New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies

Volume 22 Number 2
December 2020

Special Issue:

Trajectories of Cultural Diplomacy:
East Asian Texts and Artefacts in the Anglosphere

New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies 22, 2 (December 2020): 25-42

THE “PARTIAL” ORIENTALIST: LIN YUTANG’S *FAMOUS CHINESE SHORT STORIES* AND THE SOFT POWER OF CHINESE TRADITION

LIU MIN
Victoria University of Wellington

Introduction

Lin Yutang 林语堂 (1895–1976) was, and still is, one of the rare Chinese writers who wrote primarily in English, and made a career of being the chief interpreter of Chinese culture to the West for three decades. During Lin’s stay in the US from 1936 to 1966, at the invitation of Pearl S. Buck, he produced some 30 English works to transfer Chinese culture, philosophy, and customs to the Western audience. He was hailed as the “foremost Chinese scholar in the West” in the twentieth century (*The New York Times* 1976: 57), and as a “cultural ambassador” between China and the United States (Qian 2015: 1). However, many of these works, some of which are bestsellers in Lin’s time, have now faded into oblivion and hardly receive any attention from the English readership. In contrast, Lin’s work has enjoyed a revival of interest in the Chinese-speaking world. Not only have his books been reprinted, back-translated, and adapted for film and television in both Taiwan and the Chinese mainland since the 1980s, more recently, there has been a significant amount of scholarly effort to reassess Lin’s cultural legacy and his place in literary history. This reassessment has inevitably been complicated by the translingual and transcultural dimensions of Lin’s work.

A critical commonplace in Lin Yutang’s reception is the perceived internalisation of Orientalism in Lin’s work, a type of Self-Orientalisation that succumbs to the colonial power dynamics between China and the West, as well as the power of the American literary market. As early as 1945, Edmund Wilson lamented that Lin was Americanised and deliberately produced English works which fit Western expectations of Chinese culture (1945: 73–74). *Famous Chinese Short Stories: Retold by Lin Yutang* (hereafter *FCSS*), published by the John Day company in 1952, offers a particularly revealing case study of this charge due to its subject matter. *FCSS* contains twenty traditional Chinese tales, from both literati and popular sources, which Lin Yutang selected, edited and rewrote in English with Western story-telling techniques. In a rather crudely titled review in *The New York Times*, “The Sauce is Chinese,” Mai-Mai Sze praised Lin’s skilful retelling of the stories and their popular appeal to a wide circle of American readers (1952: 4). Contemporary critics are less accommodating. Qian Suoqiao claims that Lin’s rewriting was so market-driven and readership-oriented that his approach to traditional Chinese culture and pre-modern society was one of appropriation (2011: 190). Charles Laughlin charges that the approach with which Lin packaged Chinese tradition smacks of Orientalism as it caters to Western taste and distorts the true colour of Chinese tradition (2015: 39).

Further, Madalina Yuk-Ling Lee characterises Lin's stance on Chinese tradition as "elite-populist", which satisfied the reading expectations of his upper-middlebrow audience in the US (2009: 126–27).

Although Orientalism can be a useful critical framework in which to discuss Lin Yutang's work, much of the existing Orientalist critique can be limiting and reductive, and is itself heavily readership-oriented. While the East-West axis is an important one in Lin's literary production, not enough attention has been given to the tradition-modernity axis, which, to my mind, lies at the core of Lin's rewriting. In this article, I re-examine Lin's intricate process of rewriting in the production of *FCSS* to reveal a more complex stance vis-à-vis Orientalism. I characterise this cultural position as that of a *partial* Orientalist, in the sense that Lin's Orientalism was incomplete, and it betrayed his partiality for Chinese cultural values. In other words, Lin's unique cultural stance exhibited an ambiguity that nevertheless fragmented Orientalism as a cohesive system of thought. Moreover, "partial" could be understood as a strategic fragmentation of traditional Chinese culture. Lin's selective approach to Chinese tradition and his highlight of the modern potential embedded within Chinese tradition revealed an alternative vision of Chinese modernity.

I begin with an analysis of Lin's reinterpretation of the traditional Chinese cultural ideal *xingling* 性灵 [authentic expression of individuality] in the 1920s and 1930s, which illustrates his distinct approach to Chinese cultural tradition and its modernisation. Then, through close reading of the textual and paratextual elements in *FCSS*, I demonstrate how Lin's rewriting of traditional Chinese tales is informed by his re-interpretation of *xingling*, and conversely, how the modernity of his re-interpretation is conveyed and embodied in his selection of the tales, his rewriting strategies, and his adoption of certain modern story-telling techniques. I will also compare Lin's work with the rewritings of three other prominent Chinese writers (Lu Xun 鲁迅, Wang Zengqi 汪曾祺 and Wang Xiaobo 王小波) to illustrate that the rewriting and reinterpretation of traditional Chinese literature has been an integral part of the Chinese pursuit of modernity throughout the 20th century.

I will therefore shift the context of *FCSS*, and much of Lin's literary practice in the US, away from the US readership and reception, and reconnect it with the deeper roots of Chinese modernity. Yet there is no denying the fact Lin's works were written in English, and that they were without doubt vehicles of cultural diplomacy. However, by firmly situating Lin's English works in China's struggle towards its modernisation, I argue that works such as *FCSS* project a soft power of Chinese tradition that transcends the ephemeral goal of the "likeability" of Chinese culture in the West, as it is ultimately concerned with the construction of an alternative Chinese modernity that subtly resists the dominant discourse of Western modernity. This shift of perspective also pinpoints the fact that the construction of Chinese modernity is inherently cross-cultural and transnational in scope, and its trajectory goes beyond national and linguistic borders.

Lin Yutang's Reinterpretation of *Xingling*

In the 1920s and 1930s, Lin Yutang was noted for his affiliation with three literary ideals[1] – *xingling* 性灵 [authentic expression of individuality], *xianshi* 闲适 [leisure], and *youmo* 幽默 [humour], which he promoted against the tide of the dominant May Fourth New Cultural Movement (Wu Si xin wenhua yundong 五四新文化运动) (hereinafter the May Fourth). Both *xingling* and *xianshi* are traditional Chinese ideals that harken back to the late Ming dynasty in the 17th century, and in juxtaposition with the concept of humour imported from the West, they seemed at odds with the mainstream May Fourth discourse which advocated the eradication of the Confucian literati tradition and the borrowing of Western science and technology to realise Chinese modernity.

