. . . . burning wood flew to the ceiling, and the room was quickly *engulfed* [emphasis added] by flames. (Bai, 1994, p. 364)

Note. Compiled by the author

To begin the analysis, the original passage in this example is from the male character, Liang Rui, who narrates nearly half of the story. Readers can follow his perspective to understand the world in which he lives: first under the rule of communists and then in the utopia. This is where readers find Liang Rui's narrative flow of thoughts after he is invited into the Mosonian society, and his reports regarding Mosonian customs and ways of living. Although he is aware

that reuniting with one's former lover, and polyandry, are common in this remote country, his inability to suppress his strong will, which was developed in the patriarchal framework to which he is accustomed, leads to his rage over his own failure to control his wife. In narration, the passage can be regarded as Free Direct Thought in which Liang Rui presents his thoughts without any reporting clause or quotation marks.

Special attention in this case should be paid to underlined sentences because the language is much more formal and grammatically correct in the final version. For example, the phrase "[t]o steal into **My** room, get into **My** bed, seduce **My** wife," which employs bolded and capitalized terms in the draft, is altered to use italics, which represents a type of emphasis that is familiar to target readers. More importantly, the pronoun of the target of Liang's attempted violence is changed from "him" in Wu's draft to "you" in the final version. The change of pronoun, in particular, alters the effects that the passage has on the intended readers. In Wu's version, the use of the third-person pronoun "him" corresponds to the Free Direct Thought that Liang Rui has in mind. The use of "you," on the other hand, leads the passage to lose the original feeling of being the Free Direct Speech that Liang Rui is narrating to himself, and may even imply that he is confronting Ying Zhi in person. Indeed, Wu's draft presents Liang Rui's thought as a direct interior monologue by means of informal English, short phrases, and the use of "him." Thought is presented more inwardly, using phrases rather than sentences as his rage escalates. The interior monologue not only presents what the character thinks, but also the character's immediate experience or consciousness of these thoughts (Leech & Short, 1982, p. 337). As is the case with an example noted by Cohn (1978), the monologue captures both inner and outer reality, and these concrete mental images could inspire anger in the reader (p. 169). In contrast, the final version, which features formal English and an orderly presentation,

allows readers to watch the character's thoughts as they change instantly. By comparing the draft and final versions, we can see the differences between the two and the shift from Liang Rui's interior monologue to Free Direct Thought in the final version. This shift could, in turn, demonstrate that in her draft, Wu managed to draw readers into, and engage them with, Liang Rui's mindset in confronting his rival, Ying Zhi.

Several linguistic items have been modified for a more formal English presentation in the final version. For example, the informal use of "dirty dog" in the draft is replaced by a more formal term, "scoundrel," in the published version. Likewise, the term "swallowed" is replaced by the formal "engulfed." Notably, Sunamei's cry is expanded in the final version to "a strange scream, a soultearing cry like that of a wounded beast" (Bai, 1994, p. 364) to correspond to the source text, while it seems that Wu had originally simply provided a rough description.

Female Superiority

In contrast to the society in which Liang Rui has been raised, the Mosonians espouse strict egalitarianism in daily material distribution, but the female always stands in the central position and is superior to the male. Moso women do not have to court men; instead, they have the right to choose among those who court them. They are much more independent in regard to relationships with men; whereas in "civilized" China, a woman's husband is her entire life, as shown in the following comments by Sunamei:

> 你以為我也像你們漢族女人**那麼賤** [emphasis added]，丈夫夜晚沒回來，**滿街** [emphasis added] 去找；男人不要她，她哭天號地，像天塌地陷一樣？有一回在城裡就遇見了這樣的漢族女人，我問她：大嫂，你哭哪樣呀？她哭著說：我那個挨刀的男人不要

> 我了呀！**沒有良心的強盜** [emphasis added] 呀！——**像唱歌似的** [emphasis added]，我對她說：大嫂！她不要你，你不會不要他？她被我這句話**嚇住了** [emphasis added]，眨巴眨巴眼睛，想了想又唱著歌**哭起來** [emphasis added]：我的天呀！我的地呀！我的命呀！ (Bai, 1988, p. 449)

