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to contextualize more easily the cases of translation and adaption of children’s books since the early 20th century, which I shall present in detail.

Let me state first that I shall not dwelve into concepts and into the theory of children’s literature, because other are much better qualified do so as I am. Second, I shall limit myself to some basic data of Chinese literature, just in order facilitate orientation to those who might be unfamiliar. Third, I shall not give an overview of Chinese children’s literature, but I have selected three works translated from other languages, which have a certain impact until the present day, and have essentially contributed to the emergence and development of literature for children. These texts have also produced of works belonging to the ‘same family’, so to say, i.e. siblings, cousins, as well as children and grandchildren, to keep the image. This implies that from one single, originally translated text, a great number of new texts emerge. This may well be identified as a ‘classical’ procedure of interliterary communication: that existing texts simply produce

This essay is based on a lecture delivered in a preliminary version at the University of Vienna on 10 Jan 2012, in the framework of the lecture series »Literarisierung von Kindheit und Jugend im transkulturellen Kontext«, organized by Professors Wynfrid Kriegleder and Ernst Seibert, Österreichische Gesellschaft für Kinder- und Jugendliteratur-Forschung, then reworked and expanded for the Mandel Lecture, delivered in Jerusalem, 12 Mar 2014. Further research has been made possible thanks to a Visiting Professorship at the Mandel School of Advanced Studies in the Humanities, and to the Research Project on »Translation Activities in China Since 1948: An Inquiry into the Sociology of Foreign Language Teaching and Literary Translation« (2012-14) at the Truman Institute, both Hebrew University of Jerusalem. I am also gratefully acknowledging support from Gong Mingde and Tao Xia (Sichuan Normal University, Chengdu) who again generously granted me access to their breathtakingly rich collection of banben (‘distinct editions’), surprisingly even in different translations of Cuore by Edmondo de Amicis.

Despite a considerable number of studies on Chinese children’s literature, none of these studies pays serious attention to the issues discussed below, namely Jean-Pierre Diény, Le Monde est à vous: la Chine et les livres pour enfants (Paris: Gallimard, 1971); Heike Frick, Rettet die Kinder! Kinderliteratur und kulturelle Erneuerung in China, 1902–1946 [Save the Children! Children’s Literature and Cultural Renewal in China] (Münster [etc.]: Lit, 2002); Fang Weiping, Western Anthropological Thought and Modern Children’s Literature Theory in China: The Case of Chou Ts’o-ÁE-ÁE [Zhou Zuoren] (History of Education and Children’s Literature 3,1 (2008), 141–153; which is also true for Linda Pratt and Janice J. Beaty, Transcultural Children’s Literature (Upper Saddle River, NJ: Merrill, 1999), despite the contrary claims of the book’s title. The definitely most-cited cited work in the field, Mary Ann Farquhar, Children’s Literature in China. From Lu Xun to Mao Zedong (Armonk, NY: Sharpe, 1999), devotes two sub-chapters to translations (43–52), it does even mention indirect translation,
new and distinctly different text, known in theory as 'rhizome', i.e. the rootstock of a plant in botany.

The works I have selected are not only landmarks of Chinese children's literature—I am deliberately labelling their renderings as 'Chinese literature'—, but of literature for children all over the world. If you do not know the first work, you have for sure heard about it. It is Der Schweizerische Robinson oder Schiffbrüchige Schweizerprediger und seine Familie: Ein lehrreiches Werk für Kinder und Kinderfreunde (The Swiss Robinson or the Shipwrecked Swiss Minister and His Family: An Instructive Work for Children and Children's Friends; 1812–27) by Johann David Wyss (1743–1818) with not only an almost baroque title, but an even more 'baroque' reception history, although it is deeply rooted in enlightenment ideas. The second work is Cuore (Heart; 1886) by Edmondo de Amicis (1846–1908) and has not been very lively received after World War I in Western and Central Europe. This is definitely not true for the third work you certainly know at least in its cinema version, that is Harry Potter (1997–2007) by Joanne Rowling (b1965), as it has been launched universally in an unprecedented globalized PR effort.

1 Background

In China, texts for children have been written since roughly 1,000 years. The most prominent among them are first the Sanzijing (Book of Three Characters) from the 12th c. This book has not received its name because it were just consisting of 'three characters', but for the structure built of more than 500 syntagms, each consisting of just three characters, i.e. simple phrases considered easily understandable for children. Topic-wise, the work may be divided into 6 (sometimes 12) chapters that elaborate basic knowledge of China's then official self-perception, and on the one hand rests on historical knowledge, and on the other on the ethical code of Confucianism including its mostly hierarchical codified norms. It had a number of adaptations and rewritings, among them the Book of Three Characters for Girls, or for Women (Nü sanzijing, 1905) when these norms became systematically questioned, while at the same schooling for girls was about to be established systematically, and a New Book of Three Characters (Xin sanzijing, 1986) when after the Cultural Revolution China set out for its course of large-scale economic construction.

The next work are the Hundred Family Names (Baijia xing, 10th c.), actually a list of 411 to 504 names (according to edition), covering far over 90 per
cent of all existing Chinese family names. These names are accompanied by short biographies of famous persons of the respective names, including information about local and regional distribution. Thus it represents a condensed lesson in history—according to a pattern «family A is originally from B province, the family member named C had such and such office and is important for such and such achievement». The third work is on a more demanding level in matters of style: The Qianzi wen 千字文 (Thousand-Character Text; 6th c.) proposes a model text in composition in which none of the exactly 999 characters is appearing twice.

These three works form a little canon with the functions of primer, textbook, manual for social behaviour, introduction to history, norm of style, intended for the very small group of male children (never more than 2 per cent of the population in imperial times) having the privilege to learn reading and writing, and thus may be addressed as children’s literature, not least because they systematically integrated anecdotal and other narrative elements. Together, they had such a high circulation that they became soon known as ‘three-hundred-thousand’ (San-bai-qian 三千) — this not being a figure, meaning ‘300,000’, but a collective name formed of the first character from each, in a sequence with clearly didactic motivation, i.e. ‘easiest first’. Needless to say that these ‘three-hundred-thousand’ have seen numerous illustrated editions since Ming times.

Outside this established canon, there is also the Book of Filial Piety (Xiaojing 孝經, ca 1st BCE), written much earlier than the abovementioned works and not strictly addressed to children, though of course its main topic imposed itself to be processed in children’s reading material. Here a number of narratives about model behaviour conforming to the rules of xiao are given, with partly drastic examples: If his parents are suffering from hunger, a son adhering to filial piety is expected to cut out a piece of meat from his thighs to prevent his parents from starvation. This is among the stories by which Chinese children have been fed over centuries, such that quite early criticism of such reading material was raised. The Xiaojing underwent a great number of commented and illustrated editions, at times almost sadistically elaborating the consequences of such ‘filial’ behaviour. Early 20th c. writers’ memoirs, written in a climate of fervent anti-Confucianism, understandably abound in accounts that overtly suggest traumatisation.