However, Lin's treatise on *xingling* involved a considerable amount of reinterpretation that blurred the lines between Chinese tradition and Chinese modernity. In "Lun wen" 论文 [On literature] and "Ji xingling" 记性灵 [On xingling], Lin wrote:[2]

"*Xingling* is none other than self" (xingling jiushi ziwo 性灵就是自我) (1994: 147).

> Each person has his own *gexing* 个性 [personality], this Personality [originally in English] unrestrainedly and freely expressed in literature is called *xingling*. In literature, what calls to give free rein to one's personality has always been called *xingling*. *Xingling* is Personality. (1936: 525–26)

In "Lun wen", Lin further stated that *xingling* writers and Western expressionists, despite being from different historical and cultural backgrounds, reached a consensus on the criteria of literary creation. Sohigian has observed the interesting trajectory of Lin's discovery of the values of *xingling* writers in the late Ming via Croce's and Spingarn's theories of expressionism of the early 20th century (2015: 118). Lin's appreciation of Western aesthetics and literary criticism prompted him to embark on a reassessment of the legacy of Chinese tradition.

Xingling was first proposed as a literary ideal by the Gong'an school (gong'an pai 公安派)[3] in the late Ming. In his preface to his brother Yuan Zhongdao's 袁中道 (1560–1624) poetry collection, Yuan Hongdao 袁宏道 (1568–1610) pointed out that Yuan Zhongdao's poetry "*dushu xingling, buju getao*" 独抒性灵，不拘格套 [expresses his *xingling* and is not bound by the externals of form], and prized *xingling* as the highest dictum of writing (1964: 5). It can be deduced from the couplet that Yuan Hongdao thought that content played a more important role in poetry than formal attributes, and that ideally freedom of style could be achieved in poetic production. Yuan Hongdao further added in his preface that his brother was unwilling to produce any work not flowing from his heart, and deemed *zhen* 真 [truthfulness] and *xin* 新 [newness] as the two main characteristics of *xingling*.

---

[1] In the 1930s Lin launched three journals in Shanghai, in which the literary ideals of *xingling* 性灵, *xianshi* 闲适 and *youmo* 幽默 were proposed, explained and popularised. The three journals are *Lunyu banyuekan* 论语半月刊 [The Analects Fortnightly] (est. 1932), *Renjian shi* 人间世 [This Human World] (est. 1934) and *Yuzhou feng* 宇宙风 [Cosmic Wind] (est. 1935).

[2] The following two quotations were originally in Chinese and translated by Qian Suoqiao (Qian 2011: 138).

[3] The late Ming Gong'an school (gong'an pai 公安派) was named after Gong'an in Hubei, the birthplace of its core figures, the three Yuan brothers (Yuan Zongdao 袁宗道, Yuan Hongdao 袁宏道 and Yuan Zhongdao 袁中道), among whom Yuan Hongdao was the best known poet and critic of the Gong'an school.

From Yuan Hongdao's words we can roughly interpret *xingling* as a literary feature which encourages writers to articulate personal feelings and emotions in a genuine manner. His emphasis on the genuineness of literary production is not hard to understand if we consider the literary milieu in the late Ming, which was dominated by the imitation of ancient models, in particular the poetry of the High Tang period (Ong 2016: 23–24). Yuan Hongdao's proposition of *xingling* thus undertook a systematic critique of Ming archaism by stressing the role of the writer's natural feelings, which produced freshness and individuality in literary production.

The concept of *xingling* evolved from the late Ming and was transformed during the Republican Era. Despite its liberating insights on writers' unfettered creativity, the notion of *xingling* was marginalised in the late Ming, and *xingling* literature was even banned by the Qing court, chiefly due to *xingling*'s implication of overturning the regulative standards of Confucian orthodoxy (Daruvala 2020: 134). After three centuries of oblivion, the notion of *xingling* was rejuvenated in the 1920s by Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885–1967), one of the leaders in the New Literary Movement (xin wenxue yundong 新文学运动), as the precursor of the literary renaissance of modern China. Zhou reckoned that the late Ming literature, epitomised in *xingling* literature, was the origin of the literary movement in the 1920s. In Zhou's view, because *xingling* literature embodied the free-thinking voices and the liberation of style, thought and sentiment, the Gong'an school writers marked a real break with archaism and truly entered modern literary writing (1937).

Lin Yutang endorsed and expanded on Zhou's celebration of *xingling* writings as a native Chinese precedent for modern liberality and pluralism (1935). In Lin's view, originality as advocated by *xingling* literature saved Chinese writing from substituting mere composing for real thinking, avoided the literary production guided or enforced by external political dicta, and defended the autonomy of literature. Against this background, Charles Laughlin's translation of *xingling* as "the liberation of spirit" responded to Zhou's and Lin's recognition of *xingling* as a symbol of the originality and freedom of writing (2015: 47).

If Laughlin's translation "the liberation of spirit" indicated the source of the writers' original and free thinking, then Qian Suoqiao's translation of *xingling* as "self-expression" (2011: 127) underscored the approach with which the writers turn free thinking into literary production. Taking departure from Lin's statement of "*xingling* is none other than self", Qian argued that the defining feature in creative literature lay more in expressing the self (ziwo 自我) than in probing into the self (2011: 139). Qian added that the self-knowledge of personality could be improved consciously through learning and life experience, but the expression of unique personality was the core to creative artistic production and was hard to achieve.

Although Qian did not investigate the notion of the self when explaining his translation, it would be helpful if we were familiarised with the discussions on the self between different scholars. Zhang Junmai 张君劢 (1887–1969) deemed the self as the central focus of life, and regarded the focus of the self as being on subjectivity and free will which should not be governed by utilitarian and positivist concerns (1981: 998). Lydia Liu furthered the discussion on the self by locating this term in the beginning of China's modernising process, and argued that the translation of Western concepts including the self, individual, personality into Chinese had awakened the masses and enlightened the mass culture to the authentic, free pursuit of individual goals (1999: 85).

Differing from Zhou Zuoren who took *xingling* as an incentive of his self-isolation, Lin Yutang amplified the counter-utilitarian sense of *xingling* and employed this term as a starting point to challenge the politicisation of literature as upheld by The League of Left-wing Writers (zuoyi zuojia lianmeng 左翼作家联盟) who treated literary production as a tool of ideological propaganda in the name of national strengthening and national salvation. In "Lun wen", Lin contended that the assessment criteria of works of art would be ludicrous if utilitarian goals were taken into account, and that such a control of aesthetics would lead to the fabrication of false individuality (1994: 149).