This quote is from Sunamei, the female protagonist and Mosonian woman who has been brought up with different ideas about relationships with men than those in Han society. In terms of the discourse presentation, it is a direct speech in which the author (Bai) allows readers to read every linguistic item exactly as the character does; thus, it brings readers closer to Sunamei's thought process because there is no interference. In a way, the author "gives voice" to the character and invites readers to follow her mental flow. Nonetheless, in this quote, the focus is on the dialogue between Sunamei and the Han woman, particularly as it is translated into English. Chinese typically employs a semicolon and inverted commas to indicate that someone is speaking in direct speech, but in this case, the dialogue from the Han woman (narrated by Sunamei) is presented in Table 2 with only a colon and with no quotation marks. It might arguably be due to the idiosyncratic writing style that the author Bai uses to attempt not to hinder the narrative flow with too many quotation marks. This informal style, direct speech with no quotation marks, could be open to interpretation. On one hand, readers might take the speech after each colon to be the Han woman's verbatim speech, because even the inverted commas are missing. On the other hand, the reporting phrase can be assumed to be used by Sunamei to portray the Han woman in narration as in Free Direct Speech. However, the difference between the two presentations lies in the dialogue's vividness and immediacy, both of which are prioritized in the first translation. The blend in this example might supplement the study by

Shen (1991), in which she first describes the ambiguous mode that can result in at least two interpretations as a "blend" in Chinese; however, the example of a "blend" used in her study concerned both direct and indirect modes, while in this case, even the direct mode itself can become a blend in presentations of speech and thought. In terms of translation, we witness the translators' decision-making process: we have five sentences using colons, the first indicating that the translator Wu attempted to introduce Sunamei's illustration of the way that Han women value their husbands, and the remainder is used to indicate the lines of dialogue between Sunamei and the Han woman.

Table 2

Example 2 in Draft and Final Versions

Draft	Final
Do you think I would *behave myself in such an inferior way* [emphasis added] as a Han woman: if her husband is not home by night, she searches *the whole street* [emphasis added]; if the man does want her any more, she cries as if the sky were falling? Once in town I met such a Han woman wailing. I asked her: Sister, why are you crying? She screamed: That man of mine, who deserves being butchered, abandons me! That heartless Beast! *Her curse was so much like singing* [emphasis added]. I told her: Sister, if he abandons you, why don't you abandon him? She was *scared* [emphasis added] by my words. Blinking her eye for a moment, she wailed even louder: Oh, my Heaven! My Earth! My Life! (Wu, 1991, p. 226)	"Do you think I would *lower* [emphasis added] myself as a Han woman does? If her husband does not come back at night, she searches *high and low* [emphasis added]; if the man does not want her any more, she cries as if the sky is falling. Once in town I met such a Han woman wailing. I asked her, 'Sister, why are you crying?' She screamed, 'That man of mine, who deserves to be butchered, has abandoned me! That heartless beast!' *It sounded more like singing than cursing* [emphasis added]. I said to her, 'Sister, if he has abandoned you, why don't you abandon him?' She was *horrified* [emphasis added] by my words. Blinking her eyes for a moment, she wailed even louder: 'Oh, my heaven! My earth! My life!'" (Bai, 1994, p. 358)

Note. Compiled by the author

As in the previous case, other interesting modifications are made in the final English version, which is much more formal than the initial draft. For example, we find one example of the translators applying English-language idioms, such as "searches high and low" when translating the item "滿街去找," while in the initial draft, Wu uses "searches the whole street." In addition, some new terms are found to be added by the translators, such as the word "horrified," which is used in the translation to indicate the extent to which the Han woman is shocked upon hearing Sunamai's perspective on marriage. The translators' supplementation is also shown when they address the two Chinese terms "像唱歌似的" and "哭起來," which are translated as "[i]t sounded more like singing than cursing" and "wailed even louder." Thus, the researchers initially inferred (and Professor Beebee later confirmed) that the readers' reception was prioritized because this translation's main purpose was to familiarize readers with the story rather than to highlight Bai's idiosyncratic writing style.

Discussion and Conclusion

Unlike the think-aloud protocol applied by Jones (2006), and instead in correspondence with Filippakopoulou's (2008) attempt to keep the investigation "as free of the hazards of verbalization as possible" (pp. 21-22), this study is a qualitative examination targeting Wu and Beebee's decision-making process. Because of the relatively small database, it would be inappropriate to apply any corpus-related methodology, so an interdisciplinary approach was employed in combination with the corpus-based and process-based approaches used by Munday (2013). Using the concept of genetic criticism of drafts as records of translators' evolving perceptions of the original, the study exposes the otherwise hidden collaborative nature of a translated work (Cordingley & Manning, 2017; De los Reyes Lozano, 2015), which is one of this study's

major findings. Additionally, this study explores the differences between the draft in Wu's PhD dissertation and the final version, which may illuminate the translators' decision-making process more than provide a full picture of the results. As can be found in with the concept of "critical points" developed by Munday (2012, 2013), in evaluating drafts in which the translator constantly revisits and explores the work, this study also focuses on identifying linguistic features that are susceptible to value manipulation, that generate the most interpretative and evaluative potential, or that show where the translators' input is most revealing. According to the in-person interview with Professor Beebee in May of 2016, the role he played in the workflow with Wu was to "novelize" her draft. In other words, he was responsible for making Wu's English more formal and acceptable to the target audience. As discovered during the interview, it is notable that Professor Beebee does not speak or read Chinese; his modification was primarily based on Wu's draft, although his name is listed on the published version as a translator.