The last work that may be attributed to ‘literature for children’ and that I shall mention here are the Riji gushi 日記故事 (Daily Recorded Stories, or Stories in Form of a Diary; 14th c.). Here everyday experiences under respective day-by-day headings are put down—experiences not made by children, but by adults, which also follow a didactic purpose, i.e. ‘a lesson’. The fact it has been
published in an illustrated edition in 1542 has seduced a somehow excessively eager scholar to label it as the very first illustrated children’s book in the world, i.e. far before the Latin primer Orbis sensualium pictus (The Visible World in Pictures; 1658) by Comenius, or Jan Amos Komenský (1592–1670), generally considered the first of its kind in the West.° Such a claim is at least questionable, given that the Riji gushi did by no means reach the didactic sophistication of Comenius’ work, and was not at all specifically addressed to children. Yet it should be noted that the pattern of calling for a regular and formalized account of an individual’s daily actions is very close to what is instituted in the Catholic ‘confession’, and what has finally become internalized in Protestantism.

From the beforementioned it is clear that there are two classes of works that may be adressed as children’s literature, as far as the Imperial period until the late 19th c. is concerned: on the one hand those oriented towards language didactics, i.e. with the intention to convey writing skills for persons who already master the necessary language to a certain degree; on the other, we find work intent to elaborate on the traditional Confucian code of social behaviour—ideas that may be labelled the ideological basis of imperial China for then roughly two millenia (and possibly, in varying disguise, still of some importance today, seen that Confucius Institutes are established across the world).

Persons in China who have ever had the opportunity to see, and even to read one the abovementioned works, presented a very tiny minority of the Chinese population. Until the mid-19th c., the literacy rate was neatly below 2 per cent, before it rised towards 5 to 10 per cent—but just in certain urban areas of Southern China, mainly of the provinces of Jiangsu, Zhejiang, Fujian, and Guangdong. Of course, narratives with their didactic aim drawn from canonical writings also entered oral traditions, and from them re-entered works elaborated in written form, as they had entered namely the Xiaojing and the Baijia xing. This process including all three intermediary steps (canonical text—oral tradition—elaborated narrative text) can be identified as early as the 2nd–3rd c. of our era.

Some words about the Chinese terminology related to children’s literature are in place here: There is modern Chinese equivalent to ‘(fairy) tales’, tonghua, i.e. literally an ‘orally transmitted’ tale for children'. However, tales about supernatural or phantastic characters and events have existed since earliest written tradition. Plethora of such stories have been written ever since Tang times and have acquired various labels, such as chuanqi 傳奇 (‘transmission of the extraordinary’) or zhiyi 志異 (‘record of the unusual’) which in turn later were termed tonghua, simply for their content. This term covers a broader semantic

field than the technical terms coined only when texts written specifically for children began to attract critical attention in China, namely *ertong wenxue* 兒童文學 (‘children’s literature’) and *ertong de wenxue* 兒童的文學 (‘literature written for children’).

When in the late 19th century reform efforts in China could have resulted in a constitutional monarchy and these efforts failed, intellectuals started to concentrate their efforts on general education and the promotion of (Western) scientific knowledge on a broader scale. Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873–1929), in his famous article *On the Connection Between Narrative Literature and Rule by the Masses* (1902), believed that science fiction was the ideal tool for this purpose, and that it would finally lead to some sort of ‘democracy’. His own science fiction novel, however, as well as a number of other works written in the same vein, remained uncompleted. One of the pioneers in the field of related children’s literature was the educator Xu Nianci 徐念慈 (1875–1908), teacher in various reform-oriented schools, among them the famous Patriotic School for Girls (Aiguo nüxiao 愛國女校), who in the journal *Forest of Tales* (Xiaoshuo lin 小說林, 1907–08) made a fervent plea for translating and editing, i.e. sincizing foreign literature especially written for children, «in order to arouse their interest, to foster their intelligence and to form their character». He himself translated several novels which I have unfortunately not seen, so that his own mode of ‘sincization’ remains unclear.

The most influential theorist of literature for children who made his appearance after the May Fourth movement of 1919, when the whole set of traditional literary values was more systematically questioned. It is Zhou Zuoren (1885–1967) who may be labelled the grandfather of comparative literature and was himself a very prolific translator and influential essayist. His definition as «literature read in elementary schools» highlights the intimate connection with concerns about establishing curricula, and articulates the following principles: (1) meeting children’s needs, because (2) the world of children is different from the adult world, and (3) children experience a development with specific needs

5 Donghai Juewo 東海覺我 [i.e. Xu Nianci], «Xiaoshuo lin yuanqi 小說林緣起 [On the Original Motivations to Publish (the journal) Forest of Tales], Xiaoshuo lin no 1 (Mar 1907).
cognitive abilities in every stage. Zhou Zuoren’s most important source was *Childhood in Literature and Art. With Some Observations on Literature for Children* (1894) by Horace E. Scudder (1838–1902) who in turn is one of the founding fathers of studies in literature for children. It is not surprising that Zhou Zuoren also coined the term *ertong de wenxue*, emphasizing by the attributive particle the distinct world of children. In his seminal article, he writes:

> Because babies are not able to take solid food, they are breast-fed; because they not able to walk, they are carried—this is generally known. With intellectual abilities, it is similar. There are no children who are not delighted to hear stories. Children consider it most natural that flowers and trees are capable to think, and cats and dogs are capable to speak. If we criticize children explaining them, flowers and trees were plants and cats and dogs animals who cannot think nor speak, it is of no use to them, but is on the contrary harmful, because it destroys their world. ⁶

The idea that the world of children may claim autonomy, i.e. that it is existing in its own right and was not just a stage leading to adulthood, and that scientific concepts may not interfere in children’s imagination, was quite in contrast the dominant *zeitgeist* of that period: Scientific and technical knowledge was on the contrary believed to provide a tool to overthrow traditional ideas, including the Confucian social code; and education designed to convey the tools to acquire such knowledge. Only two years earlier, in an emblematic article on *Humane Literature* (or Literature for Humans), ⁷ Zhou Zuoren had summarily condemned all traditional stories with ghosts and fairies and supernatural events as ‘inhuman’ (*feiren de*) and irrational. In his this respect had made a turn by 180 degrees. With his essay on Literature for Children, Zhou Zuoren was the first in China to attempt at defining age-groups of children and the requirements for reading material adapted to them. His arguments were not only drawn from developmental psychology, but also from evolution theory, applied to the development of literature: The most appropriate reading for children were those texts standing at the beginning of written tradition in all literatures.