I will further accentuate the counter-utilitarian connotation of *xingling* developed by Lin in the 1920s and 1930s, and translate *xingling* as "authentic expression of individuality". In this translation, I highlight authenticity and individuality as two critical criteria for the quality of expression, to echo Lin's words in "Lun wen" that *zhen* enabled writers to give full play to their nature and individuality. According to Lin, the respect held for a writer's individuality endowed *xingling* with a "grandeur of universality" (Sohigian 1991: 276). It is worth mentioning that the association between *xingling* and universality is pivoted on Lin's reinterpretation of *xingling* as the essence of humanism. In *The Importance of Living*, one of his best-received works in English, Lin expounded the idea that, in their purest form, traditional Chinese values could touch the human heart and move people across the globe (1937: 1). *Xingling* was recognised as one of these fundamental Chinese values. As we shall see in my subsequent analysis of *FCSS*, Lin placed high hopes on the universal potential of *xingling*, which guided his selection, rewriting and modernisation of traditional Chinese tales with the ultimate goal of "touching the human heart".

Xingling as an Agent of Modernity in *FCSS*

While much of the cultural-aesthetic debate since the May Fourth era focused on the contradictions between tradition and modernity and the tensions between China and the West, Lin's reinterpretation of *xingling* highlighted the affinity between traditional Chinese culture and Western modernity by linking *xingling* with Croce's and Spingarn's aesthetic theories. This link underscored Lin's recognition of the value of traditional Chinese culture and its potential to contribute to universal humanistic endeavours in his cross-cultural work. In this section, I will demonstrate how Lin's approach to reworking traditional Chinese texts responded to his promotion of the *xingling* ideal in 1920s and 1930s China. As my analysis of *FCSS* will show, Lin's selection and re-organisation of traditional Chinese folk tales, as well as his varied and sensitive rewriting strategy, all echoed his interpretation of *xingling* as an authentic expression of individuality that transcends linguistic and cultural barriers.

FCSS consists of Lin's retelling of twenty traditional Chinese stories in English. The Chinese stories range from Tang dynasty *chuanqi* 传奇 [classical tales of the marvellous], Song dynasty *huaben* 话本 [vernacular scripts of a story-teller], to the minor genres such as *xiaoshuo* 小说 [short stories] and *biji* 笔记 [jottings]. In Lin's English renditions, the original genre distinctions are erased and a thematic organisation is adopted. The twenty stories are categorised into six thematic groups —"Adventure and Mystery", "Love", "Ghosts", "Juvenile", "Satire" and "Tales of Fancy and Humour". While one or two of the themes ("Ghosts", "Adventure and Mystery") may have their roots in the Chinese narrative tradition, the other themes ("Love", "Juvenile", "Satire" and "Tales of Fancy and Humour") are predominantly of Western origins or influenced by Western genres. On one hand, Lin's re-organisation of the tales constitutes a reinvention of Chinese cultural legacy by bringing generically heterogeneous and previously unrelated tales into the same frame; on the other hand, his adoption of certain abstract and Western-influenced themes reveals his attempt to align traditional Chinese stories with values and ideals that he deemed modern.

Although in the title of this book, *Famous Chinese Short Stories: Retold by Lin Yutang*, "retold" was highlighted to suggest the rewriting strategy Lin adopted in producing this work, as opposed to literal translation, not all the traditional Chinese elements in the originals were erased or underwent drastic modifications in Lin's rendition. Based on my comparison between the original tales and Lin's English rendition, eleven of the twenty stories remained similar to the original with only minor adjustments, while the remaining nine were significantly modified in terms of plot, setting, characterisation, and thematic focus. In addition, some traditional Chinese elements were maintained formally and visually in *FCSS*, such as the Chinese titles of stories printed in the Chinese calligraphic forms on the contents page. As Lin mentioned in the introduction of *FCSS*, the reason he selected traditional Chinese tales as the source of (re)writing for Western readers was that those tales had a universal appeal (1952: 11). Lin went on to say that the universal appeal meant those tales were able to help Western readers gain a particular insight into human character, deepen the knowledge of life, and awaken pity, love, or sympathy for a human being. It can be seen from Lin's words that traditional Chinese tales were a vehicle for Western readers to perceive a common humanity which has universal appeal. *Xingling*, reinterpreted by Lin as the core of humanity, untainted by any utilitarian concerns, became a guiding light for Lin's selection and rewriting.

Humanistic concerns permeated the traditional Chinese tales that Lin selected for *FCSS*. In many tales, the struggles against Confucian orthodoxy and the striving towards individual freedom were so strong that Lin had little to change in terms of plot and characterisation. In these cases, his English renditions remained "faithful" to the

Chinese originals because the core of humanity in these stories already aligned with Lin's *xingling* ideal. Yet it is in the nine stories that Lin chose to substantially rewrite that his reinterpretation of *xingling* most prominently and actively manifested itself. I will focus on three stories, *The Stranger's Note, The Jade Goddess* and *Jealousy*, as their differences from the Chinese originals most vividly illustrate how Lin's rewriting is shaped by his understanding of *xingling* as the authentic expression of individuality. I list the main textual changes of these three stories from the Chinese originals to Lin's English renditions as below (see the table following over page).

In the Chinese original of *The Stranger's Note*, entitled *Wuming xin* 无名信 [An anonymous letter], a monk who is a thorough cheat and villain fabricates a note, which insinuates that the wife of a high official is likely to cheat on her husband. The official believes it and his wife is repudiated. However, it turns out that the wife is blameless. The Chinese story ends with the wife going back to her husband, and the monk being punished with flogging. By contrast, in the ending of Lin's English rendition, after the wife is proven blameless, the previously suffering, submissive woman decides to stay with the monk instead of going back to the high official, because the monk treats her much better than her husband, who mistrusts her.

The core issue of *The Stranger's Note* lies in whether the official's wife should go with the monk instead of her husband. The wife's choice reveals her neglect of the Confucian moral codes in which a wife should stick to her husband even though she was treated unfairly. In the Confucian social hierarchy, women occupy a far inferior position to their husbands, and women are supposed to act and fulfil responsibilities in accordance with their husband's will (Gao 2003). In this sense, the anti-rational, norm-bending choice by the wife in Lin's ending demonstrates her individuality and freedom to reject the binding of the Confucian moral codes, and to make independent decisions based on her own will. The wife's transgressive and non-conformist individuality, which challenges the subordination of women to their husbands in pre-modern society, corresponds to Lin's modern reinterpretation of *xingling*. By endowing the wife with the agency to express her individuality, a key connotation of *xingling*, Lin highlighted the potential for Chinese culture to transition from tradition to modernity through his rewriting.

