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Abstract Zhou Zuoren and Lu Xun intended to include a translation from Mikszáth’s novel into the sequel to Yuwai xiaoshuo ji (Stories from Abroad; 1908–09). Zhou Zuoren’s translation is extant as manuscript, including Lu Xun’s corrections. On the basis of the manuscript, this paper will examine the sources of their knowledge about Mikszáth, Zhou Zuoren’s translation techniques, Lu Xun’s interventions, and their respective specifics.
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1 An Episode From Literary History as Preliminary Remark on Indirect Translation

When the famous Enlightenment period lover Giacomo Casanova (1725–1798) wrote his memoirs Histoire de ma vie (or in its full title, Mémoires de Jean Casanova
de Seingalt, écrits par lui-même, written between 1780 and 1798 and inachieved, while living as a librarian of the Count von Waldstein in Duchcov (Dux, Bohemia), he probably could not imagine that his fragmentary work would ever be published. However, Casanova’s nephew Carlo Angiolini in 1821 sold the manuscript to the Lipsian publisher Friedrich Arnold Brockhaus (1772–1823), father of the prestigious encyclopedia that carries his name (1810–2009). Upon that, Brockhaus appointed the German poet and essayist Wilhelm von Schütz (known as »Schütz-Lacrimas«, i.e. ‘Schütz with Tears’; 1776–1847), an experienced translator of French, to render Casanova’s work into German (12 vols., 1822–28). This version was heavily abridged in its more explicit parts,—not surprisingly, given that the translator converted to Catholicism soon after his work’s completion (and the Holy See put his translation on the *Index Librorum Prohibitorum* in 1834). Moreover, the translator had abandoned cooperation with Brockhaus, leaving volumes 5 to 12 to an anonymous translator not yet identified, but following principles similar to his predecessor with his ‘rewriting-translation’. Despite its flaws, the German translation (prepared from the French original, to be sure) found an overwhelming response in France that resulted in a considerable number of translations into French, because Brockhaus—for understandable business reasons—did not allow access to the French Casanova manuscript. These French back-translations were in turn translated into a number of other European languages, such as English, Italian, Spanish, and others. As a result and from fear of legal persecution for «divulgation of pornography», the publisher Brockhaus appointed the French scholar Jean Laforgue (1782–1852), then professor of French at the Lipsia Academy of Knights (*Ritterakademie*), to produce a purged version on the basis of the manuscript. The result was even more deficient than the German translation, as in addition to sexually explicit portions also passages dealing with religious issues—and they are numerous, indeed—were deleted.

A period of various editions and translations to even more languages followed, both legal and pirated, and with various emphases in their selections, until in the late 1950s an agreement could be reached between the original Brockhaus publishing house and all those namely French publishers interested in such an enterprise. As a result, an accorded and simultaneous ‘complete’ but still purged French and German edition was published,¹ yet the original manuscript,
still in the hands of the heirs of the original German publisher’s, had not actually served as its basis.

Only in 2010, the French National Library bought the original manuscripts from the hands of the heirs of Brockhaus, at the highest price ever paid for a literary manuscript, i.e. ca € 7.4 millions. On this basis, after almost two centuries of public uncertainty about the original text’s shape, a critical edition could be prepared which was swiftly published in France’s most prestigious series of literary texts «La Pléiade».

This complicated case of various secondary translations, and in addition of translations from German back into into French although the original text was written in French, may appear exceptional. In fact, it is fairly normal in the history of translation—though the particular case might display peculiarities due to the not uncontested content of the original work.

Another case of secondary translation, not from the 19th century, but from the earliest years of the 20th century, may demonstrate that the actual motivations for secondary translation have been, at times, very simple and totally

1 Giacomo Girolamo Casanova, Histoire de ma vie. Edition intégrale, 12 vols. (Wiesbaden: Brockhaus, 1960–62); and Geschichte meines Lebens, 6 vols., «erstmals nach der Urfassung ins Deutsche», tr. by Heinz von Sauter (Berlin: Propyläen, 1965).—To be sure, the first Chinese translation as Wo de yisheng 我的一生, tr. by Gao Zhongfu 高中甫 & al. (Beijing: Yanshan chubanshe, 2006), was based on a German, also abridged version.


detached from the literary work’s contents—though it has played a role, as will be shown, but in a totally unexpected domain of British-American publishing houses’ censureship.