A successor to Zhou Zuoren, the critic and literary historian Zhao Jingshen (1902–1985), has devoted longer standing attention to children’s literature and collected several of his essays in a volume published in 1927. He employs the term *tonghua*, rather than *ertong de wenxue*, which seems to indicate a concen-

---


tration on existing literary heritage, yet explicitly takes into consideration the technique of ‘rewriting’ which will be of particular interest in my following considerations. Furthermore, he introduces a classification including specific aims that are best reached by particular genres. In her summarizing account about *Children’s Literature in China*, Mary Ann Farquhar has tried to present his views in the following chart:

**Figure 3.3 Educational Fairytales for Children: Zhao Jingshen**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Fairytales</th>
<th>Folk Literature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Goblins and witches</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monks and demons</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairies and giants</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princes and criminals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Talking plants and animals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends, polished and rewritten</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories in fairytale form</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legends with a super-imposed morality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Let me jump from China to Vienna: This where Hermynia Zur Mühlen (1883–1951) was born, daughter to a diplomat and brought up in Constantinople, Lisbon, Milan, and Algier, became known in Weimar Germany as the ‘Red Countess’, escaped to Vienna in 1933, then after the Nazi invasion in 1938 to Bratislava, and finally in 1939 to Britain. She had earned her nickname only for her journalism, but also for her many literary fairy tales conveying a very distinct social class consciousness. She made her *entrée* in 1921 with *Was Peterchens Freunde erzählen* (What Little Peter’s Friends Are Telling), illustrated by George Grosz.
(1893–1959). This was probably the most prominent reason why it caught Lu Xun’s 魯迅 (1881–1936) attention, and why the book was subsequently translated into Chinese by his partner Xu Guangping 許廣平 (1898–1968) from the Japanese version by Hayashi Fusao 林房雄 (1903–1979).\(^8\)

Plate 2

Cover of *Hermynia Zur Mühlen*, Xiao Bide 小彼得 [Little Peter], *tr. by Xu Xia* 許霞 [Xu Guangping], *Designed by Lu Xun* (1929).

---

\(^8\) In all evidence, this was the very first translation, followed by Esperanto (1928), French (1934), and Czech (1947).
The following passage may illustrate the combination of the technique of letting unanimate objects speak with distinct social criticism, and why the book was considered an ideal representative of littérature engagée for children:

The bedcover sighed so deeply that blow of wind went across the room, and responded:

«The blue and red flowers on green background [on the bedcover itself] are murderers, and have destroyed the health of many many humans. In a huge hall, a great number of men and women are working. That is where the colours are produced which make up my beauty. I do not want to explain the whole process, and not even be capable. How would be able to describe precisely one’s own birth, when when still half-dizzily opening one’s eyes for the first time? I just remember that strong, putrid and foul-smelling vapours were rising.»

«Vapours of aniline», mumbled one of the charcoals that kept quiet since many days.

The bedcover nodded, pleased to find somebody who about her.

[...] Now they all began to talk at the same time. The loudest among them was the tiniest piece of charcoal, with a peeping voice: «I know a way out! I know a way out! The factory owners have to be compelled to work for months in the same halls where they imprison their workers.»

---

Plate 3

Illustration by George Grosz in Hermynia Zur Mühlen, Was Peterchens Freunde erzählen (1921).

This translation is a prominent example for how multiply motivated selecting and translating reading material adapted to children could—but of course the earlier. At the same time, said aside, it is also a fine example for the literary cooperation of a couple: The translation work was undertaken in order to improve Xu Guangping’s level of Japanese, while her partner, the already established writer Lu Xun edited her translation on the basis of the German original. Moreover, she was translating while pregnant with Zhou Haiying (1929–2011).

2 The Swiss Robinson

This book is among the earliest and most successful examples of children’s literature translated into Chinese. It is, evidently, among the many ’Robin-soniades’ produced all over the world since the publication of Robinson Crusoe (1719) by Daniel Defoe (ca 1660–1731) almost three centuries ago. It has itself a fairly twisted genesis: Originally, it was just put down in handwriting by the
Municipal Minister in Berne, Johann David Wyss (1743-1818) in order to be told orally to his four children, with no intention to be ever published. Only his Johann Rudolf (1782-1830) edited the manuscript and brought it out in three parts, 1812-27. What his father had actually done is nothing else than a procedure similar to what Xu Nianci had proposed in the early 20th century for a future Chinese children’s literature: Rather than to ‘sinicize’ an existing text, he so-to-say ‘helveticized’ Robinson Crusoe by retaining certain core elements of the narrative (shipwreck—deserted island—need to survive and know the new environment), supplementing them, however, with a constellation that obviously reflected his own family situation, and with ‘useful instruction’ on the then emerging sciences, then called ‘natural history’—precisely a combination that could be deemed very useful to Chinese needs around 1900. Should be noted that the scribblings of father Wyss were put down 1794-98, i.e. they came to an end precisely in the year when French armies invaded Switzerland and established the Helvetic Republic.\(^\text{10}\)

The book became very soon a bestseller all over Europe, with an earliest English translation already in 1814 that rendered the long title as *The Family Robinson Crusoe. Or, Journal of a Father Shipwrecked, with his Wife and Children, on an Uninhabited Island* (remarkably printed for M. J. Godwin, at the Juvenile Library).\(^\text{11}\) But more importantly, ever since the first French translator Isabelle de Montolieu (1751-1832) immediately wrote a continuation and a certain «M. de Barins» in 1862 produced an abridged French version, countless adaptations and retellings have been produced, from which I only count some in English, just to illustrate the book became both a best- and a long-seller. «Retold for young children» (1914), «adapted for children aged 8 to 9 years» (1930), «adapted and abridge» (Felix Sutton, 1960), «new version» (Joan Marlow Todd, 1978), up to «retold» (Martin Powell, 2009). A film version by Walt Disney (1960) is not.


\(^{11}\) The apparently earliest full English version was *The Swiss Family Robinson. Or, Adventures of a Father and Mother and Four Sons in a Desert Island. The Genuine Progress of the Story Forming a Clear Illustration of the First Principles of Natural History, and Many Branches of Science which most Immediately Apply to the Business of Life, with Explanatory Notes, and Twelve Cuts from New Designs, and a Map of the island* (1843).—Until the mid 19th c., most English translations remained anonymous, unlike the French.
missing, while there is also at least one parody, Not the Swiss Family Robinson (Fiona Robinson, 1991). Such descendency from a single text alone, ranging from a considerable number of translations to media change, would amply justify to see a full-fledged case of a ‘rhizome’, as proclaimed in the theory of interliterariness. Yet in addition, recent research has brought up that also Daniel Defoe’s work, some time considered ‘original’, is based on a much greater range and number of sources than were previously considered.¹²

This is where the Chinese reception of The Swiss Robinson is setting in, with the earliest Chinese version published in 1905 (4th edition 1913), under the title 小仙源 (Little Well of Immortals, or Little Paradise), translated anonymously, but published in the prestigious Commercial Press of Shanghai. Even the breathtakingly prolific translator Lin Shu 林纾 (1852–1924) to whom more than works translated from a variety of languages may be attributed,¹³ saw compelled to contribute a Swiss Robinson translation, prepared with the help of Chen Jialing 陈家麟 (1905–1932) and published under the title Notes from the Sparrows’ Nest (Zhanchao ji 鶯巢記, 4 vols., 1920), though the apogee of his activities was definitely over, and after the May Fourth movement he had become a best-hated advocate of the classical language as a literary medium. Most likely, this translation was on The Swiss Family Robinson. An Account of the Adventures of Swiss Pastor and His Family on an Uninhabited Island (tr. by Henry Frith, 1878).