The Jade Goddess is another story where Lin substantially changed the plot and thematic focus. The Chinese original *Nianyu guanyin* 碾玉观音 [Carved jade goddess] revolves around an artisan couple who serve a high official. The male protagonist is a jade carver, being selected as a servant due to his incredible jade goddess sculpture that greatly impressed the official, and his lover is selected due to her outstanding embroidery skills. However, the couple blunders badly and then escapes. In the Chinese original, the male protagonist goes into hiding and the woman is put to death and becomes a vengeful ghost. In Lin's rewriting, however, the jade artisan resumes his livelihood in jade carving, and his products are so extraordinary that the official recognises them and traces him. Facing the threat to his life, he is determined to abide by his artistry and continues to work, and is arrested by the official in the end. The Chinese original offers a stark criticism of social injustice in pre-modern China where the ruled class did not have the freedom to determine their own fate. In Lin's rewriting, by contrast, the theme is shifted to the predicament of an artist torn between artistic integrity and mere survival.

Table 1: Main Textual Changes Made from the Chinese Originals to the English Renditions in *FCSS*.

Textual Changes	**Changes in Titles**		**Other Textual Changes**		
English Titles in *FCSS*	**Chinese Titles in *FCSS* created by Lin**	**Chinese Titles of the Chinese Originals (Author/Collection/ Time period)**	**Plot**	**Setting and Characterisation**	**Thematic Focus**
The Stranger's Note	*Jiantie heshang* 简帖和尚 [A monk who sent a short note]	*Wuming xin* 无名信 [An anonymous letter] (Anonymous/*Qingping shantang huaben* 清平山堂话本/the Song dynasty)	A monk abducts the high official's wife, and is ultimately punished by flogging → A monk saves the high official's wife from an unsatisfactory marriage, and they live happily thereafter	The descriptions of the monk's appearance: a snub nose and a wide mouth which indicate he might be an evil person → the facial features which indicate the monk might have a good fortune	To uphold the values that evil conducts will finally be punished → To encourage individuals to prioritise individual happiness to Confucian moral codes
The Jade Goddess	*Yu guanyin* 玉观音 [Jade goddess]	*Nianyu guanyin* 碾玉观音 [Carved jade goddess] (Anonymous/*Jingben tongsu xiaoshuo* 京本通俗小说/the Song dynasty)	A jade carver and his lover elope because they may not get married due to their distinct social positions → A jade carver and his wife elope because they have illicit intercourse deemed unacceptable by Confucian orthodoxy	N/A	To criticise the fact that members of the ruled class in pre-modern China do not have the agency to determine their own fate → To discuss whether it is worthwhile to pursue artistic achievement at the cost of personal safety
Jealousy	*Jidu* 嫉妒 [Jealousy]	*Xishan yiku gui* 西山一窟鬼 [Ghosts of the western mountain cave] (Anonymous/Jingben tongsu xiaoshuo 京本通俗小说/the Song dynasty)	N/A	The ending in the Chinese original where a Taoist priest is called to exorcise the spirits is omitted in the English rendition.	N/A

Qian Suoqiao has used *The Jade Goddess* as an example to illustrate that Lin's rewriting undermines the original flavour of the traditional Chinese folklore tales to suit the reading practices of the West. According to Qian, Lin appropriated traditional Chinese literary resources and twisted the theme in *The Jade Goddess* to suit the Western fixation on art and artist. Qian continued that Lin's appropriation was conducted with his Orientalist intention to cater to the Western audience and in turn to enter the Anglo-American mainstream literary marketplace through his satisfaction to the Western taste. In Qian's assessment, Lin's cross-cultural literary activities are not a successful representation and transfer of Chinese culture, and *FCSS*, in particular, is so target culture-oriented that Lin is suspected of a certain complicity with the colonial powers of the West (2011: 195).

Qian Suoqiao is not the only scholar who has criticised Lin's Orientalist perspective as betrayed by his appropriation of Chinese tradition. In a similar vein, Charles Laughlin compares Lin's rewriting of traditional Chinese stories to the conduct of a "native informant" to the English-speaking world (2015: 38). The "native informant", as explained by Gayatri Spivak, is often used as a derogatory term to indicate an indigenous person who works as a collaborator with the colonial or invading power and discloses native information to the coloniser/invader in their expected manner (1999: 6). Laughlin deemed Lin a native informant because Lin packaged the images of the Orient as strange, exotic and remote, in accordance with the manner expected by the Western readers to satisfy their curiosity. In Laughlin's view, Lin overlooked whether his rewriting distorted the intention of the authors of the Chinese originals.

To critically engage with Qian's and Laughlin's accusation of Lin as an Orientalist, it is necessary to briefly revisit the conception and evolution of Orientalism. The notion of "Orientalism" was firstly problematised by Edward Said in his work *Orientalism* in 1978. According to Said, the images of the East were invented by the West as those of romance, exoticness, and haunting memories, and the East of those images was designated by the West as the Orient (1978: xii). Vukovich expanded on Said's theory by maintaining that the existence of the Orient was designed by the West to contrast with the images of the West itself, and to constitute the Orient as the Other. In doing so, the West effectively assimilates the Orient and makes the Orient a subordinate component of itself (2013: 25). Arif Dirlik further developed the notion of Orientalism and applied it to Asian intellectuals in the East (1996). In a process of what Dirlik has termed Self-Orientalism, some Asian intellectuals served the colonial intentions of the West and imparted the geopolitical awareness of the Orient as the Other into the East. Those intellectuals internalised and consolidated the Orientalist knowledge built by the West in which the Orient was inferior to the West, and disseminated the knowledge within the East. In this sense, those Asian intellectuals facilitated the Western conquest of the East.

Given Lin's position as a Chinese writer operating in the Anglo-American world at the time, Qian's and Laughlin's accusation of Lin's Orientalist perspective can be better understood against the notion of Self-Orientalism. However, even the label of Self-Orientalism can seem reductive as a descriptor for Lin's cross-cultural work.

While Lin might have exhibited an outward inclination of catering to Western taste, his rewriting of traditional Chinese stories in English does not capitalise on the strange, the exotic, and the remote. Quite the contrary, Lin sought to downplay aspects of the stories that might be considered traditionally Chinese while reinforcing those aspects that appear enlightened, modern, and universal.

