ABSTRACT

This project looks at the curious case of the translations of James Joyce’s “Oxen of the Sun” episode in *Ulysses* done by two Chinese translators. In this episode, Joyce claimed in his correspondence to have imitated the process of gestation. The action takes place at a maternity hospital where characters such as Stephen Dedalus, Leopold Bloom and their friends gather, drink and discuss issues relating to fecundity and abortion. The episode is unique due to Joyce’s parodying of prose styles in the literary history of English literature, from Anglo-Saxon, through Milton, Defoe, De Quincey, etc.; the chapter ends with a “frightful jumble of pidgin English, nigger English, Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel.” Both Chinese translators, Jin Di and Xiao Qian, undertook the tremendous task of translating this “encyclopedia of styles.” Under what circumstances is it possible to translate stylistic elements of a text? What does the translation of styles mean to both translation and literary practices? These are the question that I attempt to answer by comparing the two Chinese translations with the original Oxonian chapter.
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Introduction

“The style is the man himself; style therefore cannot be stripped away, cannot be carried off, cannot change.”

Georges-Louis Leclerc, comte de Buffon

The famous statement by the 18th century French naturalist, mathematician, cosmologist and writer, the Comte de Buffon, is often quoted and seldom questioned. The question that I ask in this paper is not whether style could be translated, but rather, under what circumstances would the translation of style and its discussion be possible? That is, under what theoretical discourses and literary practices has style begun to resemble a signature that, according to Derrida, has a “repeatable, iterable, imitable form”? (20) The discussion of stylistic issues has a long history in translation theory, but its ultimate challenge had not presented itself until the beginning of the 20th century with James Joyce’s writing of “Oxen and the Sun,” one of the last episodes in Ulysses.

The story of the translation of style began in seventeenth-century France. One day, Pierre Daniel Huet was in the middle of translating the patristic Latin writings of Origen. This French scholar, renowned for works in history, theology, literary criticism, and translation theory, was interrupted by a visitor, Jacob Praemontius, whom he considered his mentor. Praemontius, taking his usual position as the mentor, did not hesitate to express his surprise and disappointment upon seeing the “carelessness of writing” in Huet’s translation. Having expected “more” from his mentee, Praemontius suggested that Huet either “take down” the piece of writing completely or treat it as a crib and “cover” it with embellishments. Thus commenced one of the earliest theoretical discussions on the issues of the translation of style.
Huet records the event in his pioneering work on the translation of style – *De optimo genere interpretandi* [Concerning the Best Kind of Translation] (1661) – as a prelude to his theory on stylistic responsibilities of the translator as an important issue in the practice of translation. Praemontius’ immediate concern for form over content, and particularly his disappointment over Huet’s having surrendered his own command of an elevated style for the accuracy in rendering the original’s style, reflects on the specificity of Huet’s group of readers. After all, Huet’s translation in this particular period is restricted to an erudite readership, which celebrated elevated styles such as that of Racine’s tragedies as the utmost literary achievement. Praemontius’ position is not only one that advocates for the *belles infidèles*, but also one that is similar to that of the modern-day editor, who often stands in the position of the antagonist to the faithful translator and who insists on making the readers’ experience the translator’s priority. Huet protests by means of differentiating the role of a translator from that of a writer:

Because I am apprehensive lest by carefully polishing the language of this work I gain possibly the reputation of being a writer who is not bad, while I am losing the reputation of being a good translator. But this second reputation is the one I ought most of all to strive to achieve at this time, while the reputation of being a good writer is, for the moment, of no importance…If anyone takes on the role of translator, his efforts should especially be focused, not on using his skill in writing, if by chance he has some such skill, and not on deceiving people with the charm of his language, but on displaying in his own words the author, whom he is trying to translate, as if the author were to be preserved in a mirror and picture.

(164)
Huet, then, believes that the translator is the humble servant to the words of the author, and therefore must mirror the exact image of the original text; neither to belittle the author due to his own incompetence, nor to betray the original text by using a more elevated style in the translated text to boost his own ego.

The problem in the case of translating *Ulysses* is, however, not of choosing between being faithful to Joyce’s genius or not, but of how to faithfully translate such a complex text, if it is possible to do so. *Ulysses*, as the title suggests, has a certain kinship to and influence from Homer’s *Odyssey* that is often qualified as “parody.” The story takes place in Dublin, Ireland, during an ordinary day, June 16, 1904. The three main characters are Stephen Dedalus, a young school teacher and aspiring writer named, and also the recurring character from Joyce’s earlier novel, *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, a middle-aged Jewish advertising salesman named Leopold Bloom, and Leopold’s wife, Molly Bloom. Stephen has just lost his mother, and is surrounded by a group of quasi-friends who, at least from his own perspective, exploit him. Stephen is in the stage of limbo with no place he could call home and with a job that he dislikes. Leopold Bloom, often known as an antihero, is preoccupied by thoughts of his wife’s affair. He is also unusually kind to Stephen because he has lost his son and has projected his fatherly feelings onto Stephen. Molly Bloom is a renown opera singer in Dublin who is, just as his husband suspects, having an affair. Her character is unique in the way that her thoughts, written in Joyce’s famous “stream of consciousness” with almost no punctuation at all, fill up the whole length of the last episode of the novel.

*Ulysses* rejects from the very beginning the idea of a coherent style. Joyce himself said that he used a different style for each episode, but this is actually an understatement,
in that in reality he employs in a few episodes varying styles, most notably in “Oxen of the Sun.” Considered the least successful episode in Ulysses, “Oxen of the Sun” presents a three-fold parody. First, it is a parody of Book Twelve of Homer’s Odyssey, where Odysseus arrived at the island of Helios, a place forewarned by Circe and Tiresias to bring about the further delay of Odyssey’s voyage home. Odysseus’ men insisted on going to the island and slaughtered Helios’s cattle, resulting in the god’s vengeance. Joyce’s parody is thematic in the sense that it is filled with occasional symbolic references to the Helios’s oxen. The second parody is closely related to the theme of crime committed against fecundity by sterilizing the act of coition, where the action takes place at a maternity hospital and discussions of fecundity and abortion are discussed by the many characters gathering and drinking at the maternity hospital. The third, and most relevant to this discussion of style, is the parody of English prose styles presented in chronological sequence, from Latin prose to fragments of modern slang. The episode utilizes the idea that English prose styles developed through a succession of styles, each deviating from its predecessor, and Joyce’s technique is to represent the embryonic development through literary devices. To give a general impression of the task with which translators of this text are presented: The first paragraph is a Sallustian-Tacitean prelude that represents the stage of the unfertilized ovum, which is then followed by the parody of Anglo-Saxon that is achieved though a heavy use of alliteration. After that, the styles come from Malory’s Morte D’Arthur, the Elizabethan “chronicle style,” and many more styles from writers such as Milton, Pepys-Evelyn, Defoe, Dickens, etc., and ending with a cocktail of slang and dialectical phrases.

First published in 1922, Ulysses was first translated into French in 1929 by
Auguste Morel. Its Chinese counterparts appear rather late, considering the fact that Modern Chinese literature was at the period of the New Cultural Movement after the May Fourth Movement in 1919. During this time, the Chinese language was at a stage of reform and was heavily dependent on translations of works from other literary traditions. However, Chinese translations of *Ulysses* were not published until the last decade of the 20th century. Until this day, this novel remains one of the most difficult literary works written in, mostly, English, as commented by Richard Ellmann, a biographer of Joyce and author of *Ulysses on the Liffey*.