To make complex things short, I just give a list of selected translations that followed:

- Ruishi Lubinsun jiating piaoliu ji 瑞士魯濱孫家庭漂流記 (Notes from the Adventures of Swiss Robinson Family Floating Around; 4 vols., 1933), tr. by Peng Zhaoliang 彭兆良
- Ruishi Lubinsun jiating piaoliu ji (s.a. [ca 1936]), tr. by Shen Yizhi 沈逸之
- Xin Lubinsun piaoliu ji 新魯濱孫漂流記 (Notes from the Adventures of a New Robinson; 1989), tr. by Huang Jun 黃竣
- Ruishi jiating Lubinsun 瑞士家庭魯濱孫 (The Swiss Robinson; 1999—from The Swiss Family Robinson, retold by Michael Philipp West and D. K. Swan; 1962), tr. by Wei Haiwen 衛海文

¹² Though put into fictionalized mode, the work of Tim Severin, In Search of Robinson Crusoe (New York: Basis Books, 2002), is highly revealing in this respect, as it is in turn based on Takahashi Daisuke’s 高橋大輔 work of the same title (Tōkyō: Shinchōsha, 1999).

• **Ruishiren Lubinsun** 瑞士人魯賓孫 (Swiss People as Robinson; 2000— from abridged version by John Kennett; 1997), tr. by Wang Qiuhai 王秋海

• **Haijiao yi leyuan** 海角一樂園 (A Paradise on the Beach; 2005), partial tr. by Tang Jieyi 唐潔儀

• **Ruishiren de Lubinsun gushi** 瑞士人的魯賓孫故事 (A Robinsoniad of Swiss People; based on abridged version by Madeline du Vivier, 2006)

• **Haijiao yi leyuan** (A Paradise on the Beach; based on West and Swan, bilingual edition English-Chinese, 2007), tr. by Gao Jianwu 高劍範

This is just a tiny selection from titles that have been published over last 80 years or so. A request in the catalogue of the National Library of China has resulted in almost 200 findings with the keywords ‘Swiss’ or ‘Switzerland’ and ‘Robinson’, and in nearly 500 with ‘Robinson’. The items selected above are chosen according to the relevance previous rewritings are playing as models of the publications in Chinese; in all likelihood, until the present day no translation or adaptation has been prepared from the original language of the work (German), but they were all produced from English or from French.

A glance at two cover pages from the 1930s and from the first decade of the 21st century may be further revealing: In 1933 (Plate 4), a very detailed design implying a sequence of potential effects of reading may be noticed. It is evidently ‘gendered’, as the ideal displayed is presented as the possible outcome of the book. On the left-hand side, we see a girl reading a book, and subsequently engaged in various activities (apparently connoted positively), i.e. painting on a canvas, hunting for a butterfly (for scientific purposes? we may ask), running, and finally writing. On the right-hand side, a boy is seemingly using his kit for chemical experiments. Strangely, it is not a boy, but visibly a girl that is watering a plant, while the next to pictures seem to represent some sort physical exercise—but in the end, the result (or the conclusion) is again put down in writing. The topside prominent images represent a well-equipped library on the left, and a girl reading on the right. Should be noted that the text is ostensibly qualified as reading material, and moreover for students of elementary schools, by being published in a series »Xiaoxuesheng wenku« 小學生文庫 (Library of Elementary Students). In other words: reading a books result in writing in general; and in (artistic) painting on the one hand, and sports or the wording of scientific findings on the other.

However imitative it may appear, the girl reading a book in a fairly seductive (or seduced?) position is still the most important emblematic element in the cover: reading appears as most prominent.
More than seventy years later, the situation has obviously changed a lot (Plate 5): the reading process as such has totally disappeared, and what is displayed in effigy are the markers of an exotic life at least, and of an adventure holiday experience at most. Nonetheless should be recorded that the text and its basic plot, as well as (prominently) its title have survived.

The great number of adaptations in which reference to any ‘original’ is not only missing, but apparently obsolete, demonstrates well to which extent not a particular text, but rather a set of motives of narratively basic patterns had become generally available—without any need their original source may be mentioned, or in any other mode of importance at all.

3 Edmondo de Amicis, Cuore (1886), Chinese in 1909/10

The book Cuore. Libro per i ragazzi (1886) by the former high army officer, educator and travelogue writer Edmondo de Amicis (1846–1908) has a mentally
and geographically very different origin: We are in the first decades after the Italian *risorgimento* with its concerns about all issues of nation-building. As a consequence, most of his narrative texts are situated in the core institutions of the modern nation-state: the school and the army, while his travelogues mostly explore the countries of the Mediterranean, once the sphere of Italian colonial ambitions. *Cuore*, the irregular diary of a boy during his 4th grade in elementary school, became an extremely successful book first across Europe and later all over the world. Within years upon publication it was translated into well a dozen languages:

- *Coraçaõ. Livro para rapazes* (Portuguese, 1887)
- *Serce: ksiąžka dla młodzieży* (Polish, 1887)
- *Cuore. An Italian Schoolboys Journal: A Book for Boys*, tr. by Isabel Florence Hapgood (1887)
- *Cuore*, Alfred Güth (German, 1888)
- *Herz. Ein Buch für die Knaben*, Johann Adolph Herzog (German, 1889)
- *Sirt: asbakerti lisbatakarænê*, P’illipps Vardane (Armenian, from French, 1889)
- *Dnevnik škol’nika*, V. Krestovskiy (Russian, 1889)
- *Srce: kniha pro mládež*, Václav Marek (Czech, 1889)
- *Jongens-Leven. Een boek voor ouders an kinderen* (Dutch, ca 1890)
- *Srce, Janja Miklovčič* (Slovene, 1891)
- *Zapiski škol’nika* (Russian, 1892)
- *Kausakoulu-opettajan nuoruudenvaibet* (Finnish, 1892)
- *Du cœur!, Gérard Du Puy* (French, 1892)
- *Cuore. Livre de lecture pour toutes les écoles*, Adrienne Pazzi (French, 1892)
- *Heart. A Book for Boys*, Georgine Sarah Godkin (1895)
- *The Heart of a Boy. A Story*, G. Mantellini (1895)
- *Gakudō nisshibi: kyōiku sōsetsu* 學童日誌：教育小說 [Diary of a Pupil: An Educational Novel], Sugitani Daisui 杉谷代水 and Tsubouchi Shōyō 坪内逍遙 (1902)
- *A magyar szir. Csupaki Pali levelei nénjébe, Mártához* [The Hungarian Heart. Letters of Csopak Pál to his Older Sister Marta], János Sziklay (1903)
- *Corazón: diario de un niño*, Giner de los Ríos (1907)
- *Cuore (imma de copil)* (Romanian, ca 1910)
- *Srce, S. Kalik* (Serbian, 1910)
- *Serce, Maria and Borys Hrinchenko* (Ukrainian, 1911)
- *Kuore, Nagura Jirō 奈倉次郎 and Sawamura Torajirō 澤村寅二郎* (1915)
There are, needless to say, also a number of translations into Hebrew, the earliest one by Ya'akov Helman and Aharon Shemi (Halev), first published in 1900 and reprinted dozens of times, at least up to 1966, and another six different versions I managed to identify, the most recent is from 1994 (Ya'el Ron Lerer), with even a stage adaptation from 1998 (Simonah Larom and Ilan Shainfeld). A Yiddish version «adapted for schools» was published in Warsaw in 1927 (Dos Harts, Shloyme Sheynberg).