With the admission that Lin could have internalised some Orientalist tendencies given his upbringing and social milieu, I propose to describe Lin as a "partial" Orientalist whose literary activities did not facilitate the Western conquest of the East, but rather facilitated the reception of traditional Chinese culture in the West. In *FCSS*, Lin made a significant amount of textual changes to traditional Chinese tales, and his rewriting betrayed his desire to ease the cultural differences between China and the West. Lin admitted that his rewriting involved narrating Chinese stories with the pace and techniques of modern short stories of the West, with the aim to bridge the gap between the Chinese and Western worlds in terms of language, custom and cultural practice (1952: 16–17). Such rewriting is no doubt interventionist. Yet, to extend from Yifeng Sun's idea of displacement and intervention in cross-cultural translation (2007), I submit that Lin's interventionist rewriting, unlike the Orientalist gaze, works on both source and target cultures, leading to ruptures and readjustments on both sides of the cultural transaction.

In my interpretation of Lin as a "partial" Orientalist, "partial" could be understood as Lin's selective approach to the transmission of Chinese cultural tradition. Lin's presentation of traditional Chinese culture in English is fragmentary rather than comprehensive or systematic. However, this fragmentation is strategic rather than haphazard. Different from an over-sweeping Orientalist perspective which portrays pre-modern China as the passive cultural Other vis-à-vis the West, Lin's selective approach to Chinese tradition energises it with his partiality to those aspects of Chinese tradition that are conducive to its transition to modernity. On the other hand, Lin's position as a "partial" Orientalist also suggests that Lin's literary activities had the potential to fragment Orientalism as a coherent system of thought.

Lin subverted the tropes of Orientalism largely through the adoption of rewriting strategies that might be described as "narrative framing". According to Mona Baker, narrative indicates the stories which may shape people's understanding of or behaviour towards certain issues, and framing sketches the process of shaping through transmitting the connotation in the narrative to readership. In this process, framing also plays the role of an interpretative device which explains the author's motivation behind establishing the narrative (2007). Baker further pointed out that, through cross-cultural rewriting, the connotation embedded in the narrative of the source text may be accentuated, undermined or modified in the target text.

Sometimes, omission can be as effective a framing device as augmentation or modification. I will use the story *Jealousy* as an example to illustrate how Lin uses the technique of omission to generate a space of the Other, which becomes a symbolic gesture of his partial Orientalist stance. In the Chinese original *Xishan yiku gui* 西山一窟鬼 [Ghosts of the western mountain cave], the male protagonist tries to find a woman to marry, but it turns out that all the women around him are ghosts. A Taoist priest turns up and tells the protagonist that he is condemned to the company of ghosts because of his indulgence to worldly pleasures in his previous life. The story ends with the Taoist priest restoring the order by exorcising the ghosts.

In Lin's English rendition, however, the exorcist ending is omitted. This omission reframes the narrative and sheds an entirely different light on the ghost-human relationship. By acknowledging the ghost's desire to dwell among human beings, Lin's rewriting shifts the narrative focus to the predicament of ghosts, a theme that is often evaded or denied in mainstream philosophical discourse. Luo Hui has described this denial as the suppression of the feminine, non-ancestral and non-human forces embodied by the ghosts in traditional Chinese culture, and the exercise of power to control or tame the ghosts in Chinese folklore, as in the form of Taoist exorcism, symbolises the struggle between the dominant ideology and the counter-discourse of the Other (2009: 49–50). In the context of this discussion, Lin's narrative framing not only reactivates the ghosts' critical potential against Confucian orthodoxy, but also creates a space for a discourse of the Other in his own struggle against the dominant discourse of Western modernity.

Lin's discourse of the Other in 1950s America echoed his championing of *xingling* literature in 1920s and 1930s China, when his counter-utilitarian approach to literature was deemed inappropriate, or even unpatriotic, for the political environment at the time. One could even argue that the very approach of rewriting was a demonstration of *xingling*. However, a discourse of the Other when the US was at the height of its power was bound to be marginal, dismissible, or irrelevant. As a less successful example of Lin's cross-cultural undertakings in the US, *FCSS* would have to be assessed in a different frame of cultural and historical references to reveal its true significance.

Chinese Tradition in the Pursuit of Modernity

In *FCSS*, Lin's promotion of *xingling* as an important value of Chinese tradition challenged what is widely understood as the Eurocentric discourses of humanism and modernity (Kow 2014). Yet the significance and impact of his work lies not in its moment of encounter with the West, in 1950s America, but in the longer timeframe of China's pursuit of modernity. In 1920s China, Western modernity was held as a banner by the mainstream May Fourth intellectuals. They advocated the total Westernisation of Chinese society as the sole approach to Chinese modernity, and dismissed traditional Chinese culture as unfit for the modern world (Ouyang 2016: 90). In this sense, Lin's championing of Chinese tradition challenged the mainstream May Fourth discourse on Chinese modernity.

Differing from mainstream May Fourth thinking, Lin believed that Chinese traditions were not necessarily incompatible with the pursuit of modernity. Advocating a Chinese-Western synthesised approach to Chinese modernity, Lin held that modern Chinese culture should be one in which traditional Chinese culture and modern culture of the West are balanced and fully integrated (Qian 2011: 60–61). According to him, Chinese tradition and Western modernity should contest and coordinate on the Chinese pathway to modernity. Instead of contemplating a radical rebellion against Chinese tradition, Lin thought that part of the Chinese cultural heritage could be passed down and preserved for a modern Chinese society. In this respect, Lin's championing of the position of traditional Chinese culture in Chinese modernity was more proactive than the mainstream May Fourth camps, because Lin aspired to decentre the dominant discourse of Western modernity in Chinese society, while Lin's Chinese peers were still following the Eurocentric paradigm of Western modernity.

Lin's defending of the value of Chinese tradition in the pursuit of modernity narrowed the gap between Chinese tradition and modernity. His rewriting strategy in literary production, in particular, suggested a potential pathway for Chinese society to transition from tradition to modernity. Lin was not the only 20th-century writer who attempted to bridge the gap between Chinese tradition and modernity through rewriting traditional Chinese tales. The interplay between tradition and modernity can also be detected in the rewriting works of other prominent short story (re)writers, in particular Lu Xun, Wang Xiaobo and Wang Zengqi. Each of these (re)writers attempted to investigate the most appropriate paradigm for Chinese literature to transform from traditional to modern forms, and their rewritings revealed their unique perspectives on the pathways between Chinese tradition and modernity.

As a pioneering figure of May Fourth "new literature", Lu Xun was fairly ambivalent about his connection to Chinese tradition. In 1923, Lu Xun produced *Zhongguo xiaoshuo shilue* 中国小说史略 [A brief history of Chinese fiction] as the first systematic treatise on traditional Chinese *xiaoshuo*. It is not hard to detect the tension between Lu Xun's vision of modernity and his retrospective act to reassess traditional Chinese literature. Lu Xun's project was to narrate the trajectory of *xiaoshuo* from its early origin in the minor genres of "petty talk" to its modern transformation into the Chinese equivalent of the Western novel. This transformation was aided by Lu Xun's application of modern aesthetic criteria. Those aesthetic criteria, especially the one highlighting the role of authorship in literary production, were in effect fairly recent imports from the West. Thus Lu Xun's systematic re-evaluation of traditional Chinese *xiaoshuo* was regarded as an attempt to create a modern paradigm for Chinese literary production and criticism.