After fifty years *Ulysses* still presents itself as the most difficult of entertaining novels, and the most entertaining of difficult ones. To read it is not enough, one must read it with unwonted attention, and read it again. Even then it keeps some of its mysteries. Joyce’s purposes in the book are not nearly so public as might be expected from his having helped Stuart Gilbert to write a book-long commentary on it, or from his having supplied Frank Budgen with much material on its composition. To divulge his means was one thing, his meaning another. (xi)

The pioneering translators of *Ulysses* have indeed given the text their “unwonted attention.” Jin Di was the first one to have translated excerpts of *Ulysses*, which were published in 1986 by the literary journal, *Shijie Wenxue [World Literature]*, in Beijing. In 1993, Jin published a first volume with twelve episodes and in 1996 a second volume with the remaining episodes. Jin claimed to have spent a total of sixteen years on the whole translation project. He has received much scholarly attention over the years, partly due to his publications of theoretical discussions on translation. Jin became the first Asian to be conferred an honorary membership in the Irish Translators’ and Interpreters’
A much more popular version, yet less recognized in the circle of Joycean
scholars, translated by Xiao Qian and Wen Jieruo, was published in 1994 and 1995. Xiao
was an established literati, and Wen, his wife, was a journalist who had studied English
literature. They have allegedly spent four years completing the translation, which
amounts to eight man-years. The timing of this publication stirred competition and rivalry
between the two teams of translators and publishers, but what makes the translations so
controversial and worthy subjects of analyses is their reception.

With the publication of these two Chinese translations of the novel in the early
1990s, the question of translating style had become much more complicated than where it
had started. The rival Chinese translations by Xiao/Wen and Jin have always been
compared and put on opposite ends of translation practices. This is the reason why I have
chosen to limit my study to these two pioneering translations, despite the existence of
other Chinese translations of *Ulysses*. The Xiao/Wen translation is easy to read and thus
popular whereas Jin’s uses obscure language and thus makes a better scholarly work;
Xiao/Wen’s was a best-seller whereas Jin’s have received more coverage in scholarly
works.¹ Many have described the couple’s translation as a free, domesticating translation,
whereas Jin’s is one that stays loyal to Joyce’s original and thus a foreignizing work of

¹ *James Joyce Quarterly*, for example, had a special issue entitled “*Ulysses in China*” in 1999, in which
seven articles were published on the Chinese translations of *Ulysses*. Out of the seven articles, only two
actually compared Jin’s translation with that of Xiao/Wen’s; the others simply wrote in a way as if the
Xiao/Wen translation did not exist. One of the critics who commented on the Xiao/Wen translation, Wang
Yougui, states in “Translations of the Century: A Careful Reading of Two Chinese Versions of *Ulysses*”
that “The reader who prefers a text as smooth as running water or drifting clouds, one both colorful and
smooth as running water or drifting clouds, one both colorful and exquisite, should choose Xiao and Wen’s
version, but that person wishing to enjoy something authentic in color and form and accurate and faithful to
the original should opt for Jin’s translation.” (278)
translation. A set of questions regarding the nature of stylistic concerns came up in my attempt to understand and analyze the strategies utilized in both translations to render stylistic elements: When translating a specific style, what are the procedures that allow one to determine the essential qualities in a style? Is it possible to have objective interpretations and negotiations in determining the essence of a particular style? Do consistent styles exist? At which level should or could the analysis of consistency or inconsistency take place?

Perhaps the long periods of time spent on translating are not the solution either, if the object in question, that is, the text of *Ulysses* is fundamentally untranslatable. Fritz Senn, a Swiss critic, comments in his article “Seven Against Ulysses” that,

> The question of whether great literature can be translated at all – carried across, that is, into a language different from the one in which it was conceived – is a debatable one and cannot, perhaps, be objectively answered [...] under the best of circumstances and through no fault of the translators themselves, *Ulysses* loses some of its essential features. It loses in its immediate impact, in its depth and in the close-knitted texture of its manifold patterns. (191)

In other words, *Ulysses* will be undermined by any translation that cannot bring across the totality of the text into a different language, and since this “total translation” is but an unreachable ideal, Senn remains pessimistic about the translation projects of *Ulysses*. The difficulty of undertaking this project in late 20th century is obviously due to its status as great literature, but what makes it a masterpiece of literature that could be “endangered” by efforts to translate it?
In translation studies and criticism, a common move is to evaluate the achievement of a translated text against specific translation theories. Studies on the translation of styles have not yet built up enough theoretical accounts to make them a unique area of study. Therefore, in Chapter One, I will give a brief overview of translation theories that are useful for the analysis of style as an object of translation. These include Eugene Nida’s concept of Dynamic Equivalence, Friedrich Schleiermacher’s distinction between foreignization and domestication, as well as Jin’s model of Equivalent Effect. Throughout this project, however, it has come to my attention that the corpus of theoretical and critical discourses surrounding *Ulysses* has a huge role in determining the standard against which any translation is measured. The objective of Chapter Two is thus to take a close look at the “secondary texts” that have created the battlefield that must, theoretically, be conquered by translations. These texts include detail analyzes done on *Ulysses*, as well as reference works that Joyce himself had used during the one thousand hours working on the “Oxen.” In addition to the discursive predetermination of what could and should be rendered in a translation, theoretical accounts of the literary history of both source and target languages determine what linguistic tools can possible be utilized by translators. Chapter Three will provide a quasi-historical account of what is generally accepted as the development of the Chinese language, and how the translators, despite their different trainings and goals in translating, have been bounded by the same linguistic resources available in Chinese. Chapter Four will compare a variety of translation strategies by way of textual analyses of specific passages in the “Oxen.”
Chapter One: Theories on Translating Style: Foreignization and Domestication: An Age-old Debate

The fundamentals of Huet’s arguments fall under the debate between foreignization and domestication, an age-old struggle for translation practice and a still unresolved problem in translation theory. In *De optimo genere interpretandi*, he accuses translators of *Philautia*, or self-love, for attempting to embellish the accurate, concise, and dignified style such as that of Thucydides, or to transform the smooth and elegant style such as that of Xenophon. In Huet’s case, as opposed to the contemporary designation of the two terms, domestication manifests the translator’s *Philautia*, and foreignization represents his ideal model for translation practices that reflect the original author’s style. In modern usage, the two terms represent the rapprochement of the translated text to the linguistic characteristics of either the source language or the target language. Friedrich Schleiermacher, in his “On the Different Methods of Translating,” provides clear definitions for the two categories, which he considers as the two options a translator has,

Either the translator leaves the author in peace as much as possible and moves the reader toward him; or he leaves the reader in peace as much as possible and moves the writer towards him. These two paths are so very different from one another that one or the other must certainly be followed as strictly as possible, any attempt to combine them being certain to produce a highly unreliable result and to carry with it the danger that writer and reader might miss each other completely (49).
Situating the translator in the position between the writer and the reader of target language, Schleiermacher insists that the translator cannot remain mid-way in between the two, but must decide between displacing one or the other. Schleiermacher himself had not remained indecisive in the matter, and was clearly in favor of foreignization, “We must not fail to realize that much in our language that is beautiful and strong was developed, or restored from oblivion, only through translation” (62). Foreignization, as what Schleiermacher calls a “method” of translation, benefits target readers, who have to endure difficult texts, by enriching the target language. The debate remains an issue of preference, such that advocates of neither camp could persuade the other that one method is by nature more justified than the other. Translation theories seem to have come to a dead-end trying to argue for one of the two. With a study of Joyce’s “Oxen” episode, the two Chinese translations and a selection of important works that had contributed to the theoretical discourses on the Oxonian styles, I will illustrate that the question of foreignization finds its arguments fundamentally in stylistic terms, and the discussion of which replaces semantic meaning. This case study will demonstrate how the binary oppositions of foreignization and domestication have failed to understand translation practices, and that translators have indeed succeeded in creating middle-ground between the writer and the target-language reader.

Nida puts translation practices into two categories: Formal Equivalence and Dynamic Equivalence; he defines the first as source-oriented and the latter as reader-oriented. This theory breaks away from the battle between content and form in translation practices. Coming from a background of translating the Bible where the acceptance of the biblical message is paramount, Nida privileges Dynamic Equivalence, a model for
translation practices that gears towards an effective and meaningful conveyance of
messages to target language readers. In this model, Nida takes style into account as one
of the components that could be, depending on the nature of the effects the text has on
readers, essential to creating a Dynamic Equivalence (D-E) translation, which he
describes in Principles of Correspondence.

One way of defining a D-E translation is to describe it as “the closest natural
equivalent to the source-language message.” This type of definition contains three
essential terms: (1) equivalent, which points toward the source-language message,
(2) natural, which points toward the receptor language, and (3) closest, which
binds the two orientations together on the basis of the highest degree of
approximation. (163)

Nida explains “natural” as “a D-E translation directed primarily toward equivalence of
response.” Nida lists three aspects in which the translated text must assume a
“naturalness” towards the target language, “for a natural rendering must fit (1) the
receptor language and culture as a whole, (2) the context of the particular message, and
(3) the receptor language audience” (163). The Dynamic Equivalence theory Nida has in
mind, thus, defines a good translation as one that reads naturally in the target language,
which is fundamentally a stylistic judgment of the language in the translated text.