2 Background of the Mikszáth Translation

As well known, there was a close literary cooperation between the Zhou brothers Lu Xun 鲁迅 (1881–1936) and Zhou Zuoren 周作人 (1885–1967), until their break-up in 1923. It is also well established that their division of labour usually went along their respective individual language skills, i.e. each party contributed to collective translation enterprises (these were in fact the most frequent projects of cooperation) according to language skills, in other words Japanese from both, English and later on to a certain extent classical Greek from Zhou Zuoren, and German from Lu Xun. The first tangible result of this cooperation are the translations published in the disastrously unsuccessful collection 殯外小説集 (Collected Stories from Abroad; 2 vols., 1909), marked by the auctorial indication »Kuaiji Zhou shi xiongdi zuanyi» (Compiled and Translated by the Zhou Brothers from Shaoxing). Among the total of 16 stories, only three were translated by Lu Xun—from German, and from Russian literature, namely »Lož« (The Lie; translated as »Man« 謠) and »Molčanie« (Silence; translated as »Mo« 默) by Leonid Andreev (1871–1919) and »Četyre dnja« (Four Days; translated as »Si ri« 四日) by Vsevolod Garšin (1855–1888). Moreover, it is testified that Lu Xun translated the poems included in his brother’s translation from English of the story »Lukarnik« by Henryk Sienkiewicz (1846–1916). Otherwise, the brothers’ cooperation is very poorly documented by evidence in the form of manuscripts, or in the form of

5 The pieces were taken from Novellen, tr. by Alexis von Krusenstjerna (Leipzig: Reclam, s.a. [ca 1905]. Universal-Bibliothek; 4480), or from Die Lüge. Ausgewählte Erzählungen, tr. by Nadja Hornstein (Dresden: Kämmerer, 1902), or from the translation by D. Teller, in Aus fremden Zungen 16,1 (1906).—All translations are testified to be either in Lu Xun’s possession or having been read by him; cf. Raoul David Findeisen, Lu Xun (1881–1936). Texte, Chronik, Bilder, Dokumente (Basel; Frankfurt a. M.: Stroemfeld/Nexus, 2001), 735–795.
6 This piece was translated from Die rote Blume und andere Novellen [紅花及其他中篇小說], tr. by B. W. Loewenberg (Leipzig: Reclam, s.a. [ca 1905]. Universal Bibliothek; 4660); cf. note above.
first-hand accounts of those involved—possibly also because they considered
their procedure as not beyond doubt. Only individual translations by each of the
two brothers are extant in manuscript from, and if so, most date after their split
in 1923.

Under this perspective, the translation manuscript of part 1 from Szent Péter
esernyője (1895) by Kálmán Mikszáth prepared by Zhou Zuoren in 1909 and soon
afterwards amended by Lu Xun, is the only extant material witness to the proce-
dures of cooperation among the two brothers.7 Several issues have been clarified
in the critical edition, but others have not been discussed, while others are not
satisfyingly solved. First of all should be clarified that the manuscript is misdated
by Zhou Zuoren who in retrospect believed it was produced in 1910, while in fact
all evidences point to the year of 1909, because otherwise the traces of Lu Xun’s
interventions on his brother’s translation would hardly have appeared.8

The first question that needs to be solved is how the Zhou brothers knew
there is a Hungarian writer Kálmán Mikszáth. Leaving apart the extremely
minute possibility that Japanese literary journals had written about the author or
even given one of his stories in translation during the first years of the 20th
century, it is most likely that the Zhou brother knew about Mikszáth through
the book Hungarian Literature (1898) by Emil Reich (1854–1910), a historian of
Hungarian origin born in Eperjes (present-day Prešov in Slovakia) who spent his
late years in Britain as a respected English essayist. It is from this book, possibly
upon the suggestion of Zhou Zuoren who extensively read in English, that Lu
Xun translated ch. 27 on »Petőfi, the Incarnation of Hungary’s Poetic Genius«.9
In this book, chapter 27 is entitled »Other Great Novelists—Mikszáth«, and
with their interest in contemporary literatures of ‘small and oppressed nations’,
this chapter surely did not escape to the Zhou brothers’ attention. In Reich’s