The motivations and strategies of Lu Xun's endeavour to modernise traditional Chinese literature can be gleaned more directly from his rewriting work *Gushi xinbian* 故事新编 [Old tales retold]. Produced between 1921 and 1935, this collection included Lu Xun's adaptations of traditional literary texts including myths and legends, ancient records and historical documents. In Lu Xun's rewriting, the heroic figures who enjoyed high status in the original stories were all afflicted by disgraceful figures, whereas the disgraceful always had an unshakable position in society. According to Xudong Zhang's analysis, Lu Xun's rewriting mirrored the cultural milieu in the wake of the May Fourth Movement (2014: 377). Zhang argues that Lu Xun's intention to allow the present to leave its mark on traditional literature constituted a modern literary strategy through which traditional literature and the conditions of Lu Xun's own time became inter-referential and mutually implicated.

Lu Xun's literary strategy to modernise traditional Chinese literature, namely borrowing traditional literary resources to hint at the flaws in contemporary society, was amplified in Wang Xiaobo's *Tangren gushi* 唐人故事 [Tales of the Tang people]. In *Tangren gushi*, produced in the 1980s and included five modern stories adapted from Tang dynasty *chuanqi* tales, Wang incorporated the narrative of imaginative Tang tales with his depiction of the factual to contrast the past with the present and achieve an aesthetic effect of distance (Wang 1997: 124). The characters he portrayed – vagabonds, prostitutes, monks, and the otherwise disenchanted and disenfranchised – were not those recognised in mainstream writing, and through his selection of protagonists Wang indicated his resistance to the submission to authority and his rebuke of the passive obedience to conventions (Xu 2014: 141).

Compared with Wang Xiaobo who boldly experimented with the strategy of modern fiction in his rewriting, another contemporary Chinese writer Wang Zengqi put more emphasis on the role of Chinese tradition in his rewriting work of *Liaozhai xinyi* 聊斋新义 [New interpretations of *Liaozhai*]. Wang Zengqi's *Liaozhai xinyi* was produced in the late 1980s and contained adaptations of a selection of stories from *Liaozhai zhiyi* 聊斋志异 [Strange stories from a Chinese studio] authored by Pu Songling 蒲松龄 (1640–1715) in the Qing dynasty. According to Wang Zengqi, he did not forsake the original literary techniques in Pu's stories with modern techniques of the West; on the contrary, the narrative methods of traditional stories were retained as much as possible (1998: 239). Although Wang Zengqi incorporated modern themes and aesthetics into his rewriting, such as self-identity and the tension between individual artistic ideal and social and literary conventions, he endeavoured to highlight the characteristics of traditional Chinese stories and give them a fresh, modern presentation. In this sense, Wang Zengqi's rewriting corresponded to his advocacy of "turning back to Chinese tradition" as an alternative to modernising Chinese literature in the 1980s (Wang 1998: 300).

A comparison of the modern literary strategies employed in the rewritings of Lin Yutang, Lu Xun, Wang Xiaobo and Wang Zengqi reveals two distinctive stances on the dichotomy between Chinese tradition and Chinese modernity. Lu Xun and Wang Xiaobo share certain similarities in their rewriting strategies, as they both treated the traditional Chinese stories allegorically to launch their criticism of the present day. By contrast, Lin and Wang Zengqi downplayed the socio-political contexts of the traditional stories and infused them with humanistic and aesthetic concerns. The differences in the rewriting strategies between these two pairings embody the (re)writers' distinct stances on the role of Chinese tradition in the construction of Chinese modernity. Lu Xun and Wang Xiaobo utilised traditional resources as a tool to reflect the flaws of modern society awaiting resolution, while Lin Yutang and Wang Zengqi emphasised the modern potential of traditional Chinese literature to cushion the impact of Western modernity on Chinese culture. However different the perspectives of these four (re)writers were, we can see their agreed attempts to define and negotiate the position of Chinese tradition in its irrevocable encounter with modernity.

The Soft Power of Chinese Tradition

It must be acknowledged that the encounter between Chinese tradition and Western modernity, in Lin's case, took place in English, in the USA. This distinctive feature sets Lin's rewriting in *FCSS* apart from those of Lu Xun, Wang Zenqi and Wang Xiaobo. The bilingual and cross-cultural dimensions of Lin's rewriting further complicated his mediating role between tradition and modernity, as he had to simultaneously deal with his role as a "cultural ambassador" between China and the West. To account for Lin's work of cultural diplomacy in the US without losing sight of the kinds of cultural politics he engaged with during the heydays of the May Fourth movement, I propose a retroactive application of Joseph Nye's concept of soft power to the days before China's rise in contemporary geopolitics, when the power relations between China and the West were extremely unbalanced.

According to Joseph Nye in *Public Diplomacy and Soft Power*, a country's soft power indicates its ability to obtain preferred outcomes by attraction to and persuasion of others, rather than by coercion and payment as indicated in hard power. In other words, the core of soft power relies on the capability of one country to shape the preferences of others (Nye 2008: 94–95). Nye added that, in international politics, the culture and values of one country play an indispensable part in producing soft power, and when employing public diplomacy as an instrument, the government of one country is actually mobilising the resources of culture and values to communicate with and attract other countries. In terms of the use of public diplomacy, Nye further points out that the efficacy of public diplomacy would be enhanced if one country understands the outcomes other countries hope to obtain and the way other countries process the messages encoded in the public diplomatic policies. It is worth mentioning that Nye emphasises the significance of credibility and self-criticism as significant sources of soft power, and believes the self-criticism of a government, though difficult to practise, is an effective way to establish its credibility because the criticism implies the openness of a society.