Nida distances his theory from what he calls the “traditional” battle between free
translation (sense-for-sense) and close translation (word-for-word) in terms of “the
referential content of the words,” and establishes a theory that justifies a freer translation
that aims at producing as close an effect on target-language readers as that of the original
on source-language readers. In order to create a dynamic equivalent, all components including style must be considered and weighed according to their roles in generating the effect on readers. This theory is important to the discussion of the Chinese translation of “Oxen” because it raises the question of stylistic considerations in translation; not only does it break away from the dichotomy between form and content where, traditionally speaking, content has often been chosen over form, it also suggests stylistic innovation as a way for the translation to achieve its naturalness:

It is essential...that a translation...incorporate[s] certain positive elements of style which provide the proper emotional tone for the discourse. This emotional tone must accurately reflect the point of view of the author. Thus such elements as sarcasm, irony, or whimsical interest must all be accurately reflected in a D-E translation. (165-6)

As stated here, rhetorical figures that contribute to distinctive and recognizable characteristics of an author’s style must be matched. In creating a reader-oriented translation theory, Nida replaces the traditional belles infidèles with the model of “natural infidèles,” under which style is considered a component to be rendered by the translator’s innovation. Under this model, the stylistic characteristics in the original text can be replaced by a suitable style in the target language that will produce the same reading experience for target-language readers as that for source-language readers produced by the original text.

Building on Nida’s theory that emphasizes on stylistic aspects in translation and the innovation and freedom in translating practices, Jin explained his own model for the
translation of the Oxonian styles, which he then explained and theorized as an ideal for translation practices. In *Shamrock and Chopsticks: James Joyce in China, a Tale of Two Encounters* (2001), Jin discusses in detail the processes of decision-makings he undertook in translating the whole *Ulysses*, whereas in *Literary Translation: Quest for Artistic Integrity* (2003), Jin’s more theoretical account of his translation practices that is written and published in English, he theorized and advocated for the notion of “equivalent effect” in translation practices. The kinship of this concept to Nida’s “dynamic equivalence” is clear, given that it aims at achieving the “closest approximation in total effect.” Jin explained it as follows,

“Total” means that all relevant factors that would play a role in the effect on the reader must be considered, such as imagery, tone, context, and language-specific and culture-specific factors, as well as the all-important factor of spirit. (107)

Jin’s theorization is thus close to that of Nida’s, in that all linguistic and cultural components in the source text are considered possibly important to be rendered depending on the specific cases. Jin’s theory, however, deviates from that of Nida’s when he discusses the translation of style in a later chapter in *Literary*:

Since a translator is or should be a writer himself, what comes from one’s pen as translation will usually appear in one’s own style. A stylistically sensitive translator will adjust it a little to suit the flavor he or she finds in the original author’s text, but basically it will remain the translator’s own style. This will usually be regarded by target-language readers as the style of the original work. (131)
Jin’s notion of the translator’s role in literary production here shows similarities to Huet’s ideal translator, who should remain faithful to the task of rendering the author’s style in the source text by abandoning the personal style and by adopting a variety of styles; neither of the infidèles, belles or natural, should find themselves in the target text. One other major deviance of Jin’s theory from Nida’s is that “naturalness” is of the least concern in his translation, as exemplified in his translation of “Oxen of the Sun.”

Jin’s notion of “equivalent effect” gives license for translators to use any translating strategies at their disposal or from their own innovation; it endorses neither specific means nor specific ends. This liberation of the translator from all the traditional constraints would qualify Jin’s conceptualization of “equivalent effect” as a theory of non-methodology. What appears as arbitrariness in Jin’s theoretical accounts and in the actual strategies that he adopted in translating “Oxen” must, however, be evaluated with the nature of the task: to translate the stylistic elements of a text that resists the traditional notion of style.
Chapter Two: The Oxonian Discourse: Styles as Derived from the Making and the Criticisms of “Oxen”

Joyce invested a thousand hours on the writing of “Oxen of the Sun” episode in Ulysses and created his version of a “literary” gestation process by parodying more than twenty styles in the history of English prose. This mode of production contributes to the episode’s reputation for being difficult to understand, but understanding the parodies is crucial to the appreciation of “Oxen.” Annotations are useful in this sense for the average reader. The three texts foundational to the critical analyses of the Oxonian styles quoted in annotative reader’s guidebooks include: Stuart Gilbert’s James Joyce’s Ulysses: A Study (1930); James Joyce’s letter to Frank Budgen (dated 20 March 1920); and J. S. Atherton’s chapter “Oxen of the Sun” in James Joyce’s Ulysses: Critical Essays edited by Clive Hart and David Hayman (1974). Not only do these reference materials guide the understanding of the episode by providing different versions of a list of Oxonian styles, but they also show that Joyce himself had needed guidebooks in order to create the parody. In his biography, James Joyce (1959), Richard Ellmann reveals that Joyce was studying George Saintsbury’s A History of English Prose Rhythm (1912) while writing “Oxen,” a piece of information of a biographical nature that he obtained from an interview with Stanislaus Joyce – the author’s brother (475). As if this alone could not rectify what Budgen called Joyce’s prodigious memory in James Joyce and the Making of Ulysses (176), Atherton adds a second book to the list of Joyce’s guidebooks – W. Peacock’s English Prose: Mandeville to Ruskin (1903). These texts form the theoretical canon on the study of Oxonian styles without discussing the notion of style embodied in
Joyce’s parody. However they present certain notions of style nonetheless. This chapter will examine the idea of style that governs both Joyce’s writing of “Oxen” and the discourses that attempt to understand and appreciate it.

Stuart Gilbert’s work is one of the most frequently consulted references in the studies of Ulysses. His “authority” in analyzing the subject comes from the fact that he assisted Auguste Morel in the French translation of Ulysses, the earliest among translations of the novel into other languages. On the title page of this translation a statement reads as follows, “entièrement revue par M. Valery Larband et l’Auteur [entirely reviewed by Mr. Valery Larband and the author]”; Gilbert’s working and personal relationship with Joyce helped authenticate his account of the Oxonian styles first published in 1930.

In 1949, however, an article published in Here and Now by A. M. Klein titled “The Oxen of the Sun,” which quotes parts of Joyce’s letter to Budgen, forces Gilbert to defend the accuracy of his reading of the Oxonian styles. In the letter, Joyce details his conception of the episode and the working list of styles that he plans on parlaying. He specifically notes that the episode opens with “a Sallustian-Tacitean prelude,” a style absent from Gilbert’s discussion. Apparently, this letter presents materials too authoritative to be ignored, so that Gilbert inserts into the 1952 edition of James Joyce’s Ulysses: A Study a footnote to account for the missing analysis of the “Sallustian-Tacitean prelude” to his work:

…no style could be further than this from the concision of Sallust and the epigrammatic brilliancy of Tacitus. A comparison of this letter, written while Joyce was working on the episode, with the printed version shows that he made
some changes in his programme, and this is one of them. Doubtless he saw that the style of a highly sophisticated writer like Tacitus would have been out of place in this context and amended the introduction accordingly. (298)

I do not intend for this example to prove that the status of Gilbert’s work has diminished after new critical analyses have taken place; in fact its comprehensiveness has continued to inspire works on *Ulysses*. On the contrary, this addition to Gilbert’s work demonstrates the arbitrariness of Joyce’s parody as well as others’ interpretations of the true subjects behind the parody. This has two implications with regard to translation. First, the imprecision in the analysis of Oxonian styles creates huge difficulties for translators who attempt to translate the stylistic aspects of the novel. Second, Gilbert’s apologetic could be read as an intentional fallacy; he jeopardizes the causal relationship between authorial intentions and the actual outcome. Since the identification of the “specific” prose styles parodied in “Oxen” is discursive from secondary sources, which are chiefly biographical and invested in authorial intentions by nature, any attempt to translate the Oxonian styles is one that tries to recover the authorial intentions constructed by the critical discourses on this subject.