7 The manuscript is kept by the Shanghai Lu Xun Museum, and is titled by its translator as
'Shen'gai ji gao' 神蓋記稿. It has never been published by the translator, but enjoyed a critical
edition—probably the first of its kind for modern Chinese literature, and under any
circumstances the most elaborate—by Wang Xirong 王錫雍 then writing under his pen-name
Hua Rong 華龍. On the Translation Manuscript of «Notes on a Godly Cover»; 15 Apr 1990, Shanghai Lu Xun yanjiu
no 4 (June 1991), 8–63.
8 Cf. Hua Rong, «Guanyu ‘Shen’gai ji’ yigao» 開於《神蓋記》譯稿 [On the Translation
Manuscript of «Notes on a Godly Cover»; 15 Apr 1990], Shanghai Lu Xun yanjiu 上海魯迅研究
no 4 (June 1991), 59–60.
9 As »Peituanfei shilun« 表窕飛論 [On Petőfi’s Poetry], first published in He’nan 河南 no 7
(Guangxu 光緒 34.7.9; i.e. 5 Aug 1908); cf. Lu Xun yuwen quanjí 魯迅語文全集, 8 vols. (Fuzhou: Fujian jiaoyu chubanshe, 2008; hereafter LXYQ), 1: 15–18.
overview of Hungarian literature, Mikszáth is compared to the American writer Francis Bret Harte (1836–1902) who with his stories situated among Californian gold-miners is considered a founding father of ‘local colour fiction’, just to conclude that Mikszáth is superior:

His short and thoroughly poetic tales from the folk-life of Hungary are in more than one respect superior to those of the American writer. For, to the latter’s sweet conciseness of plan and dialogue, Miszáth adds the charm of naivety. Some of his works have been translated into German, French and English; and the enthusiasm for his art will no doubt spread from Hungary to all other countries where the graces of true simplicity can still be enjoyed.10

Until the present day, no book edition of Mikszáth exists in Japanese, and although Emil Reich did for some time raise some interest in Japan, it was not for his writings about literature, but for his ostensibly social Darwinist essays

10 Emil Reich, Hungarian Literature (London: Jarrold & Sons, 1898), 242.
Success Among Nations (1904), Germany's Swelled Head (1907/14), and Foundations of Modern Europe. 11 Reich's Hungarian Literature therefore is the first possible (second hand) source of knowledge for the Zhou brothers about Miszáth.

However, the catalogue of Lu Xun’s private book collection lists four books with German translations from Mikszáth’s works, but none of them is from Szent Péter esernyője. Although the books are all published before 1901, it is difficult to establish when they were acquired by Lu Xun. They are not listed in a list of books in his possession he compiled in 1904, 12 and as they also do not appear in his diaries' monthly appendixes of incoming books and the diaries are extant only from 5 May 1912 onwards, the books must have come into his hands between these two dates. It is most likely that this happened before August 1909 when he left Japan to return to Shaoxing, and that therefore the following books were bought in Japan:

- Szelistye, das Dorf ohne Männer [Szelistye, the Village Without Males], tr. by Camilla Goldner [1883–1968]. Leipzig: Reclam, s.a. [ca 1900] (Reclam’s Universal-Bibliothek; 4413).
- Der Zauberkaftan [The Magic Caftan], tr. by Viktor Sziklai [?]. Leipzig: Reclam, s.a. [1891] (Reclam’s Universal-Bibliothek; 2790). 13

Note that three out of the four volumes were published in the cheap »Reclam’s Universal-Bibliothek« series—exactly the kind of books that were available in