How do we talk about a Chinese soft power when China was clearly in a powerless position vis-à-vis the West, when China as a nation was geographically and ideologically divided, and when, in his diasporic existence, Lin's own affiliation with "homeland" became increasingly ambiguous and metaphoric? To apply the notion of soft power to Lin's literary activities in mid 20th-century USA is also to retune and recalibrate it. Nye promoted the notion of soft power to resist the abusive use of hard power between countries and to denounce the zero-sum game in which one country's gain necessarily becomes the other country's loss. Lin's efforts to write English books on China for readers of the West during the war years no doubt had an immediate goodwill effect that suited the times, improving China's standing among its international allies. In the post-war context, Lin's continued efforts to transmit the value of Chinese tradition to the US are best understood as part of a long-term historical project, as a renewed attempt to address China's cultural deficit vis-à-vis the West in the modern era. The difference between Nye's and Lin's notion of soft power is that, while Nye emphasised the role of official policies in improving international relations, Lin focused on cultural dialogue as a preferred approach to mediating the power dynamics between China and the West. In the absence of a clear national or political affiliation, Lin's take on soft power transcends the narrow interests of the modern nation-state and elevates it to the realm of universal humanism, an enlightenment ideal to which Chinese culture both aspires and contributes.

During his long stay in the US from 1936 to 1966, Lin established his reputation as a wise promoter of Chinese culture with over 30 English works ranging from novels, biographies, as well as translations and rewritings of traditional Chinese texts.[4] Collectively these works secure a place of Chinese tradition in the English language textual field. Facing the gap between the two culture, Lin did not conclude hastily on whether traditional Chinese culture is superior to Western culture in spiritual terms, or Western society is more advanced in material terms, as commonly discussed in the "spiritual China – material West" dichotomy promoted by Chinese reformers such as Liang Qichao 梁启超. In contrast with the fighters for China's spiritual and national salvation, Lin assumed the role of a cultural ambassador and resorted to less confrontational means to create a space of dialogue with the West.

Due to his Christian upbringing and Westernised education in his formative years, Lin's knowledge of traditional Chinese culture did not hold much sway in his thinking until he taught at Tsing-hua University in his late 20s. His cross-cultural background endowed him with the vantage point to observe Western culture at close range, as well as a critical distance to reflect on traditional Chinese culture. In Lin's English works, we can perceive his internal gap with Chinese tradition which fostered self-reflection and resisted uncritical assimilation. Much as Nye's two ingredients – self-criticism and credibility – that are necessary to the success of a nation's soft power, Lin's capacity for self-criticism, from what I have described as his partial Orientalist stance, is also largely responsible for the credibility of his soft power of Chinese tradition.

Therefore Lin's soft power of Chinese tradition does not mean that he blindly extolled all aspects of Chinese tradition. Lin can be relentlessly critical of Chinese culture, both past and present, as exemplified in *FCSS* as well as earlier works such as *My Country and My people* (1936: 5). Lin's self-criticism was regarded by some critics as a strategic move to cater to the stereotyped images of the Orient in the eyes of the West. Edmund Wilson lamented that Lin was Americanised and sarcastically called him a "Professional Chinese" in the US literary market (1945: 73–74). Madalina Yuk-Ling Lee attributed Lin's success in the American book market to his pandering to the taste for "Chinese problems" among his elite-populist American readership (2009: 126–27). Other scholars are more sympathetic. Sohigian regarded Lin's self-criticism as attributes of frankness and broad-mindedness in his interpretation of Chinese tradition to the West (2015: 141–42). Similarly, Joe Sample acknowledged the sincerity in Lin's self-criticism and considered it essential for different cultures to work through their incongruities before common ground can be established (2015: 199).

---

[4] Lin's cross-cultural English works are categorised into "the wisdom series" including *The Wisdom of Confucius* (1938), *The Wisdom of China and India* (1942), *The Wisdom of Laotse* (1948) and *On the Wisdom of America* (1950); "the novel trilogy" including *Moment in Peking* (1939), *A Leaf in the Storm* (1940), and *The Vermillion Gate* (1953); biographies including *The Gay Genius* (1947) and *Lady Wu* (1957); and rewriting or translation works, including *Six Chapters of A Floating Life* (1939), *Widow, Nun and Courtesan: Three Novelettes from the Chinese, Translated and Adapted by Lin Yutang* (1951), *Famous Chinese Short Stories, Retold by Lin Yutang* (1952), and *The Importance of Understanding* (1960).

In my view, Lin's self-criticism was neither a gesture catering to Western appetite for "Chinese problems", nor was it a patronising posture towards Chinese tradition in the manner of Self-Orientalism. It must be appreciated at its face value, as self-criticism rooted in authentic self-expression. The aim of this self-criticism was not immediate success in the book market, but rather the prospect of a forward-thinking yet self-reflexive Chinese culture. To quote Lin's own words, as in his preface to *My Country and My people*, the reason he boldly disclosed the troubles of Chinese society to the West was that he hoped Chinese people could realise those problems and make improvement (1936: 5).

Not only did Lin point out the problems and signal the pathways for improvement in his English works, he actively experimented with these pathways through his rewriting strategies. Taking *FCSS* as an example, the textual changes Lin made in his English rendition of traditional Chinese stories pinpointed the flaws in Chinese tradition while simultaneously reframing that tradition so that the desirable attributes of a modernising Chinese culture could emerge. These attributes included the authentic expression of individuality, tolerance and respect for the Other, and universal humanism. Lin's soft power of Chinese tradition is ultimately an expression of his *xingling* ideal.

Conclusion

By analysing Lin's rewriting in *FCSS* through the lens of his reinterpretation of *xingling*, I have attempted to portray a Lin Yutang who stood at the crossroads between China and the West, between tradition and modernity. At this crossroads, Lin could be seen from the many critical perspectives at different historical junctures, as a cultural ambassador, a liberal cosmopolitan, or a *partial* Orientalist.

In his mediating role between China and the West, Lin engaged in a form of cultural diplomacy that generated what I call a soft power of Chinese tradition. This soft power is not merely concerned with increasing the likeability of Chinese culture in the West, although Lin's literary activities in the US were no doubt conditioned by his immediate audience at the time. However, by linking Lin's *FCSS* with similar rewritings of classical texts throughout the 20th century, I have demonstrated that the more enduring context of Lin's work has proven to be China's on-going pursuit of modernity vis-à-vis the dominant discourse of Western modernity. As Lin's English works gradually fade out of American public view and become revived in the Chinese-speaking world through back-translations and film adaptations in the last few decades, the relevance of this context remains strong.

References

"Lin Yutang, 80, Dies; Scholar, Philosopher." *The New York Times*, 27 Mar. 1976, www.nytimes.com/1976/03/27/archives/lin-yutang-80-dies-scholar-philosopher-lin-yutang.html. Accessed 5 May 2020.

Baker, Mona, 2007. "Reframing Conflict in Translation." *Social Semiotics* 17, no. 2: 151–69.

Daruvala, Susan, 2020. *Zhou Zuoren and an Alternative Chinese Response to Modernity*. Leiden: Brill.

Dirlik, Arif, 1996. "Chinese History and the Question of Orientalism." *History and Theory* 35, no. 4: 96–118.