Having laid down the reasons for investigating the notion of style as presented in the secondary sources, I now turn to the specific notions of style presented in the letter and guidebooks. The letter in question is dated 20 March 1920. At the time *Ulysses* is still being serialized (since 1918) in *The Little Review*. Therefore, as Gilbert has defended, the letter reveals only the working model of “Oxen” and cannot fully and accurately account for the actual list of styles parodied. The part in the letter that
concerns the Oxonian styles reads as follows:

Am working hard at *Oxen of the Sun*, the idea being the crime committed against fecundity by sterilizing the act of coition. Scene, lying-in hospital. Technique: a nineparted episode without divisions introduced by a Sallustian-Tacitean prelude (the unfertilized ovum), then by way of earliest English alliterative and monosyllabic and Anglo-Saxon … then by way of Mandeville … then Malory’s *Morte d’Arthur* … Then a passage solemn, as of Milton, Taylor, Hooker, followed by a choppy Latin-gossipy bit, style of Burton-Browne, then a passage Bunyanesque … after a diarystyle bit Pepys-Evelyn … and so on through Defoe-Swift and Steele-Addison-Sterne and Landor-Pater-Newman until it ends in a frightful jumble of Pidgin English, nigger English, Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel. This progression is also linked back at each part subtly with some foregoing episode of the day and, besides this, with the natural stages of development in the embryo and the periods of faunal evolution in general. (*Letter* 139-40)

In the beginning of the paragraph, Joyce introduces the linkage of the “Oxen” episode to its counterpart in Homer: he takes the slaughtering of oxen as symbolic of a “crime against fecundity” and writes the episode around this theme. Then he describes the “nine-parted episode” and a “progression” of “styles” that will take place one after another on the pages “without division.” Towards the end, he finally explains that the “progression” of style is “linked back to each part *subtly* with… the *natural* stages of development in the embryo and the periods of faunal evolution in general.”

2 I am omitting the examples given in the letter in parentheses.

3 My italics.
proposes between the development of an embryo and the changes in English prose styles
depends on the assumption that prose styles progress in a linear fashion; the analogy only
remains valid for as long as one finds some sort of arbitrary connection between Sallust-
Tacitus’s writings and that of Anglo-Saxon, and that connections of a similar nature exist
between Mandeville and Malory, or between Pepys-Evelyn and Defoe-Swift, and so on.
Furthermore, Joyce insists on the subtleness of these changes, that styles only develop
gradually (“without abruptness”), and that his nine-parted episode is “without division.”
The evolutionary nature of language in Joyce’s assumption gives us the first theory of
style, that they are derivations from linguistic traditions and that they attain and derive
their individual identities from the distance they achieve vis à vis their predecessors.
Derivation as a technique of extracting a “style” for his parody depends on the
periodization of literary traditions such as Anglo-Saxon and Elizabethan styles, etc.

To conclude from the above analysis that there is but one unifying notion of style
would do injustice to the episode, and it would be a rather non-Oxonian conclusion.
Among the various other notions presented in this letter, some lend themselves more
easily into categories than others. Deviation-as-style – as seen in his naming of a chain of
authors such as Defoe, Swift, Mandeville, etc. – is one of the easy categories. This
notion, seen in the Buffon’s much quoted phrase, “The style is the man himself” (qtd. in
Fellows and Milliken 151), considers style as the signature of the author. Deviating from
this notion of authorial style are the puzzling “Bunyanesque” and the very precise
“Malory’s Mort d’Arthur.” With “Bunyanesque,” the suffix “-esque” suggests an
imitation of characteristics that only resembles a style, but what would make this any
different from the imitation of Defoe or Milton remains a mystery: all the authorial styles
in “Oxen” are “-esques” by definition of their mode of production (they could only be otherwise if they consisted of actual quotations from the authors in question). “Malory’s Mort d’Arthur,” on the other hand, reveals Joyce’s methodology of parodying different prose styles: in attempting to imitate a style, whether it be Maloryesque or Miltonesque, he borrows particular texts from the particular authors. Besides these styles, there is also the uncategorizable “frightful jumble of Pidgin English, nigger English, Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel.”

However, the notion of derivations within the linguistic traditions as style remains more important than deviation-as-style in considering that this notion makes it possible to draw a parallel between embryonic development and changes in linguistic styles, which is the overarching idea in “Oxen.” This notion is found in Peacock’s Preface to his English Prose. The works in this anthology of English prose are “chosen and arranged” by Peacock according to certain principles laid out in the Preface, “The object of the present volume of selections is to illustrate the development of English prose… In making selections… I have been guided rather by the desire to present such specimens as should be both complete and interesting in themselves, and such as should, at the same time, be characteristic of the style of the various writers presented.” (v) Peacock shares, then, the same vision as Joyce of the history of English prose style: The unexplained linear “developments” of the styles within the same linguistic tradition that gives an illusion that some sort of development moments between the styles of different writers. The paradox here is that on the one hand, Peacock insists on the individuality characteristic and reflective of the writer’s writing in these works included in the anthology, while on the other hand, he implies that the existence of these different styles
proves a development.

This model of “development” presents, in a more legitimate way, the vision of a historical development of style, and at the same time it assumes that a single author’s style remains a fixed entity during his/her writing career. Indeed, Peacock’s assumption caused him to undertake some editing work on the texts that he “anthologized.”

According to Atherton, Joyce made use of Peacock’s work by way of borrowing words and phrases directly from the “anthology.” If Peacock’s work were a real anthology, in that he limited his editing to modernizing some spellings, as he claims in the Preface, then Atherton’s claim of Joyce’s borrowing from *English Prose* could have been easily rebuked, since Joyce could have looked up any other copies of the works of the authors he was parodying and achieved the same goal. Atherton’s claim is two-fold. First, he remarked that words that are annotated by Peacock are the ones most frequently borrowed by Joyce. Peacock explains in the Preface that, “The few explanatory notes that have been added relate almost exclusively to words which are now entirely desolate or not in general use” (v). Obviously, this obsoleteness of vocabulary fits Joyce’s need and conveniently becomes the key element in his parodying of “aged” styles. Borrowing alone would probably not count as sufficient evidence to prove Joyce’s usage of Peacock; it is the misappropriation in the “anthology” that gives Joyce away. Atherton lists a few examples of Peacock’s mutilations (beyond modernizing spellings) to the texts he “anthologized.” One such example of stylistic alteration happens to the Pepys section in the anthology. According to Atherton, Pepys’s “careful integration of subordinate phrases and clauses into the main body of a sentence” becomes the “Peacock-Pepys” which is “jerky” as opposed to the smooth discursiveness that one finds in the normal Pepys (324).
According to Atherton, then, Peacock’s supposedly “anthological” work is closer to Joyce’s parodies than the faithful selection and disposition that he claims.

Having looked at where the notions of style are situated in these critical discourses, and how they correspond to Joyce’s overall idea about the episode, I shall now give a brief note about Joyce’s other guidebook, Saintsbury’s *A History of English Prose Rhythm*, and the fashion he uses for his own goals. In contrast to Peacock, whose true opinion about specific styles is hidden from the Preface and only becomes clear with an analysis on the degree of editing in his anthology, Saintsbury states very clearly in the Preface what he considers as “style,” and not just “good style”:

> You can never get at the final entelechy which differentiates Shelley and Shakespeare from the average versifier, Cluvienus and myself from Pater or from Browne. But you can attend to the feature-composition of the beautiful face, to the quality of the beautiful features, in each of these masters, and so you can dignify and intensify your appreciation of them. (viii).