Even a brief glance at this list reveals several things: (1) translators seem not certain about the gender of i ragazzi which can be the plural including both ragazzine and ragazzi, so that sometimes they are becoming 'children', sometimes 'boys' (which of course true for the diarist himself); (2) already the various subtitles in the translations hint to adaptations, and in several cases they are explicitly mentioned (such as «adapted for schools» or «abridged» etc.), i.e. to the supposed cultural needs of the audience, up to the outright transposition to Hungary and the transfer from the diary to the letter genre; (3) it is unlikely that all translations have been prepared from the original Italian, given the late 19th century's spread of skills in that language; and finally (4) knowledge about the book's title seems to have been so common for some time that a number of translators just kept Cuore (French, German, Japanese, Korean, Vietnamese) in Italian.

Under almost every one of these aspects, the first Chinese version inscribes itself into these general trends. There are translations of Cuore into 43 languages. The earliest among East Asian translations was into Japanese, in 1902, based on Hapgood's English of 1887. The Japanese translation in turn became the source for the Chinese adaptation by the prolific author of popular stories, Bao Tianxiao. This text that may well be considered an adapta-

---

14 The qualification as ‘full translation’ in Gakudō mikki zen’yaoku 學童日記全譯 by Ishii Shinpo 石井新保 (1924) suggests that earlier translations have been abridged.

15 In her dissertation, 'Wan Qing ertong wenxue fanyi yu Zhongguo ertong wenxue zhi dansheng' 翻譯|譯|譯|譯(Translation of Children's Literature in the Late Qing Period and the Birth of Chinese Children’s Literature) (Ph.D. thesis Shanghai, Fudan University, 2005), 61 and 123n88, however, Zhang Jianqing 張建青 claims that in 1901 Bao...
tion under the title *Xin’er jixue ji* (Notes of Xin’er About his Learning Experience) was first published in 12 installments, in the influential fortnightly journal *Jiaoyu zazhi* (Educational Review) of the Commercial Press from February 1909 to February the following year, before it appeared in a book version that same year.\(^{16}\)

Some remarks about the organization of *Cuore* are in place: It has a striking parallel to the Daily Recorded Stories from Ming dynasty mentioned before. *Cuore* is the diary of an elementary school pupil, grouped under monthly headings with irregular entries of varying length. Their main contents are his experiences at school. One of the aims of *Cuore* was to strengthen the sense of cohesion among the various Italian regions that had come under a single political roof shortly before. Elementary school is depicted as the place where different social classes meet, and where social difference is transcended by the means of a shared learning experience. There are, for instance, good children from wealthy families who generously make presents to the less privileged. The whole work is a typical example for the ideology of ‘nation building’ in the process of which the society finally converged in the full-fledged nation-state.

What Bao Tianxiao did in his version was in fact following the idea of his colleague Xu Nianci when he accommodated the text to Chinese needs. The most obvious operation in this respect is that the protagonist Enrico acquires a typically Chinese name, that is »Xin’er«, meaning ‘a son of good smell’, with the

Tianxiao had already completed a translation of the whole ‘monthly story’ »Dagli Appenini alle Ande (racconto mensile)« from the May section of Enrico’s diary, reportedly even from Italian (though *yi zi Yidaliwen* 聽自義大利文 may simply indicate the original source, not necessarily meaning ‘translated directly’), published as *Sanqian li xunqin ji* in Search of a Family Member (1903), with modified title *Ertong xiushen zhi ganqing* 兒童修身之感情 (A Child’s Feelings While in Moral Self-Cultivation) (1905; last known edition 1922).

The National Library of China has not yet noticed that the book *Xin’er jixue ji* is not an independent work solely written by Bao Tianxiao. However, as early as in 2000, Gong Mingde 龔明德 has contributed a detailed study not only on the liberties Bao Tianxiao has taken, but also on the various competing translations of *Cuore*, including their respectively different context and linguistic specificities, in his »"Ai de jiaoyu" zai Zhongguo« [The Education to Love in China], in his *Zuori shuxiang* 昨日書香 [The Smell of Books from Past Days] (Nanjing: Dongnan daxue chubanshe, 2002), 3–20. Moreover, a Taiwanese scholar has devoted an extensive study to the topic of Bao Tianxiao’s adaptation, yet without noticing Gong Mingde’s preceding and even more comprehensive perspective: Chen Hongshu 陳宏殊, »Yizhe de caozong: cong "Cuore" dao "Xin’er jixue ji"« 譯者的操縱：從 *Cuore* 到《馨兒就學記》, *Bianyi luncong* 編譯論叢 3.1 (Mar 2010), 41–68.
poetic *xin* frequently used in the sense of ‘well-educated’, ‘learned’, also ‘polite’ in present usage.\(^{17}\) If the father of Xin’er *alias* Enrico is passing away during the period of the record, it has not been designed that way by De Amicis, but was invented by Bao Tianxiao, in order to provide an example of filial piety—so to say a *Xiaojing* (Book of Filial Piety) in Italian guise. In this case, Xin’er expresses his piety by producing a text of mourning, interestingly enough of exactly 1.000 characters, i.e. in turn with a reference to the *Qianzi wen*.\(^{18}\) In his memoirs, Bao Tianxiao, the translator-rewriter of *Cuore* gives the following account:

> I have translated Notes About his Learning Experience by Xin’er from Japanese. At that time, Japanese translators of European novels without any exception ‘Nipponicized’ characters’ names, behaviours, cultural contexts and places. In turn, I ‘Sincized’ everything. A number of passages are fully my own and deal with events in my own family.\(^{19}\)

This early version of *Cuore* provides revealing evidence for the rewriting and transformation of texts in the course of a translatorial process, and Bao Tianxiao’s testimony makes clear that it was fully conscious deliberate.

During the years briefly before the final collapse of the Empire, the vernacular was not yet generally accepted as a medium for literary expression. As a consequence, a great number of texts translated between the 1880s and 1920 needed to be translated again, and be it for a mere linguistic economy to make them fit into the emerging more generalized usage of the vernacular.

The first translator of *Cuore* into vernacular was the linguist and literary critic Xia Mianzun 夏丏尊 (1886–1946) to whom we also owe a number of textbooks and stylistic manuals for modern Chinese. His translation was first published in instalments in the influential journal *Dongfang zazhi* 東方雜誌 (sub-

---

\(^{17}\) According to Gong Mingde, even this detail of naming the protagonist was due to a ‘personal experience’ by Bao Tianxiao, as one of his sons was named «Kexin» 可欽 (*"Ai de jiaoyu" zai Zhongguo*), 6.

\(^{18}\) As his son Kexin passed away before reaching the age of 3 when Bao Tianxiao was half-way in composing *Xin’er jiuxue ji*, the essay of mourning by Xin’er may be read as an inverted projection in which he makes his son prematurely passed away write an essay which is in fact his own mourning (cf. Chen Hongshu, «Yizhe de caozong...», 65n2).