---

11 Translated respectively as Kokumin kôgyôron 國民工業論, tr. by Miyai Yasukichi 宮井安吉 (Tôkyô: Dai Nihon bunmei kyôkai 大日本文明協會, 1909); Doitsu no kodai môsô 德國的遠大妄想, tr. by Uchida Roan 内田隆安 (Tôkyô: Habunkan, 1919); and Kinsei Yôroppa no kiso 近世ヨーロッパの基礎, tr. by Murata Tsutomu 村田十 (Tôkyô: Dai Nihon bunmei kyôkai 大日本文明協會, 1910).
13 See Lu Xun shouji he cangshu mulu 魯迅手跡和藏書目錄 [List of Manuscripts and Books Stored by Lu Xun], ed. by Lu Xun bowuguan 魯迅博物館 [neibu ziliao 内部資料], 3 vols. (Beijing: Lu Xun bowuguan, 1959), 3.2: 43–44.——As all books do not carry any date of publication (and are accordingly recorded in the List), the years of publication, identified by interpolation on the basis of the series' current numbering by librarians with detective skills, are compiled here from catalogues of several German and Swiss libraries.
Japanese antiquarian book-stores, again according to Zhou Zuoren’s testimony.14 This presents a second (and first hand) source of knowledge about Mikszáth for the Zhou brothers. Though it was not possible to the present writer to consult the copies formerly in Lu Xun’s possession (they are stored in the Beijing Lu Xun Museum) and check whether they carry reading traces—even if so, physical traces may well stem from previous readers, as they were most likely bought as ‘used’ copies. Nonetheless, Lu Xun might have told his brother about the acquisition(s) even though not having read any of them.

In his 1947 memoir of Lu Xun, Zhou Zuoren also reports that he had even found a portrait of Mikszáth to go along with his translation of Szent Péter esernyője, intended to become vol. 3 of Yurawai xiaoshuo ji in a “History of World Literature” by the German “She’er” 興爾,15 in fact the Illustrierte Geschichte der Weltlitteratur (1886, 10th ed. 1899, 11th ed. 1926) by the Swiss scholar Johannes Scherr (1817–1886). Though Mikszáth is mentioned casually in one single sentence, this work presents the third safely testified source of knowledge. Yet it should be taken into consideration that Zhou Zuoren did not read German, and just was on the hunt of a portrait of the author of Szent Péter esernyője, so that its role may not be very prominent.

Plate 2

In sum, there are three different sources for what the Zhou brothers knew about Mikszáth. It is not easy to appreciate the weight of Lu Xun’s first-hand knowledge from German translations against both brothers’ second-hand knowledge from Emil Reich. Yet in any case, Scherr’s *Illustrierte Geschichte der Weltliteratur* has played a minor role, despite its relatively prominent mention in Zhou Zuoren’s memoirs.

It may, in conclusion, also be established safely that Zhou Zuoren used the English translation by B. W. Worswick when in 1909 he set out to render Mikszáth in Chinese—until now the only English version (1900, 3rd US ed. 1901; hereafter abbreviated as »W-GB« and »W-US«), though it was revised in 1962 for a new edition published in Budapest. This is also supported by Zhou Zuoren’s own statement that he borrowed his English translation «the year before last year» to Kang Siqun 康嗣群 (1910–1969),16 the writer who in the early days of the PRC was appointed to prepare a Chinese book version of *Szent Péter esernyője*, that is to retranslate those parts already translated by Zhou Zuoren which will be discussed in detail below. At the time, Zhou Zuoren’s foreign language skills were limited to Japanese and English.

The last issue that remains to be clarified is whether Lu Xun, when revising his brother’s translation, consulted other translations, i.e. one in German, because as a medical student he was compelled to learn German, in addition to Japanese. As he has not left any preserved explicit record about Mikszáth in general and about his amendments on the Zhou Zuoren translation, the only way to solve the question is to examine the body of the translation manuscript. When Lu Xun began revising his brother’s translation, not less than three German translations of *Szent Péter esernyője* were available:

• *Sanct Peter’s Regenschirm. Humoristischer Roman*, tr. by Oscar von Krücken [i.e. Sándor Jásznigi (1861–1925)]. [Berlin–] Charlottenburg: A. Michow, 1898 (Michow-Bücher; 21).