According to the interview with Professor Beebee, Wu made the final decisions about linguistic items in the final version because she had understanding of the original story and had personally selected the work to be translated for publication (T. O. Beebee, personal communication, May 20, 2016). Because of her bilingual competence, Wu subverts our previous understanding of translators, who have long been portrayed in scholarship as subservient figures due to an imbalance in negotiating power (e.g., Simeoni, 1998) in the publication field. More importantly, it was Wu who embarked upon the translation activity herself after obtaining her PhD, and she invited Professor Beebee to cooperate. They later accepted General Editor Howard Goldblatt's invitation to submit the unpublished translation to Hawaii University Press. After a strict examination process, it was chosen as one of the fiction works for the series *Fictions from Modern China*, which Goldblatt

says is composed of "unpublished translations, completed or nearly so" (H. Goldblatt, personal communication, August 28, 2014). The formation of the series *Fiction from Modern China* diverged from series examined in previous studies in certain very specific ways (Hermans, 1996; Lee, 2010). Typically, an editor or a publisher selects the works to be translated and then outsources the books to translators who are qualified in the publisher's estimation; however, in this series, the translators either sent in their unpublished works in the hope of being published, or they accepted the invitation from the General Editor to submit their translations. Thus, we see the translators exercising power by playing an active role rather than remaining submissive and passive to their patrons. In connection with this project, the translators not only decided the story they wanted to translate but also determined which publisher or press would publish their translations. They did not plan on a translation fee paid by the publisher per word; instead, they began the translation job long before being commissioned by the publisher. These translators, most of whom are university professors and sinologists, are well-known in their respective fields; therefore they have at least some cultural and social capital, as proposed by Bourdieu (as cited in Wolf, 2002). Moreover, the translations they completed were sold as products on the basis of royalties (T. O. Beebee, personal communication, May 20, 2016).

Nevertheless, after closely examining the limited examples, the "novelization," as described by Professor Beebee, improved the register in English. This result is particularly apparent when we implement the representation of speech and thought as the basis for evaluating the draft and published versions of the work we selected for analysis. In particular, based on ambiguities between narration and thoughts, this study aimed to discover how the two translators' decisions were made during the process and how these decisions are indicated in the draft and final versions of the work. In the first

example, we could see the changes between the two versions, from the direct interior monologue in Wu's draft to Free Direct Thought in the published version. Although both modes invite readers to access the character's mind without the author as an intermediary, replacing "him" in the draft with "you" in the published version further intensified the potential for confrontation between Liang Rui and his rival Ying Zhi. Therefore, the effect is much stronger than the interior monologue in the draft, which is assumed to be the main reason that Wu would have agreed to modify this part of her draft. In the second example, we examine a direct speech from Sunamei, the leading female protagonist in the novel, who conveys her discussion with a Han woman to explain to Liang Rui (her Han husband) her confusion at the concept of marriage and the man-woman relationship in Han Chinese society. She shares different perspectives with Liang and, through this speech and her interior dialogue, the author attempts to portray the wide cultural divide between the two societies. In the original, Bai Hua's idiosyncratic writing style uses only colons to indicate the conversation between Sunamei and the Han woman. In this manner, the author exploits this ambiguous mode by simultaneously preserving the quote's effect and removing the quotation marks for uncluttered reading. In addition, Shen (1991) considers the use of direct speech without quotation marks in English translation to be rather rare. While Wu's draft followed the original text by not using the inverted comma to present the dialogue, the final version includes quotation marks, which were added so that the formal English would be grammatically correct and readers would not be confused by the original format's ambiguity.

Although this study has examined only a small corpus of research, we have explored the two translators' decision-making processes, interviewed one of the translators and personally communicated with Mr. Goldblatt, the General Editor of the series *Fiction from China* during the period in which the

translation was published. More importantly, in addition to the findings from the textual analysis, this study has also shed light on the conditions of the translation industry in which the translators of *Fiction from China* worked during the 1990s, and the power, as well as capital, they possessed in their translation activity, which is also addressed in sociologies of collaborative translation (Cordingley & Manning, 2017, pp. 12-15). Our findings distinguish these two translators' work from previous understandings of translation strategies and the perceptions that are held regarding commercial translators.