\(^{19}\) Bao Tianxiao, *Chuanyinglou huiyilu* 蜷影樓回憶錄 [Memoirs from the Mansion of the Gleaming Bracelet; 1971/73], quoted from Zhu Shaowei 朱少偉, «Xia Mianzun yiben fengfei quanguo "Ai de jiaoyu" ruhe jinru Zhongguo» 夏丏尊一本風靡全國——《愛的教育》如何進入中國 [Xia Mianzun’s Translation is in Great Fashion All Over the Country. How »Education to Love« Entered into China], *Renmin zhengxie bao* 人民政協報 27 May 2011.
titled »Eastern Miscellany«) in 1923, and in 1926 as a book. He considered his version not just a literary translation from the milieu of schooling he knew well as a teacher, but also an active contribution to promote the establishment of the vernacular register. Had he translated the Italian title *Cuore* literally into Chinese, i.e. *xin* 心 for ‘heart’, it would have been crossly misleading, as it is a core philosophical term denoting ‘mind’.

De Amicis employs *cuore* with a different meaning, namely to emphasize the diarist’s emotional attachment to his family, to his school-mates, to his teachers, and not least to his country, the freshly formed Kingdom of Italy. Xia Mianzun based his translation on English and Japanese versions. In the latter, he could find models similar to his title option *Ai de jiaoyu* 愛的教育 (Education to Love), such as ‘school for loving’ (1912), simply because Japanese shared the same philosophical vocabulary. According to Xia Mianzun, the most prominent elements of *Cuore* are »love among the family; love of teachers for their pupils; friendship among schoolmates; love for one’s country; and finally compassion within society at large«. It is obvious that the nation-state ideology of unified Italy, with the narrative situated in the first Italian capital Turin and tales from the various regions of Italy and about the *Risorgimento* heroes, fitted well into the programme of the recently promulgated Republic that had partly been inspired by getting rid of imperialist and non-Han domination, and at the time struggled with centrifugal tendencies.

This translation by Xia Mianzun was enormously successful and went into 21 editions until 1938. A new edition illustrated by the famous *manhua* artist and essayist Feng Zikai 豐子愷 (1898–1975) in turn saw 20 editions until 1949, and was reprinted over and over again until well into the 21st century.

---

20 *Ai de jiaoyu* 愛的教育 (Shanghai: Kaiming shudian, Mar 1926. Shijie shaonian wenxue congkan 世界少年文學叢刊).

Plate 6

*Illustration by Feng Zikai to Ai de jiaoyu, tr. by Xia Mianzun (1948)*,

*Showing the Diarist’s Father as an Authority Supervising the Writing Process.*
Xia Mianzun’s translation managed to overrule dozens of competitors, also those publishing bilingual English–Chinese versions, and so far even the first translation prepared from Italian and only published in 1998.22

In the first diary entry, school as the place where all classes in society convene is exemplified by the parents accompanying their children on the first day of the new school year:

Signore, signori, donne del popolo, operai, ufficiali, nonne, serve, tutti coi ragazzi per una mano e i libretti di promozione nell’altra, empivan la stanza d’entrare e le scale, facendo un ronzio che pareva d’entrare in un teatro. (»Ottobre: Il primo giorno di scuola«)

Ladies, gentlemen, women of the people, workmen, officials, nuns, servants, all leading boys with one hand, and holding the promotion books in the other, filled the anteroom and the stairs, making such a buzzing, that it seemed as though one were entering a theatre. (»October: First Day of School«, tr. Hapgood, 1887)

22 Ai de jiaoyu, tr. by Wang Ganqing (北京: 人民文学出版社, 1988. 世紀教育叢書). The translator chose to use the established translation title Ai de jiaoyu. Gong Mingde provides plenty of indirect evidence for confirming his claim of direct translation from Italian (»Ai de jiaoyu” zai Zhongguo, 19–20), yet beyond examining the texts, the most convincing evidence probably lies in the translator’s suing several publishers and distributors between 2005 and 2010 for offending his copyrights as translator. At least five of the verdicts are documented in the Peking University Faculty of Law exemplary cases’ archives, namely against (1) Zhongguo funü chubanshe 中國婦女出版社 (7 Dec 2005); (2) Xinlei chubanshe, Beijing shi Xinhua shudian Wangfujing shudian 新蕾出版社・北京市新華書店王府井書店 (09 Sep 2006); (3) Ji jie gongye chubanshe 機械工業出版社 (09 Dec 2008); (4) Zhongguo duiwai fanyi chuban gongsi and Liu Xinwu 中國對外翻譯出版公司・劉心武 (23 June 2009); (5) Zhejiang shaonian ertong chubanshe, Beijing tushu dasha youxian zeren gongsi, and Lü Lina 浙江少年兒童出版社・北京圖書大全有限責任公司・呂麗娜. See the report by Xie Zhengyi 楊正宜, »Ai de jiaoyu“ shanzhaidian hengxing—fanyijia Wang Ganqing fa zhengtao shengming [The Craze of Pirating »Education to Love«—Translator Wang Ganqing Makes a Declaration Provoking Discussions], Xinwen wanbao 新聞晚報 (Shanghai) 27 Feb 2009; as well as the ensuing response from the publishing world, understandably questioning the translator’s claims, namely in »Jiu ge “shanzhaidian” Ai de jiaoyu“ Yizhe Wang Ganqing zhuiju qinquanzhe» 九個“山寨版”《愛的教育》？譯者王幹卿追究侵權者 [Are There Nine Pirated Editions of »Education to Love«? The Translator Wang Ganqing Is Investigating Against Copyright Offenders], Chuban cankao (書刊參考 (業內資訊版) 5/2009.
The listing of all kinds of persons present at the opening for the new school year is clearly intended to stand for a social panorama. This is where the first Chinese translator from Italian made a clear distinction (as clear as Xia Mianzun who obviously found a supportive model in his Japanese version), emphasizing with a more contemporary *guì* (for ‘aristocratic’) as attribute, unlike the presently less known *shenshi*, usually rendered as ‘genry’ for the land-owning class in traditional China. If Wang Ganqing’s successor who also claims to have translated from Italian is missing precisely this point, might it be due to a not sufficiently reflected egalitarian educational background that he did not even make it conceivable that there was a difference between *»signore«/»ladies« and *»donne del popolo«/»women of the people« (‘common women’)? In any case, Xia Mianzun, unlike his successor, seems to have been much aware, as class distinction was part and parcel of his experience. To include ‘military persons’ in the additive term *junguan* (‘military and civil officials’) certainly makes sense in late 19th century Italy. The ‘grandmothers’ (*nonne*), mistranslated by Hapgood as ‘nuns’, is becoming the touchstone to judge the level of Italian in Chu Lei who uses the colloquial terms of address for both genders, yeye and nainai, while Wang Ganqing appropriately uses just *zumu*. Talking about the *libretti di promozione* might appear an excessive dwelving in vocabulary (seen that I am unable to provide evidence about what kind of information was exactly included in those *libretti* in the 1880s), but the different rendings are still of some interest: where Wang Ganqing is cautious and prefers to translate literally, Chu Lei as well as his predecessor Xia Mianzun did not hesitate to simply sinicize it as ‘school report’, though of course the term denotes a document about ‘achievements’.