---

16 Zhou Qiming, *Lu Xun de qingnian shidai* [1957], in *Lu Xun huizhila*, 2, 859; cf. Kang Siqun’s statement in *Guanyu zuozhe* 閒於作者 [About the Author], in Kálmán Mikszáth, *Sheng Bide de san* 圣彼得的伞 (Shanghai: Pingmin chubanshe, 1953), ii, according to which he had got hold of the 1900 translation by Worswick two year previously, i.e. in 1951—without, of course, mentioning the traitor Zhou Zuoren’s name.
It may appear striking that so many translations were published within such a short period of time. However, pre-World War’s I Germany was unusually prolific in translation, on the one hand because it had to catch up, and on the other, because asylum granted to a number of separatists and 1848 revolutionaries from the Habsburg empire, then for the expansion, thus having a wide variety of language skills available, mainly from Eastern and Central European languages.

Moreover, it is not unlikely that the translation by Marie Kálmán (who cannot be identified biographically) is just a polished version of the Wechsler version—a successful polishing, to be sure—and that the female translator is nothing but an ironical fiction using the author’s first name as a family name.

Plate 3
Cover Page of Kálmán Translation (1899).
In any instance, if Lu Xun consulted any translation, it is most likely that is this one from the cheap »Reclam’s Universal-Bibliothek series, still in existence to the present day, that flooded the Japanese antiquarian book-market and has had the highest circulation among all German translations of Szent Péter esernyője, until Sophie Boháti-Maringer (1950). As the List of Manuscripts and Books Stored by Lu Xun from 1959 conveys, his knowledge of world literature to a large extent stems from these series. If none of the abovementioned three translation appears in the List, it is no counter-evidence at all, as ever since Lu Xun’s library was transferred from Shanghai to Beijing, many a book (among them foreign books with preference) were informally borrowed and never returned, because this part of his collection did not enjoy much attention.17

The Role of Slovakia in Mikszáth’s Stories
There is a general misunderstanding by the Zhou brothers in their general interest in Hungary, driven mainly by Sándor Petőfi (1823–1849) as the dominant poetic voice of the failed 1848 uprising against Habsburg. In this perspective, Hungary appeared as a ‘small oppressed nation’ under the domination of Austria, yet in fact national movements in Slovakia and Croatia (and to a certain extent in Romania and Dalmatia) considered themselves in turn ‘oppressed’ by Hungary, and rightly so.

The following map displaying the ‘ethnic’ distribution (in fact, according to native tongue) in the Hungarian part of the Habsburg empire shows clearly how complex the situation was. The darker parts in the center, denoting a proportion of more than 70 per cent Hungarians, is roughly equivalent with present-day Hungary, created by the Treaty of Trianon in 1921, while the darker parts in South-East indicate Hungarian majorities on the territory of present-day Romania that have been mostly transferred after 1921. To the South-West (present Slovenia and Croatia), Hungarians present a minority of less than 1 per cent, except for a few urban centers. To the north, in the area then labelled ‘Upper Hungary’ (Hung. »Felvidék« or »Felföld«, Slovak »Horná zem«; originally Hung. »Felső Magyaroszág«, Slovak »Horné Uhorsko«) and roughly equivalent with present-day Slovakia, most areas have a Hungarian population of less than 20 per cent, with the exception of some districts to the North with less than 1 per cent, and areas to the South, with 20 to 40 per cent, mainly along the Danube and in the mining areas. Though the explanations to this map being in Hungarian admittedly presented a certain obstacle, it is still surprising that the Zhou

17 Personal communication of Chen Shuyu 陳淑渝 (Beijing Lu Xun Museum), 24 March 2005.
brothers fell prone to such misunderstandings, because the map is included in precisely the volume *Hungarian Literature* by Reich that Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren both must have had in hands. However, to speak in favour of the Zhou brothers, maps and other enclosures are the foremost prones to be torn out of books, no matter whether bought as antiquarian or borrowed from libraries.