References

Alves, F., Pagano, A., Neumann, S., Steiner, E., & Hansen-Schirra, S. (2010). Translation units and grammatical shifts: Towards an integration of product- and process-based translation research. In G. M. Shreve & E. Angelone (Eds.), *Translation and cognition* (pp. 109-142). Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Bai, H. (1988). *Yuanfang you ge nuer guo* [The remote country of women]. Taipei, Taiwan: Sanmin.

Bai, H. (1994). *The remote country of women: A novel* (Q. Y. Wu & T. O. Beebee, Trans.). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Bosseaux, C. (2007). *How does it feel? Point of view in translation: The case of Virginia Woolf into French*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Rodopi.

Bush, P. R. (2006). The writer of translations. In P. R. Bush & S. Bassnett (Eds.), *The translator as writer* (pp. 23-32). London, UK: Continuum.

Cohn, D. (1978). *Transparent minds: Narrative modes for presenting consciousness in fiction*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Cordingley, A., & Manning, C. F. (2017). *Collaborative translation: From the Renaissance to the digital age*. New York, NY: Bloombury Academic.

Cordingley, A., & Montini, C. (2015). Generic translation studies: An emerging discipline. *Linguistica Antverpiensta, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 14*, 1-18.

De los Reyes Lozano, J. (2015). Genética del doblaje cinematográfico: La versión del traductor como proto-texto en el filme *Rio* [Genetics of film dubbing: The translator's version as a proto-text in the film *Rio*]. *Linguistica Antverpiensia, New Series: Themes in Translation Studies, 14*, 149-167.

Deppman, J., Ferrer, D., & Groden, M. (2004). *Genetic criticism: Texts and avant-*

textes. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Englund Dimitrova, B. (2005). *Expertise and explicitation in the translation process*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Filippakopoulou, M. (2008). Translation drafts and the translating self. In P. Nikolaou & M. Kyritsi (Eds.), *Translating selves: Experience and identity between languages and literatures* (pp. 19-36). London, UK: Continuum.

Gharaei, Z., & Dastjerdi, H. V. (2012). Free indirect discourse in Farsi translations of Woolf's *Mrs. Dalloway*. *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, 14*(1), 1-9. doi:10.7771/1481-4374.1771

Goldblatt, H. (1994). [Foreword]. In H. Bai, *The remote country of women: A novel* (p. III). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Gunn, D. P. (2004). Free indirect discourse and narrative authority in *Emma*. *Narrative, 12*(1), 35-54. doi:10.1353/nar.2003.0023

Hermans, T. (1996). Norms and the determination of translation: A theoretical framework. In R. Alvarez & C. Vidal (Eds.), *Translation, power, subversion* (pp. 25-51). Clevedon, UK: Multilingual Matters.

Hulle, D. V. (2004). *Textual awareness: A genetic study of late manuscript by Joyce, Proust & Mann*. Ann Arbor, MI: The University of Michigan Press.

Jones, F. (2006). Unlock the black box: Researching poetry translation processes. In M. Perteghella & E. Loffredo (Eds.), *Translation and creativity: Perspectives on creative writing and translation studies* (pp. 59-74). London, UK: Continuum.

Klitgård, I. (2004). Dual voice and dual style: Translating free indirect discourse in *Ulysses*. *Nordic Journal of English Studies, 3*(3), 319-345.

Komissarov, V. N. (2009). Russian tradition. In M. Baker & G. Saldanha (Eds.), *Routledge encyclopedia of translation studies* (pp. 517-524). London, UK: Routledge.

Lee, T. Y. (2010). *Translators as gatekeepers: Gender/race issues in three Taiwan*

translations of the Color Purple (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Newcastle University, Newcastle, UK.

Leech, G. N., & Short, M. H. (1982). *Style in fiction: A linguistic introduction to English fictional prose*. London, UK: Longman.

Levenston, E. A., & Sonnenschein, G. (1986). The translation of point-of-view in fictional narrative. In J. House & S. Blum-Kulka (Eds.), *Interlingual and intercultural communication: Discourse and cognition in translation and second language acquisition studies* (pp. 49-59). Tübingen, Germany: Guten Narr.

Munday, J. (2012). *Evaluation in translation: Critical points of translator decision-making*. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.

Munday, J. (2013). The role of archival and manuscript research in the investigation of translator decision-making. *Target, 25*(1), 125-139. doi:10.1075/target.25.1.10mun

Rouhiainen, T. (2000). Free indirect discourse in the translation into Finnish: The case of D. H. Lawrence's *Women in Love*. *Target, 12*(1), 109-126. doi:10.1075/target.12.1.06rou

Shen, D. (1991). On the transference of modes of speech (or thought) from Chinese narrative fiction into English. *Comparative Literature Studies, 28*(4), 395-415.