Apparently for Saintsbury, the notion of style is linked to an esthetical judgment, “beauty,” and thus to “greatness” in literary accomplishments by various authors: only “good styles” can be considered “styles.” As the title of Saintsbury’s work might suggest, his accounts of this history of prose styles are primarily on the rhythms of the works by various English authors, that is, the “footings” that could be found in prose. Joyce’s interpretation of this “feature-composition” obviously deviates from that of Saintsbury. As demonstrated above, Joyce’s usage of his guidebooks consists mostly of direct borrowings of words and phrases, thus his interest in the prose-verse crossovers studied by Saintsbury is limited with one exception: his parody of Anglo-Saxon. In his letter,
Joyce conceptualizes an “alliterative” Anglo-Saxon. Unlike the “Sallustian-Tacitean prelude,” which he abandons in the final version and replaces with a general “mediæval Latin – reminiscent of Ulrich von Hutten’s *Epistolae Obscurorum Virorum*, for instance – by a demented *German Docent*” according to Gilbert, Joyce keeps to his plan and creates alliterative phrases that read as follows, “Before born the babe had bliss. Within the womb he won worship” (*Ulysses* 384). Alliteration, however, as both Saintsbury and Atherton point out, is not a defining feature of Anglo-Saxon prose; the Anglo-Saxon genre that makes use of alliteration is poetry. Saintsbury states clearly that in his study of Anglo-Saxon prose, “Alliteration, which plays so important a part in Anglo-Saxon verse, is here almost entirely absent” (23). I share Atherton’s opinion in this matter in that it is probably correct to assume that Joyce “would know, from his study of Saintsbury, if not before” this to be an inaccurate parody of Anglo-Saxon prose. At the same time, that Saintsbury find so “remarkable” this distinction between Anglo-Saxon prose and verse indicates that it is not a widely-known fact. Thus, Joyce knowingly confuses the two to produce paragraphs that Atherton evaluates as having “an amusingly Anglo-Saxon flavour” and that “it helped to produce the effect he wanted and tied up with the ‘double-thudding’ motive of the oxen” (317). This example shows Joyce’s attitude and true methodology in his borrowings: he uses free and flexible borrowings and has little regard for the authenticity of his parodying or for the “beauty” and “greatness” of these styles (or of styles in general); as long as it produces the ideal effect for the episode in its entity, his goal is accomplished.

I have discussed in Chapter One that Jin’s goal is to translate the style by way of translating the “effect,” and this seems to correspond to Joyce’s methodology in a
fundamental way; Joyce’s parodying, in this sense, could also be explained as a kind of translation that focuses on the dynamic equivalence of effects. From a close look at the critical discourse surrounding the Oxonian styles, it is clear that these effects lie not in the actual “styles” being parodied, but in the notions of style themselves. In attempting to translate the stylistic aspect of “Oxen,” a translator must locate the possible meaning(s) of these notions in the target language for both writers and readers; he must translate the notions, instead of the styles, into the linguistic tradition of the target language.
In complying with the Oxonian complex of styles, the Chinese translators have taken much liberty in translating the content in order to render the styles as faithfully to the original as possible. They are, however, bounded by the Chinese linguistic systems and literary discourses that restrict the means by which they create the sense of stylistic progression. Unlike what appears as a linear progression of styles in the English literary production, essentially the mode of thought that allowed Joyce to allegorize gestation with literary development in English prose, the historical notion of Chinese stylistic development is perceived as what resembles that of a rupture: the sudden replacement of the Literary or Classical style (wenyan) by the Vernacular style (baihua). I will now locate the two Chinese translations in the historical context and discourse that structure the understanding of stylistic changes in Chinese literature during the first few decades of the 20th century. The significance of this quasi-historical analysis include: First, a re-evaluation of the notion of “rupture,” which I shall argue and present as a discursive product necessitated by the elites from 1910-1930, with a juxtaposition to Hu Shi’s Baihua Wenxue Shi [History of Vernacular Chinese] (1928). Second, illustrating how a project such as translating the “Oxen” with or without an effort in translating the stylistic elements necessarily brings the Classical style back into the contemporary mode of writing dominated by the Vernacular style; in other words, due to the mode of production on both Joyce’s part and the translators’, that they put emphasis on the stylistic element, literary styles that have been hidden from contemporary mode of Chinese literary production reappear in the scene. Third, by translating the switching of one style to
another in the original text, the two Chinese translations create a most curious case in translation practices in which the foreignizing style of translation (Xiao/Wen’s) renders a text more readable than the one that domesticated the original text (Jin Di). Using the translated texts as my point of departure, which means the importance of examples chosen manifests itself in the translated text, I shall illustrate the theoretical discourses to which the translators subscribed, thus creating a similar situation in which literary production is at once made possible and restricted to a language, and the stylistic effects of which is pre-determined by the discourses.

The juxtaposition between baihua and wenyan is key to both Chinese translations, and the translations of these two terms demonstrate the layers of differences between them in literary discourses. Baihua is often translated as Vernacular Chinese whereas wenyan is translated both as Classical Chinese and as Literary Chinese. The two aspects of opposition in the juxtaposition between the two are thus of style and of historicity. Baihua, from the point of view of a contemporary reader (non-academic scholar) is the default language used in both spoken and written Chinese nowadays. In fact, most readers of Chinese do not find it necessary to define the language they read as Baihua, because it reads as natural to them. Wenyan, on the other hand, gives the impression of an ancient text immediately after the reader’s glance falls onto the page because of the much shorter and concise phrases between punctuations, as well as the sensation of foreignness given by the vocabulary and xuci, or interjection found only in wenyan texts. Wenyan is translated as “Classical Chinese” precisely because the reading of it feels “medieval” to contemporary readers. This stylistic difference thus clearly specifies a contemporary stand point.
Another aspect of this juxtaposition between baihua and wenyan has to do with the scholarly efforts to theorize and define Baihua in such a way that it could be said to have had co-existed with wenyan throughout the long and glamorous history of Chinese literary practices. One of the most important and influential theorists is Hu Shi. His definition for baihua reads as follows:

There are three meanings to “Baihua”: The first is the “Bai” as in the plain narration on stage in theater, meaning the words that can be spoken and understood by listening; The second is the “Bai” as transparent, meaning words that are not ornamented; Third is the “Bai” as being clear, meaning words that read smoothly and are easily understood.4 (8)

Basing his analyses on these definitions, Hu Shi was able to expand the corps of work that would fall under the category of baihua. What this creates is an ahistorical baihua and thus its naturalization as a mode of production throughout Chinese literary history. Because baihua has co-existed with wenyan, Hu Shi was also able to reduce the traditionally important wenyan into a static, erudite and uninteresting mode of literary production in order to make room for the emergence of baihua.

In the preface to Baihua, Hu Shi begins by asking what appears as a rhetorical question today: “Why must I talk about the history of vernacular Chinese?” The obvious answer would be that Hu Shi, known as one of the most important “revolutionary” for the May Fourth Movement, which is profound in cultural and literary aspects, writes this quasi-theoretical anthological work as an effort to legitimize the use of vernacular

---

4 My Translation.
Chinese in writing. But his own answers for this question took a different route:

I want all of us to know that baihua literature is not something that has been made up by a few people in the past few years; I want us all to know that baihua literature has a history, and that history is very long and very glorious…We have to know that since a thousand and eight hundred years ago, there had already been people writing books with baihua; Since a thousand years ago, there had already been people using baihua in poetry (shi and cǐ); Since eight to nine hundred years ago, there had been lectures in baihua; Seven to eight hundred years ago, novels in baihua; Six hundred years ago, theater (xiqu) in baihua…We need to know that in the past few centuries, the most popular and influential publications in Chinese society were not the Four Books and Five Classics… but rather those baihua novels with the “foulest language that leads them to the farthest place”!

This unfinished work of Hu Shi essentially rewrites Chinese literary history and the collective memory of what Chinese literature was prior to the May Fourth Movements. In attacking the elites for having maintained the dominance and glamour of wenyan in literary productions by undermining the existence and value of baihua, Hu Shi turns over the argument by saying that not only has baihua existed throughout Chinese literary history, but that it has also been at the center of all of Chinese literature. His effort, along with that of other May Fourth advocates, succeeded rather completely in creating this rupture between baihua and wenyan: Prior to the 1930s, although wenyan holds a superior status to vernacular styles, the two co-existed regardless and were used

---

5 My translation. The last quotation is Hu’s parody on the idiom “those whose language is not good will not go far.”
interchangeably within the same works; For some seventy years, however, not only has the vernacular took dominance, but it has also almost completely wiped out wenyan such that no one writes like that anymore and most cannot understand the language without a lot of footnotes. The rewriting of Chinese literary history created the mutual exclusion between wenyan and baihua, and has also created the rupture in the Chinese written language by erasing the difference between spoken and literary language. Surely baihua, in Hu Shi’s definition, did not suddenly appear in the twentieth century, but the rupture is rather brought about by the disappearance of the literary language.