Different registers in apparently stylistically motivated insertion are obvious in the two contemporary translations: Where Wang Ganqing tends to use four-
character compounds of the *chengyu* 成語 type to adapt the text to Chinese tastes, Chu Lei feels compelled to insert additional elements, apparently in order to make the text ‘smoother’, such as ‘they were looking like’ or ‘they seemed to be’ (here both marked in darker grey)—which are of course both inventions.

I am not going into further details in Xia Mianzun’s translation, as I have not had access to the Japanese translation he was using.
Spoken aside, Umberto Eco (b1932) in his »Elogio di Franti« (in *Diario minimo*, 1963/75) has considered the protagonist of *Cuore*, the diarist Enrico, as a typical representative of dull and respectable Italy, drawing a direct line to Fascism. Eco’s hero, on the other hand, is Franti, Enrico’s mate who is relegated from school and plays the part as the narrative’s villain. In him, he sees the impersonation of any resistance against an existing order, i.e. the born revolutionary.

Not only the successful translation by Xia Mianzun invited plethora of competitors. Also in Italy, a continuation to *Cuore* was produced in order to share in the success. It was an immediate outcome of the spread of findings from developmental psychological if a close friend of De Amicis wrote a sequel: It is *Testa. Libro per i giovinetti* (Head. A Book for Adolescents; 1887, 17th ed. 1890) by Paolo Mantegazza (1831–1910) which is again anchored in the learning environment at school. The protagonist Enrico, diligent pupil now aged 14, is entering college (*liceo*) and suffers a nervous breakdown after having learned day and night, and successfully passed the annual examinations. He is sent to relatives in the south of Italy—a hint to the south-north working migration inside the unequally industrialized country—where he is »learning for on year from the Book of Life«.

This book was also translated by Xia Mianzun, and simply labelled *Xu ai de jiaoyu* (The Education to Love, Continued; 1930), taking up again a very popular literary production mode in Chinese narrative literature as had done before him Bao Tianxiao, i.e. by reference to a preceding work of authority. It was again based on an English translation, prepared very soon (*Testa. A Book for Boys*, tr. by Luigi D. Ventura, 1889).

A statistical survey from 1949 onwards drawn from the National Library of China (Guojia tushuguan 国家图书馆) covering all publications carrying »Ai de jiaoyu« in their title reveals the following picture (according to year of publication):

---

23 At least since the edition of 2011 (Shanghai: Yilin chubanshe. Yilin mingzhu jingxuan 薩林名著精選), one of the numerous new editions since 1926, the two works have been published together as one volume, making disappear altogether that there are two authors of two distinct works with different titles, which demonstrates (1) the efficiency of the translation title, (2) the authority of the translator—only »De Amicis« and »Xia Mianzun« appear together on the cover, while Mantegazza is relegated to the page where the ’continuation’ is beginning.

Several conclusions from these figures are allowed: A centralized Leninist organization of the literary system made the publication ratio drop dramatically and efficiently in disfavour of any nationalist discourse. Only after 1978, with the policies of ‘reform and opening’, such perspectives became permissible again (1980), and were even supposedly employed within minority policies (1983), before in the 1990s reprints and retranslations of Ai de jiaoyu (or Cuore) rushed towards an apogee of the implicit nationalist kitsch towards the end of the first decade of this century. It included a systematic conservation of the past reception history of Ai de jiaoyu, resulting in respective reproductions, and did afterwards just slowly decline in the merely quantitative perspective (which inspires the consideration that the ‘market’ was yet sufficiently provided, so that request for Cuore would be low for some while).

The craze about Cuore in the first decade of this century—to be sure: almost one century after the first and still repeatedly reprinted first translation into Chinese was published—went as far that a scholarly association devoted exclusively to the study of this work was established, the only one in China specialized in work of foreign literature, to my knowledge. Its journal is called True Love is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Translation Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>1 (tr. into Uighur)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>62 (including microforms of historical translations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 The table of all Cuore translations since 1903 provided as an appendix by Zhang Jianqing (Wan Qing ertong wenxue fanyi yu Zhongguo ertong wenxue zhi dansheng, 177–192), lists not less than 127 titles. If the total number differs slightly from the abovementioned table, it is due to the differing perspectives, the above just recording the entries in the catalogue per year, while Zhang Jianqing has the ambition to identify ‘distinct editions’ (banben), in which reprints of the same banben are of course not considered.

26 Jiang Xinjie, Ai de jiaoyu yanjiuhui zouguo 20 nian 愛的教育研究會走過 20 年 (The
Worth Gold (*Zhen'ai shi jin* 真愛是金; 2003ff). It is the period when *Cuore* was also made into a sentimental movie by A Nong (b1934), *Xin ai de jiaoyu* 新愛的教育 (The New Education to Love; Hong Kong, 2000/03). A detailed reading instruction for *Cuore* prepared for elementary schools is evidence that it is widely read.27

It is worth considering why so suddenly, around the year 2000, a freshly awakened interest in an already established 'classic' of foreign children's (and youth's) literature arose. This was by no means limited to the Chinese-speaking world, but also finds its parallels in Japan (and possibly, as a reverberation, also in Korea), namely in a number of new film adaptations.


I am now jumping across more than half a century, well aware that I am skipping the important chapter of the great variety of translations and adaptions and reworkings of children's literature from the countries of the Socialist block which left a weighty imprint in China from selections inspired by Soviet predictions in the late 1920s up to the reception of sophisticated Czechoslovak and Polish children's literature and their illustration until far into the 1980s. Yet I am talking about *Harry Potter*, published in 7 volumes within a decade. Probably no other work so far has enjoyed such an enormous and globally concerted PR effort by the publishing world. It is well known that a great number of pirated editions have been produced, aiming at partake in the effects of the propaganda machine running wildly. The movie versions of *Harry Potter* have of course greatly contributed to the craze.

Under the perspective of translation, the most remarkable phenomenon is that marketing experts have decided to divide the Chinese-speaking world into two different areas: one including Taiwan, Hong Kong and all Oversea's regions, provided with the translation prepared by Peng Qingwen 彭倩文; the other limited to the PRC for which Ma Aixin 马爱新, partly in collaboration with somebody who is looking as if a sister or brother, Ma Ainong 马爱農 (if they are

---

not altogether fictitious), provide the Chinese translation. The craze about *Harry Potter* is, as it convenes to the size of China, richly developed: Dozens of collections of essays about the work have been published, along with more than 30 M.A. theses. There is a considerable number of translations of books and other material by enthusiasts, such dictionaries of characters, glossaries, lists of places of the plot, systematically compiled decodings of symbolic reference, and so forth. A subgroup is formed by publications titled such as Learning English with Harry Potter, or Learning Grammar with Harry Potter.28

One of the outcomes of this craze was that even before volume 5 (*Harry Potter and the Order of Phoenix, 2003*) was written, the fever in China had been driven to such a level by marketing experts that various (anonymous) writers saw a chance in claiming to provide the passionately awaited volume, so that the publisher felt it necessary to sue Chinese authors for supposed plagiarism of false fifth volumes. In fact, all these putative (or, from their authors’ perspective) claimed sequels to the preceding fourth volume were nothing but more or less sophisticated extrapolations—or ‘continuations of…’ (*xu…* 推), as they had existed all along during the history of Chinese narrative literature. Among them most remarkable is *Hali Bote yu Baozoulong* 哈里波特與豹走龍 (*Harry Potter and the Baozou Dragon, i.e. the Dragon who Rushed like a Leopard; 2004*).29 This book was in fact an amalgamation of the character of Harry Potter into *The Hobbit* (1937) by J. R. R. Tolkien (1892–1973).