Simeoni, D. (1998). The pivotal status of the translator's habitus. *Target, 10*(1), 1-39. doi:10.1075/target.10.1.02sim

Toolan, M. J. (1988). *Narrative: A critical linguistic introduction*. London, UK: Routledge.

Toury, G. (1995). *Descriptive translation studies and beyond*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: John Benjamins.

Twitchell, J. B. (1995). *The Remote Country of Women* by Bai Hua, Qingyun Wu, Thomas O. Beebee. *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews, 17*, 167-169.

Wolf, M. (2002). Translation activity between culture, society and the individual:

Towards a sociology of translation. *CTIS Occasional Papers: UMIST, 2*, 33-44.

Wong, L. (1996). Female rule in Chinese and English literary utopias by Qingyun Wu. *Utopia Studies, 7*(2), 356-358.

Wu, Q. Y. (1991). *Transformation of female rule: Feminist utopias in Chinese and English literature* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA.

Appendix

Personal Communication with Professor T. O. Beebee

The Researcher: So, do you still remember the novel you translated "The Remote Country."

Professor Beebee: Yeah.

The Researcher: That would be a pretty while ago.

Professor Beebee: Yes. Yes.

The Researcher: So, can I ask do you still remember how you worked with the other translator Wu?

Professor Beebee: Yes.

The Researcher: Do you still remember that?

Professor Beebee: Yeah. It was pretty simple. She would prepare a rough version in English, so I like to say that she translated it into English and then I novelized.

The Researcher: You novelized?

Professor Beebee: Novelized, yeah. It's a novel.

The Researcher: So, do you use Chinese? Do you use Chinese? Do you read the original?

Professor Beebee: No.

The Researcher: So, you try to novelize.

Professor Beebee: She, I was working from her English.

The Researcher: Okay, okay. I see. Before I found some draft pieces in her PhD dissertation. I think you were her advisor at that time, right?

Professor Beebee: Yeah, yeah.

The Researcher: So I believe you worked together but I don't know how you both did so. So do you still remember how long did she work on that draft?

Professor Beebee: Oh no. That I don't remember.

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC

The Researcher: How about you? Do you remember how long you spent on that process? Novelizing process? No? So, you didn't check the original? But you...

Professor Beebee: Right. That's right.

The Researcher: You tried to make it much more official in English.

Professor Beebee: Well, more... So, obviously her English was not native English and therefore... Particularly, there's a lot of dialogue in the novel. And so the dialogues then would not be the way Americans, let's say, would engage in dialogue.

The Researcher: I see.

Professor Beebee: Right? The terms would be a little bit different, or you know, just that that kind of thing is to make... And descriptions to a certain extent as well, the way things are described... We actually, I do remember we had big debate about the title.

The Researcher: Really?

Professor Beebee: Yes.

The Researcher: The title?

Professor Beebee: Yes.

The Researcher: The Remote Country.

Professor Beebee: Yes, because apparently women and daughters are the same word. I wanted to call it "The Remote Mother Country."

The Researcher: Oh really! Mother Country.

Professor Beebee: Yes, right. The Remote Mother Country.

The Researcher: And but she disagreed?

Professor Beebee: Yes, she wanted a more literal translation.

The Researcher: Oh really.

Professor Beebee: But she said it could be The Remote Country of Women or The Remote Country of Daughters.

The Researcher: Daughters! Okay. But in Chinese is women actually. So you finally you gave in?

Professor Beebee: Yes. She always won.

The Researcher: Really?

Professor Beebee: She's very strong-willed.

The Researcher: Oh really?

Professor Beebee: Yeah.

The Researcher: Okay. Did you ever, except for that I mean the title, did you talk in person about how this process will go? How many how many times you edited the draft? Only once or twice?

Professor Beebee: No, I don't think we I don't think we came up really with the plan. Really, there was just a kind of the stage of me getting the English text from her. She gets the Chinese. She produces the English. I look at the English. I produce the draft, so that would be the second draft of the English. I would of course, mark places where I had questions. Right? You know, so she would produce something that didn't make sense, or there was ambiguous, or you know why did you use this word like blah blah blah. And so I would go, you know then we would converse and you know come up with the solution. And then so that would produce the third draft.

The Researcher: Third draft.

Professor Beebee: Yeah.

The Researcher: So that would be the final draft.

Professor Beebee: Yes.

The Researcher: Final version.

NATIONAL CENTRAL LIBRARY ROC