The importance of this historical background of the rupture between Classical Chinese and Vernacular Chinese in this analysis lies precisely the impressionistic differences generated during a readers experience reading texts in the two styles, and it is these subtle differences that is utilized by both Chinese translators as an effort to render the play on styles by Joyce; it is also precisely this methodology that has ultimately failed them in re-creating the most important element in Joyce’s parody: the progression of prose styles.

In the Xiao/Wen version of the “Oxen,” the translators included over four hundred entries of endnotes. The first of these describes the couple’s use of the perceived difference in historicity between baihua and wenyan as the key strategy in their attempt to translate the Oxonian styles.

In this chapter, the author used the historical developments of English prose to symbolize the gestation process from embryo to childbirth [...] The farther into the chapter, the less elegant the style becomes, where the last style even included in it quite a bit of dialects and slangs. These are indeed difficult to be expressed in
the Chinese translated text. The translator thus only used a style of half Vernacular and half Classical in the first part, and gradually switched back to Vernacular. (922)⁶

Xiao/Wen’s hybrid “half vernacular half classical” style reads more Vernacular than Classical due to his choices for vocabulary. A contemporary reader will find this hybrid a smooth read, and will most likely only recognize the Classical pronouns and interjections that are inserted to the mostly neutral and contemporary sounding passage. This hybrid style is used consistently in what is called “the first part” in the footnote without any noticeable changes that would correspond to Joyce’s constant switching from a style to another. The abrupt, instead of gradual, change from the hybrid style to a pure vernacular style takes place, in this translation, where the Landor passage begins. There, the “ancient sounding” pronouns such as “彼”, “伊”, “汝”, “吾” are replaced by “他”, “她”, “它”, “我”, “你”.⁷

Another reason why the Xiao/Wen translation gives an overall vernacular sense is that it takes away all the free indirect discourses from the original by putting quotation marks to indicate dialogues and speeches throughout the chapter. In taking liberty on changing the punctuation, and thus changing the discursive style that Joyce uses consistently in all the episodes to create obscurity and difficulty for readers to understand who is saying what at what time, Xiao and Wen also provide readers with a text that follows more contemporary practice of using punctuation. First, literary texts in Classical Chinese are mostly without punctuation; an elaborate system of punctuation, such as one

⁶ My translation
⁷ The first group resembles the archaic forms of personal pronouns “thou,” “thy,” etc., but is not limited to the second person.
that includes quotation marks, did not get incorporated into Chinese until, not coincidentally, the beginning of the 20th century. The introduction of the system of punctuation into the Chinese writing system is one of the efforts of May Fourth advocates such as Hu to create a writing that is more easily comprehensible to the common readers. The joint proposal of 《請 頒行 新 式標 點符 號議 案》[“Please Issue New Punctuations Proposal”] published in the literary journal Science in 1919 is a monumental document that marks the intrusion of punctuations into the Chinese writing system, and Hu’s 中國哲學史大綱[History of Chinese Philosophy], reprinted in 1919 by Shanghai Commercial Press was the first volume that formally uses the Vernacular language with the new set of punctuations.

As mentioned before, Jin’s translation is allegedly more difficult than that of Xiao/Wen. Jin preserved the “French style” of non-punctuated direct discourse, used run-on sentences that are strange and difficult to understand for contemporary Chinese readers, and refused to translate non-English words and phrases in the episode (he would explain their meanings in footnotes). All these combine to form obstacles for Chinese readers. In this sense, Jin’s translation resembles one of foreignization.

Despite the differences in how the two texts read, Jin’s main strategy is not far from that of Xiao/Wen, in that he also makes use of the contrast between baihua and wenyan to recreate the progression of the Oxonian styles. One of the “scholarly” advantages that Jin has over Xiao/Wen, in that he was received more readily by the circle of Joycean scholars and considered by academics as a more successful translator than Xiao/Wen, is the fact that he has published a few scholarly works in which he explains the rationales behind his methodologies in translating Ulysses. In Literary Translation:
Quest for Artistic Integrity, he elaborates on his idea of an ideal translation: ones that create the “equivalent effect,” as discussed in the first chapter. It is, however, in Jin’s other scholarly work, *Shamrock and Chopsticks: James Joyce in China*, that he reveals his true intentions in translating the Oxonian styles by narrating the long process through which he decided on the strategies to be used to render the “unwieldy Oxen”\(^8\). Jin’s original idea was to find, for each style parodied by Joyce, an equivalent style in the history of Chinese literature; His intention was to parody Joyce’s parody of a progression in prose styles. When this proved too idealistic of an idea that was impossible to accomplish without destroying the actual rhythm in Joyce’s parody, Jin turned to the idea of simply simulating the styles as Joyce presented,

Why not, indeed? For the first few styles of that chapter, that was really the only way out. It was also, as a matter of fact, the only appropriate way to render the first three short paragraphs of triple invocations, each with its own distinctive color. Otherwise how would the Chinese readers ever feel the evocative force? (162)

What Jin is talking about here is the fact that the most ancient form of Chinese writing, carved on bones and other materials, along with the most ancient form of Chinese in general, had very brief sentence structures. Seeing that the first few Oxonian styles all had very long sentence structures, the strategy of making use of what would be, with regard to the historical progression of literary language, the equivalent of Latin prose in Chinese would incorrectly render the rhythm of Joyce’s on-going long sentences.

The ideal rendition of the unwieldy Oxen, I believe, is not to tame them, but to keep them as unwieldy as in Joyce’s original while bellowing their various tales

---

\(^8\) Jin’s title for the chapter in *Shamrock and Chopsticks*. 
in various Chinese styles. Although a perfect copy of Joyce’s sequence of stylistic evolution is not really possible because of the disparity between the linguistic histories of Chinese and English, a verisimilitude of the process of the stage-to-stage development is entirely within reach. What is even more important, however, is that each of the various Chinese styles ought to be able to convey the mood and colour [sic] of the corresponding Joycean style. (166)

This is the perfect example to illustrate the problem of categorizing a certain translation as foreignizing or as domesticating. The debate between foreignization and domestication as the rightful strategy in translation practices has been portrayed as the difference between bringing the original to the reader or bringing the reader to the original. Jin’s initial strategy could be described as an effort to domesticate Joyce’s mode of producing the Oxonian styles with a similar “progression” in the history of Chinese prose, thus reshaping the original text into something with which the Chinese readers are familiar; whereas the final strategy of “simulating” the Joycean styles could be considered as foreignization where the Chinese language is molded into the many shapes of English prose styles, and thus readers are asked to comprehend the stylistic changes in the English language. Jin’s intention has been clear from the very beginning, that is, to render Joyce’s intentions as closely as possible. This reading into the history of his decision-making process reveals, however, that even with the intention of foreignizing the target-language text, it is still possible to choose between a domesticating strategy and a foreignizing one.
Chapter Four: The “Frightful Jumble” of Strategies: A Comparative Textual Analysis of the two Chinese “Oxen’s”

The importance of this historical background of the rupture between wenyan and baihua in this analysis lies in the impressionistic differences generated during a reader’s experience reading texts in the two styles, and these subtle differences are utilized by both Chinese translators as an effort to render the play on styles by Joyce; it is also this methodology that has ultimately failed them in re-creating the most important element in Joyce’s parody: the gradual progression of prose styles.