Gao, Xiongya, 2003. "Women Existing for Men: Confucianism and Social Injustice against Women in China." *Race, Gender & Class* 10, no. 3: 114–25.

Kow, Simon, 2014. "Enlightenment Universalism? Bayle and Montesquieu on China." *The European Legacy* 19, no. 3: 347–58.

Laughlin, Charles, 2015. "Lin Yutang's Unique Adoption of Tradition." In Suoqiao Qian (ed.), *The Cross-Cultural Legacy of Lin Yutang: Critical Perspectives*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 38–48.

Lee, Madalina Yuk-Ling, 2009. *The Intellectual Origins of Lin Yutang's Cultural Internationalism, 1928–1938.* University of Maryland, Master's thesis.

Lin Yutang 林语堂, "Xiaopin wen zhi yixu 小品文之遗续" (The inherited business of xiaopin wen). *Renjian shi* 20 Feb. 1935.

——1936. "Ji xingling 记性灵" (On xingling). *Youzhou feng* 11: 525–26.

——1936. *My Country and My People.* London: W. Heinemann.

——1937. *The Importance of Living*. New York: John Day Company.

——1952. *Famous Chinese Short Stories: Retold by Lin Yutang*. New York: John Day Company.

——1994. "Lun wen 论文" (On literature). In Yutang Lin (ed.), *Xing Su Ji, Pi Jing Ji* 行素集，披荆集 (My own way, Trailblazer). Changchun: Northeast Normal University Press, 145–57.

Liu, Lydia H., 1999. *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity: China 1900–1937*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Luo, Hui, 2009. *The Ghost of "Liaozhai": Pu Songling's Ghostlore and Its History of Reception*. University of Toronto, PhD dissertation.

Nye, Joseph S., 2008. "Public Diplomacy and Soft Power." *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 616: 94–109.

Ong, Chang Woei, 2016. *Li Mengyang, the North-South Divide, and Literati Learning in Ming China.* Cambridge: Harvard University Asia Centre.

Ouyang, Zhesheng, 2016. "Expanding the Discursive Domain of Research on the New Culture Movement: An Incomplete Review of Studies on the New Culture Movement." *Chinese Studies in History* 49, no. 2: 90–101.

Qian, Suoqiao, 2011. *Liberal cosmopolitan: Lin Yutang and the middling Chinese modernity*. Leiden: Brill.

——2015. "Western Universalism and Chinese Identity: Lin Yutang as a Cross-Cultural Critic." In Suoqiao Qian (ed.), *The Cross-Cultural Legacy of Lin Yutang: Critical Perspectives*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 1–16.

Said, Edward W., 1978. *Orientalism*. New York: Pantheon Books.

Sample, Joe, 2015. "His country and His Language: Lin Yutang and the Interpretation of Things Chinese." In Suoqiao Qian (ed.), *The Cross-Cultural Legacy of Lin Yutang: Critical Perspectives*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 185–200.

Sohigian, Diran John. *The Life and Times of Lin Yutang*. 1991. Columbia University, PhD dissertation.

——2015. “Lin Yutang’s Criticism of Criticism of Criticism: On Self-expression in China and America.” In Suoqiao Qian (ed.), *The Cross-Cultural Legacy of Lin Yutang: Critical Perspectives*. Berkeley: Institute of East Asian Studies, University of California, 115–42.

Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty, 1999. *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason: Toward a History of the Vanishing Present.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Sun,Yifeng, 2007. “Displacement and Intervention: Re-creating Literary Texts through Cross-cultural Translation.” *Neohelicon* XXXIV, no. 2: 101–14.

Sze, Mai-Mai, 1952. “The Sauce Is Chinese.” *The New York Times* (18 May 1952). www.nytimes.com/1952/05/18/archives/the-sauce-is-chinese-famous-chinese-short-stories-retold-by-lin.html. Accessed 6 May 2020.

Vukovich, Daniel F., 2013. *China and Orientalism: Western Knowledge Production and the P.R.C.* London: Taylor and Francis.

Wang, Xiaobo 王小波, 1997. *Wode jingshen jiayuan* 我的精神家园 (My spiritual home). Beijing: Culture and Art Publishing House.

Wang, Zengqi 汪曾祺, 1998. “*Liaozhai xinyi houji* 聊斋新义后记” (Postscript to “new interpretations of *Liaozhai*”). in Zengqi Wang (ed.), *Wang Zengqi quanji* 汪曾祺全集 (The complete works of Wang Zengqi). Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group, 238–39.

——1998. “*Renshi daode he meiyou renshi de ziji* 认识到的和没有认识的自己” (The self whom I know and do not know). In Zengqi Wang (ed.), *Wang Zengqi quanji* 汪曾祺全集 (The complete works of Wang Zengqi). Beijing: Beijing Normal University Publishing Group, 295–304.

Wilson, Edmund. “The Americanisation of Lin Yutang.” *New Yorker*, 3 Feb. 1945.

Xu, Xiaowen. *Transgression in Texts: Literary Quality of Qi from Tang Tales of Marvels to Wang Xiaobo’s Tang Tales*. 2014. University of Toronto, PhD dissertation.

Yuan, Hongdao 袁宏道, 1964. “*Wenchao* 文钞” (Selected works). In *Yuan Zhonglang quanji* 袁中郎全集 (The complete works of Yuan Hongdao). Taipei: World Book Publishing, 1–61.

Zhang, Junmai 张君劢, 1981. *Zhong Xi Yin zhexue wenji* 中西印哲学文集 (Essays on Chinese, Western and Indian philosophy). Taipei: Taiwan Student Book Publishing.

Zhang, Xudong, 2014. “The Becoming Self-Conscious of *Zawen*: Literary Modernity and Politics of Language in Lu Xun’s Essay Production during His Transitional Period.” *Frontiers of Literary Studies in China* 8, no. 3: 374–409.

Zhou, Zuoren 周作人, 1937. “Du wan Ming xiaopin xuanzhu 读晚明小品选注” (On reading selected and annotated xiaopin of the Late Ming).” *Yishi bao* 6 May 1937.

Bibliographical Note

Liu Min received her Master’s in Translation Studies from Durham University in the UK, and is currently a PhD candidate in Literary Translation Studies at Victoria University of Wellington. Her research areas are Translation Studies and Cultural Studies, alongside socio-cultural approaches such as Actor-Network theory with a focus on the reception of Lin Yutang, a modern Chinese-American. In addition, Min Liu translates into Chinese English novels and poetry albums including *Mobile Library* and *If I should write, would you listen to my soul?*