*Plate 4*

*Ethnic* Distribution According to Native Tongue in Habsburg Hungary, Based on Census 1890
(from Reich, *Hungarian Literature*)

Most of the stories by Mikszáth are situated in ‘Upper Hungary’, more precisely in Southern central Slovakia. So is *Szent Péter esernyője*, where a clear center—periphery pattern is multiply elaborated, in correspondence to higher—lower strata of society: Officials are mainly of Hungarian origin, while the poor peasants originate from the mountainous area around Banská Štiavnica (Hung. Selmecbánya). The elite speaks Hungarian, while the lower class speaks Slovak. Hungarians’ income stems from the State or from their rents as landlords, while Slovaks are compelled to migrate to the Pannonian Basin during late summers.
and falls in order to work as harvesters for Hungarian magnates. Last but not least, Slovaks and Croats are Catholics in their great majority—a fact that escaped at least to Lu Xun, as will be discussed below. Should be noted that a flourishing pilgrimage business based on overt relic, that is the title-giving umbrella of St. Peter, is unconceivable in Protestantism, beyond the fact that veneration of individual saints is banned and any veneration reaching beyond God is considered a blasphemy.

Deserves mention that stories by Mikszáth have been translated into Slovak since 1904 and to Czech since 1897.18 Szent Péter esernyője in particular saw two Czech translations and three into Slovak.19 It was also adapted for the screen several times:

- 1917 (Austria-Hungary), dir. by Alexander Korda (1893–1956)
- 1935 (Hungary), Géza von Cziffra (1900–1989)
- As Sankt Peters Regenschirm, 1971 (TV play, Austria, Germany), Helmut Pfandler (b1929).

For the two post-1949 translations to Chinese made of Szent Péter esernyője, translators’ declarations about their sources are of particular interest in view of the perspective of ‘indirect translation’. The already mentioned version by Kang Siqun from 1952 plainly and without adornment gives «Worswick 英譯者» on the copyright page. For the 1982 translation by Zhang Chunfeng and Feng Zhisheng,

---

18 Kouzelný kaftan, [The Fur-Lined Kaftan], tr. by Ludvík Kostolný (Praha: Nák. vl., 1891); Slovenskí rodáci [Slovak Natives], tr. by Gustáv Izák (Turčiansky Sv. Martin: Tlačou Knihtačiaršeho-učastonárskeho spolku, 1904. Románová Bibliotéka; 2.6).
19 1) Dežník svätého Petra, tr. by Gustav Naris Mayerhoffer (Praha: Jos. R. Vilímek, 1908. Vilímková Knihovna; 68); 2) tr. by Ladislav Hradský (Praha: SNKLHU, 1959). 1) Svätého Petrov Dáždnik, tr. by Ján Parička (Ružomberok: Ján Parička, 1921); 2) Dáždnik svätého Petra, tr. by Julius Albrecht (Bratislava: Tatran, 1960); 3) repr. as Dáždnik svätého Petra. Posledný bradný pán a iné, rev. by Alfréd Engelmann (Bratislava: Tatran, 1979. Zlatý fond svetovej literatúry); 4) tr. by Karol Wlachovský & Csaba György Kisz (Bratislava: Marenčín, 2011).—From the mere bibliographical data, it becomes evident, that there is a declared interdependence between 2) and 3), and an obvious interdependence between 3) and 4) because of the translating personnel. This is of course very common in any retranslation of a single text. More interesting is to which extent it is declared, and if not why—which is of some importance in the following paragraphs.

In any instance, the degree of interdependence of various translations may only be established on the basis of the translated texts themselves.
it is becoming more complex. The give three different sources with detailed publication data: 1) the German translation by Sophie Boháti-Maringer (Buda-
est 1967), in fact first published in 1950 in Vienna, and ever since repeatedly reprinted in Germany both East (GDR) and West (FRG), as well as in Budapest; 2) the English Worswick translation (Budapest 1962), in fact revised by István Fekete; and finally 3) an original Hungarian edition, published in 1978. Of course this reflects the material translators had at hand, but it remains (at least from their declaration) totally unclear, which was their major source. The desire to blur this particular dependence (or relationship) is becoming utterly clear in their explanation provided to their very same translation for two closely subsequent editions:

In order to make readers better understand the original work, we have throughout made use of the reworking in the German and English translations. This Chinese version is based on the Hungarian version [...] of 1978, while the German translation of 1967 and the English translation 1962 [... from Hungary] have also been consulted.