As mentioned before, the Xiao/Wen translation switches into a pure baihua from the Landor passage on, and a clear indication of this is the loss of rhythm in their rendering of two phrases. The first is when Stephen replies to Costello, boasting about his literary eloquence by claiming that he has the ability to recreate the characters with his art, “If I call them into life across the waters of Lethe will not the poor ghosts troop to my call?” (415) Xiao/Wen’s rendering of this somewhat rhythmic line resembles that of plain prose, while Jin’s show an effort in condensing the prose to create a sense of rhythm,

要是我隔著忘川把他們喚回到現在來，那些可憐的幽靈會不會應聲而至呢？
(Xiao/Wen 903)

如我隔忘川之水而呼喚他們起死回生，可憐的鬼魂豈非都將應聲群集而來？
(Jin 848)

In the first half, the disposition of the Chinese characters “著” “把” “到” and “來” (emphasized by dots) are markers of baihua prose style that, by comparison to Jin’s,
sounds much looser as a sentence structure. Jin’s also made use of four-character phrases such as “忘川之水” and “起死回生” (in italics) that give a feeling of condensed meanings. In the second half, Stephen’s tone in the phrase “will not the poor ghosts” is clearly an assertion in the form of a negative interrogation, considering the confidence he has in his artistic talents. Xiao/Wen’s rendering with “會不會” and “呢” (in bold) takes the negation away and makes the phrase read like a normal open-ended question in conversational Chinese; Jin’s “豈非都將” (in bold), on the other hand, preserves the negation and the sense of assertiveness.

Stephen’s boastful attitude then attracted an insult from Lynch and Lenehan, both medical students in the story: Lynch told Stephen not to disappoint them with his “cap ful [sic] of light odes” whereas Lenehan told Lynch, “have no fear. He [Stephen] could not leave his mother an orphan.” (415) On the semantic level, this mentioning of his mother is a sort of dark humor to Stephen since she had just been buried, but stylistically, “his mother an orphan” is also an amphibrach. Both translations have rendered this phrase in plain baihua. It seems that the styles have progressed too far even for Jin to reintroduce actual meter into the text to match the amphibrach.

Despite the differences in how the two texts read, Jin’s main strategy is not far from that of Xiao/Wen, in that he also makes use of the contrast between baihua and wenyan to recreate the progression of the Oxonian styles. In an exemplary passage, Jin made use of a wenyan structure to recreate the Anglo-Saxon passage. It describes Bloom’s (here described as the “seeker”) initial entrance to the maternity hospital (“Horne’s hall”), where he came upon the nurse, an old acquaintance whom he had failed to greet another day. The passage is full of alliteration, which was Joyce’s way of
parodying the Anglo-Saxon poem “The Wanderer,”

Loth to irk in Horne’s hall hat holding the seeker stood. On her stow he ere was living with dear wife and lovesome daughter that then over land and seafloor nine years had long outwandered. Once her in townhithe meeting he to her bow had not doffed. Her to forgive now he craved with good ground of her allowed that that of him swiftseen face, hers, so young then had looked. Light swift her eyes kindled, bloom of blushes his word winning. (385)

Jin employs the wuyan structure, literally meaning “five words,” to translate the Anglo-Saxon style,

來者恐唐突，持茂廳中立。次人九年前，曾往妹家房，愛妻並嬌女，均在屋中居；海陸九年遊，港邊曾邂逅，彼女一鞠躬，彼男未脫帽。今日渠請罪，緣由敘分明，妹顏殊年輕，瞬間未及辨。此言多懇切，深獲彼女心，眼中閃光輝，雙頰飛紅霞。(809-10)

A comparison of this with the Xiao/Wen translation will demonstrate more clearly the visual effect of Jin’s translation.

來訪者深恐冒失，乃執帽佇立於霍恩產院之門廳內。蓋彼曾偕愛妻嬌女與此護士住於同一屋頂之下。之後海陸漂泊長達九年之久。某日於本市碼頭與護士邂逅。護士向彼致意，彼未摘帽還禮。今特來懇請護士寬恕，並解釋曰：上次擦身走過，因覺汝極其年少，未敢貿然相認。護士聞言，雙目遽然生輝。面龐倏地綻開紅花。(871)
This translation conforms to Xiao/Wen’s overall strategy for translating the progression of styles in that it utilizes many characters (shown with dots) that mostly belong to the wenyan styles. Jin’s decision on using wuyan creates a rhythmic pattern that is too regular to match Joyce’s Anglo-Saxon passage. It is curious as to why Jin has not opted to use shuangsheng, a similar concept of alliteration in Chinese that means “double consonants.” What makes Jin’s decision more arbitrary is the fact that wuyan is not situated in a particular time frame in the history of Chinese literature.

Besides the overarching strategy of translating the progression of style as the transitioning from baihua into wenyan, the two translations have also made use of a variety of methodologies in translating “Oxen.” In the final “frightful jumble of Pidgin English, nigger English, Cockney, Irish, Bowery slang and broken doggerel” as promised by Joyce (Letter 140), what is parodied in the passage is not only the final stage of gestation (by this time, Mina Purefoy, Leopold Bloom’s friend, has finally given birth to a baby at the maternity hospital) but also the “drunkenness” being experienced by Stephen and his group of friends as they left the maternity hospital for Burke’s pub. The whole episode began at 10 pm and the pub closes at 11 pm. So the group is thrown out and begins going to another pub. Joyce humorously writes this passage with a military tone, “Get a spurt on. Tention. Proceed to the nearest canteen and there annex liquor stores. March! Tramp, tramp the boys are (attitudes!) parching.” (424) Gifford’s annotation points out that this passage is after the American Civil War marching song “Tramp, Tramp, Tramp” by George F. Root (442). The translations have matched the military style in this passage in different ways.

衝鋒吧。注意。目標最近處餐廳，入內佔領酒庫。前進！進，進，進，弟兄
們冒渴（求福！）前進。(Jin 864)
最後衝刺。立正。向最近的飯館前進，佔領它的酒窖。前進！沙沙、沙沙、沙沙，小伙子們（拉開架子！）乾渴。（Xiao/Wen 916）

There are a few similarities and differences between the two translations with regard to this passage. Both teams of translators seem to have understood that “Tention” is short for “Attention,” but Jin has only chosen to render it with the couplet (注意) that means “pay attention” or “watch out,” whereas Xiao/Wen’s “立正” literally means “to stand straight” but is actually used as the Chinese equivalent of “Attention!” in military terminology. Both translations rendered the next phrase in the imperative mode with Xiao/Wen’s translation ordering the group to move towards the “nearest canteen,” whereas Jin’s translation describes the “nearest canteen” explicitly as a “target” (目標).

“March” is rendered in both translations as “前進,” which literally means “to move forward.” “Tramp” is rendered by Jin’s as the single “進,” which can mean both “forward” and “to enter.” The double meaning goes extremely well with the action taking place at the moment in the episode. Xiao/Wen, on the other hand, use the double “沙沙” which gives the sound of shoes moving across a sandy surface. Xiao/Wen have perhaps taken the military metaphor a little bit too far. Coincidentally, both translations have expanded the repetition of “tramp, tramp” into the triple “進，進，進” and “沙沙、沙沙、沙沙.” After this, the two texts present some differences again: “boys” is translated by Jin as “brothers” and as “kids” by Xiao/Wen. These are minor differences due to the translators’ different interpretations of “boys.”

Major discrepancies are found in the rendering of “Attitudes!” and that of “parching.”
Xiao/Wen correctly rendered “Attitudes” as “getting into the right posture,” but Jin mistakes it to mean “blessings.” As for “parching,” a pun that plays on the fact that the characters are “marching” while being “thirsty” from the deprivation of alcohol, Jin chose to translate both meanings of the pun by a species of paraphrase “冒渴前進,” which literally means “moving forward while thirsty.” Xiao/Wen chose to render “parching” literally as an adjective that describes the “boys’” state of “thirst.”

Another major difference between the two translation is the rendering of non-English phrases incorporated into the “Oxen” episode. Jin’s methodology is, not only in “Oxen” but also throughout the whole Ulysses, that of non-rendering. In Jin’s translation, non-English phrases in italics in the source text are preserved in their original languages, and their meanings are explained in the respective footnotes. This non-rendering is a possible solution for the problem of translating texts with multiple languages, in the sense that it preserves the identity of different languages as a stylistic element of the source text, while not failing to inform target language readers of the meanings of these passages. Xiao/Wen, on the other hand, chose to render the non-English phrases the same way they rendered the English ones. To a certain extent, this strategy effaces the identity of the different languages, but gains the advantage of actually being able to render some of the effects that are supposedly brought to the original text by this switching of languages. Some of the more successful moments of Xiao/Wen’s translation of non-English phrases take place in the same passage of the “frightful jumble.”