Parallelizing two passages from *The Hobbit* and the alleged *Harry Potter* plagiarism may illustrate that the publication might have had the potential also to upset Chinese censorship authorities, as they take up core concepts of the political discourse in China, namely of political participation:

---


"We will have King Bard!" the people near at hand shouted in reply. "We have had enough of the old men and the money-counters!" And people further off took up the cry: "Up the Bowman, and down with Moneybags", till the clamour echoed along the shore.

(Tolkien, *The Hobbit*, 233)

"We want new elections!"
"We want an impeachment procedure!"
"We want Bake as our leader!"

People standing around shouted loudly: "What does that mean, leading personalities with a high moral standing? After all, they all corrupt and rotten, we are just fed up with it since long!" From afar, some people shouted: "For Bake! Down with bureaucracy!"

(Hali Bote yu Baozoulong, 160)

This is no doubt directed against the Party rule and its bureaucracy. It is remarkable that the author of *Hali Bote yu Baozoulong* succeeded in court. This is evidence to the fact that any reference of a literary text to another preceding one might be, generally speaking, much more complex than copyright regulations ever may be capable to anticipate. Seeing the potentially upsetting keywords in this plagiarized pseudo *Harry Potter* from China, it is surprising that author did not meet any difficulties with Party officials, but instead with copyright lawyers defending the supposedly inflicted rights of the author.

5 Conclusions

In sum, any rewriting or remake (or any parody, to employ the generic technical term) of an existing literary work is a process far more complex than experts of international copyright issues may fathom.

What is typical for literary reception, particularly so in early phases, is assimilation and adaptation, according to contemporary needs in vigour, and including of course secondary translation. This process is not necessary due to lack of (linguistic) knowledge or consciousness, but deliberate, well conceived and elaborate.

It includes translation from second-hand sources that are not limited to initial phases of interliterary reception, but in vigour until the present day.

‘Amalgamation’, i.e. anything putting together elements from works that may be considered incompatible, or in other words: anything that would be labelled ‘carnevaleseque’ by Bakhtin, is recurrent. Stages after the first recep-
tion—despite positive knowledge about the received literatures—do not preclude crossest distortion, in translation and by other means. This means that the procedures proposed in view of producing children’s literature for China by Xu Nianci back in 1907, i.e. any sort of sinicization, are still and until the present day widely and even extensively applied.

This is implies that the concept of ‘original’ and also of ‘originality’, such as they are laid down in copyright legislation, appear not to be rooted in China in the manner and to the same extent as they are commonly accepted outside the country. However, should be noted that to a great degree this was true outside China as well, as the non-Chinese reception of the *Swiss Robinson* and *Cuore* briefly sketched above convincingly testify. From this, we may conclude rewriting a literary piece in China is not exposed to the same degree to the Western Romanticist craze of ‘originality’, by extension also implying the concept of ‘genius’, as comes also out clearly in the well-respected literary practise of *ningsi* 凝似, established since Han times, that is of ‘imitating’, ‘rewriting’ or ‘writing in the mode of...’. As consequence, processes within the literary system (and for the few cases presented here within children’s literature) are considerably freer and less restricted by rigorous rules as to the attitude towards any heritage than they would be nowadays.

This assessment may provide an explanation why such a great variety of some time even very heterogenous works are repeatedly amalgamated. In correspondence to a concept developed in art history and cultural studies, such textual artefacts may indeed be labelled ‘fakes’, as has been suggested.30 The new entities do include certain elements of one or several models which become freely reprocessed and rearranged, resulting in something with a new identity that does not correspond to the original or the original, that is a ‘fake’—after all nothing else than the technique of *ningsi* of long tradition, with the sole difference that the concept does not operate with categories of ‘true’ and ‘false’, unlike the ‘fake’ which does not shake off the connotation that its counterpart, the ‘original’, is superior, though the good-willing coiners of the term might have intended a rehabilitation, or transvaluation.

After all, the process of reworking goes much farther than just putting together ingredients from various sources. It results in an open literary laboratory, to an extent that would be rarely accepted within other literary traditions with a higher status of originality, and accordingly lesser tolerance towards questioning this status in practice. These procedures are not hidden or concealed, but openly justified, as could be seen in the declaration by Bao Tianxiao,

as well as in the articulation of political criticism in a moderate variation of Tolkien's wording. To put it politely, all conceivable artistic liberties are taken.

Finally, as should come out as a side effect in the presentation of the three works, they may also be seen as typical representatives for three distinct periods in children's literature outside China. The two first examples, *The Swiss Robinson* as a paradigm of Enlightenment literature and *Cuore* as an example of literature intended to contribute to 'nation building', are received in China in roughly the same period, i.e. the 20th century up to the Japanese invasion in 1937. In turn, in their areas of origin, the same two works stand for a process the extended over almost two centuries. This highlights that the Chinese reception of foreign literatures, and not only for children, to be sure, re-enacted European ideas and movements in a sort of fast-motion, including linguistic developments. Italy was the much admired model for the first generation of Chinese reform-minded intellectuals, not only for getting rid of the shackles of foreign domination in the *Risorgimento* of the 1860s, but also for having developed the first full-fledged national language in Europe as a generally accepted literary medium during the Renaissance—two of the most prominent political and cultural goals of that generation.

Such projections into foreign literary writings are multiply refracted in their reworkings into the Chinese language and finally the literary system. These phenomena go along with the 'invention' of children's literature in China, so to say. It is evident that this is connected to modernization processes, heatedly discussed inside and outside China until the present day, namely under the perspective of 'catch-up development'. In this respect, *Cuore* is a particularly speaking example, as its reception in many literatures provides a very faithful image of the state of discourse about 'nation building' in the various linguistic communities. As for the data provided about the *Cuore* reception in China after 1949, it is my firm belief that they reflect quite accurately the degree to which the increase of China's economic and military potential is connected to national and nationalist claims, with a freshly awakened interest in respective patterns of constructing national identity. The translation into Uighur from 1984, deliberately included in the table above, might be considered a last lapse in attempts to integrate ethnic minorities into a greater entity, according to De Amicis' model in which he saw the diversity of Sicilians and Piemontese united in the nation-state institution elementary school, quite in contrast to present Chinese minority policies.
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