The first is the “filial blessing” in the dismissal portion of the Mass, inserted in between a mockery of Stephen walking out of the maternity hospital and the group imploring him to buy them drinks, “Jay, look at the drunken minister coming out of the
maternity hospital! *Benedicat vos omnipotens Dues, Pater et Filius.* A make, mister.” (424) Xiao/Wen translated the blessing with the set phrase used in Mass conducted in Chinese, “伏惟全能至仁天主聖父，及聖子……降福保全我眾.” (915) This allows the readers to get a sense of the group’s drunkenness at that point in the episode, such that they would yell out a “blessing” in the middle of the street at night, and misses the part where the “Holy Spirit” is also implored on for the blessing. The stylistic effect on the overall experience is much weaker in Jin’s version as his non-translation requires the readers to redirect their gaze from across the page to the footnote before they will be able to understand what the Latin means.

Another instance where Jin’s rigid faithfulness to the non-English phrases in the source text is proven too ineffective compared to the Xiao/Wen translation is with the sudden call to silence in Latin, “Silentium!” (424) Prior to this, someone in the crowd was rumbling on about book publication in Ireland. The order of silence stops the rumbling and commences the “march” mentioned earlier. Once again, Jin’s non-translation makes the reader’s experience very indirect, whereas the Xia/Wen translation uses a two-word, commonplace phrase, “肅靜！” (916) and successfully preserves the effect of abruptness in which this imperative enters the scene and refocuses the crowd on to their quest for alcohol. At other instances, however, the difference between the methodologies of translating and not translating is not too obvious. For example, the French phrase in the same passage “ma mère m’a mariée” is the opening of a bawdy French song; the allusion is thus not obvious on the literal level of such a fragmented passage, whether it is translated or not. Readers cannot understand the implications in this phrases except with the help of footnotes, endnotes or a reference work.
The one Oxonian passage that maybe ultimately untranslatable in terms of stylistic components is Joyce’s parody of Charles Dickens. This passage stands out from the rest of the Oxonian styles; however, because the parody takes place on the level of semantic field, this is perhaps the least contested style in the episode among critical discourses. As pointed out in Gifford’s annotation (438), this passage specifically resembles the chapter entitled “Another Retrospect” (Chapter 53) in *David Copperfield* (1850). Although the whole novel is structured in the form of the protagonist-narrator retelling his own past, the four chapters entitled “retrospects”⁹ are unique places when the narrator indulges into memorable moments of his life. In this specific chapter, he breaks away from the normal narration by saying “I must pause yet once again” (769) and narrates the scene of the death of his first wife, Dora, who called him “Doady.” He then seals up the piece of memory on a depressed note, “It’s over. Darkness comes before my eyes; and, for a time, all things are blotted out of my remembrance.” (774) The semantic field is made up of invocations of memory. In Joyce’s parody, the passage tells of a mother finally giving birth to a baby whom she named Doady. “With the old shake of her pretty head she recalls those days,” where she remembered all the other babies that she had once lost; she mistook her Doady as the others and thought “he is older now” and that “it may never be again” (421). Since the connection between Joyce and Dickens happen mostly on the semantic level, both translations were limited to translating the Dickensian repetitions “very very” and “a weary weary while” (420) as literally as possible. They also explained the importance of the transliteration of “Doady” as Joyce’s effort to parody Dickens in the corresponding footnote and endnote.

---

⁹“A Retrospect” (Chapter 18), “Another Retrospect” (Chapter 43), “Another Retrospect” (Chapter 53), “A Last Retrospect” (Chapter 64, also the final chapter)
The differences in methodology between the two groups of translators sometimes indicate discrepancies in their respective understanding and interpretations of the text. At times, their methodologies differ as they stick to a specific method in their handling of the same type of problems presented by the source text; and at times, their differences result from their personal writing styles.
Conclusion

If the style is the man, then what “Oxen of the Sun” presents to us is a schizophrenic Joyce. His parody of English prose styles testifies for him above all other episodes in *Ulysses* to the following statement, which he made in an interview with Jacques Benoist-Méchin in 1956, “I’ve put in so many enigmas and puzzles that it will keep the professors busy for centuries arguing over what I meant, and that’s the only way of insuring one’s immortality” (qtd. *Liffey* 52). The corpus of critical discourses that I have discussed in Chapter Two shows that Joyce has indeed achieved the goal of keeping the scholars busy. He has presented a task to the translators that require much diligence and commitment.

Presented with a text that is stylistically challenging as “Oxen of the Sun,” both teams of translators have the ideal of rendering the stylistic elements as faithfully as possible. In practice, however, the translation of style is cannot escape the critical discourses that have pre-determined the meaning of “style” and the essential qualities in it. By consulting a variety of references, translators can attempt to abide by what most critics have agreed on as the “objective interpretation” of the original text. As arbitrary as Joyce’s parodies of English prose styles, the Chinese translators have not the agency in determining the styles on their own, and are also bound by linguistic boundaries set up in literary discourses. In this case, the Chinese translators, despite their different agendas (Xiao/Wen’s in producing a popular text, and Jin’s in producing a faithful text), they have opted to render the progression of Oxonian styles in terms of the perceived differences between *baihua* and *wenyan*. The translation of style is, thus, both bounded and made possible by critical discourses surrounding literary practices in both the source and target
languages.

There is no doubt that such literary achievement demands competent translations that reflects truly the greatness of such classical work; the rendering of the “Oxen,” in particular, requires translators to weigh stylistic concerns more heavily than normal. Since there is not yet a developed field of translation theories that deals specifically with the translation of style, translation continues to be evaluated by the binary opposition between foreignization and domestication.

The differences between foreignization and domestication are not only that of the author’s intention, but also inherently a stylistic issue from the reader’s perspective: a translation that has “domesticated” the original would simply “read like an original” to the readers, and a “foreignized” text would read simply “like a translation.” Published in the end of the 20th century, both of these first Chinese translations read “like translations” as they both adopted Classical Chinese as a way of showing the progression of styles. Jin’s translation presents a higher variety of stylistic elements, but the fundamentals are the same as those of the Xiao/Wen’s, as he states in *Shamrock*.

I did do my best, however, to create the impression of a historical sequence of styles in the bulk of the chapter. From one passage to the next it proceeds through stages of Chinese prose styles roughly representing the gradual transformation from *guwenyan* (ancient writing), which was an exclusive system of written language known to the elite only, far renowned from everyday colloquial speech, to *baihua* (vernacular word), the modern writing which is close to (though still more refined than) everyday speech, and further on to something which can hardly be classified as a prose style because it consists of linguistic raw material
rarely found in Chinese writing yet, a hotchpotch of dialects and slang (165-6).

It is interesting to note that, from the point of view of contemporary Chinese readers, “guwenyan” or ancient Classical style is not different from just “wenyan”; Similar to the situation of a contemporary reader trying to understand Old English, a contemporary Chinese reader cannot be expected to understand “guwenyan” or “wenyan” without special instructions. And those who can read Classical Chinese associate this writing style with the sense of static ancientness. From the reader’s perspective, thus, this strategy adopted by both translators creates two texts that read at times like a translation and at times an original.

What these Chinese encountering of “Oxen of the Sun” have shown is that the theoretical models of foreignization and domestication never appear in their pure forms in actual translation practice. Jin has emphasized over and over in his theoretical works that his intentions were to faithfully render the total effects in *Ulysses*, whereas Xiao and Wen set off to recreate the text that could be easily understood by target language readers. Both teams of translators achieved something in between, as I have shown in Chapter Five, that Jin’s translation at times reads less close to the original than that of Xiao/Wen.

Style in any text is a valid component to be considered for a careful rendering and is not to be disregarded or sacrificed by default for a more accurate rendering of the content, especially in a text where the stylistic manipulation is the main mode of literary production. In considering how much weight should be put onto stylistic concerns over those of content, critical discourses predominates while the translator is left with little space to determine for themselves what the defining stylistic elements are, or if they are at all important. The translator, however, has more liberty in utilizing different
methodologies when the primary object of the translation is style and not content. The Jin and Xiao/Wen translations of *Ulysses* have proved that styles can indeed be translatable to a certain extent without losing the semantic meaning. They have shown much creativity in tackling with the unwieldy “Oxen.” Their works have inspired and opened up space for more innovative methodologies for the translations-to-come.
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