The shift in emphasis is remarkable with regard to very same translation. While the 1983 edition had simply given the sources in the abovementioned sequence, with the German 1950 translation ahead which probably reflects the hierarchy of importance, one year later it is insinuated that the translation was prepared from Hungarian. In contrast, in the early 1950s, even the copyright page gave the actual source. It is probably not far-fetched to consider it the shift from a ‘protected’ philological accuracy under planned book-market economy to the Romanticist paradigm of ‘originality’ (and by extension: of reference to the original sources) taking hold in an emerging market economy also for cultural goods.—To be sure, the translators may not be blamed not to have translated directly from Hungarian, given that this language enjoyed a systematic training only from 1954 at Beijing Foreign Studies University, yet they have to be blamed for an increasingly false claim.


The first and foremost importance of the translation manuscript of 1909 lies in the fact that it is the only extant first-hand witness of the Zhou brothers' years-long close cooperation in translation. None of the many cooperations over a period of almost two decades is documented on that genuine and early level; what we have in hands are only the results in print.

The translation MS of Miksáth's *Szent Péter esernyője* written by Zhou Zuoren and amended by Lu Xun consists of eight traditionally bound and folded MS pages (i.e. of 16 pages) of Japanese origin. Given that they were not published, they have been in the possession of the translator, i.e. of Zhou Zuoren, and were donated by him to the Shanghai Lu Xun Museum around 1957. On the cover of the bound pages, we find the inscription of the translation's title «Shen'gai ji» 神蓋記, possibly added when the pages were bound (in other words: when it was clear that the translation would never be completed), but in all instance later than the origin of the translation, i.e. in the early 1920s (or briefly before the donation).

The MS paper carries 15 lines per (half) page and is produced by Kinseidō 金清堂, a stationary shop that has been active since early Meiji 明治 (1870s) times and is until the present day still producing material for the needs of the literate.

Follow selected passages from the MS, preceded by the Hungarian original and the English translation used by Zhou Zuoren, and followed by the German Kálmán translation that might have been known to Lu Xun, as well as one later German translation (Boháti) and two Chinese translations (Kang Siqun, and Zhang Chunfeng & Feng Zhisheng) for reference. Single translational issues are discussed after each passage. The following abbreviations and text-markers are employed:

---


24 For a detailed physical description of the MS see Hua Rong, «Guanyu “Shen'gai ji” yigao», 58–59.
Original text, according to Mikszáth Kálmán munkái [Works by Kálmán Mikszáth], 52 vols. (Budapest: Revai, 1910–17), vol. 3.

St. Peter’s Umbrella, tr. by B. W. Worswick (London: Jarrold & Sons, 1900).


Zhou Zuoren’s translation MS.

Lu Xun’s amendments on Zhou Zuoren’s translation MS.


Der wunderthätige Regenschirm. Eine Erzählung, tr. by Marie Kálmán (Leipzig: Reclam, s.a. [1899]. Universal-Bibliothek; 4002/4003).


Sheng Pide de san 聖彼得的傘, tr. by Kang Siqun 康嗣群 (Shanghai: Pingming chubanshe, 1952).

Sheng Pide de san, tr. by Zhang Chunfeng 張春風 and Feng Zhisheng 楊植盛 (Taiyuan: Shanxi renmin chubanshe, 1983).

Each indication is followed by page number.

Text deleted by Lu Xun in Zhou Zuoren’s MS.

Substitutions and insertions by Lu Xun.

Key passages omitted or distorted in (American) English or other translations.

Key vocabulary with relevant translation issues.

Passages omitted in translations.
The original Hungarian text gives something that may be rendered as ‘widowed school-master’s [wife]’, which is properly rendered as ‘schoolmaster’s widow’, and even more so in the German version as ‘verwitwete Schulmeisterin’—simply because ‘özvegy’ is an adjective to the genitive of ‘tanítóné’. In turn, the term yili 遺孀 expresses perfectly well that the ‘widow’ has been left over.

If Lu Xun substituted the relatively neutral xuexiao jiaoshi (‘teacher in a school’) by the clearly marked shushi (‘master in a school privately funded and run by the local gentry’), it is definitely a misunderstanding, because local elementary school teachers were appointed by the (then Hungarian) state, and by no means by local gentry, because there was nothing the like. Later Chinese translators, such Kang Siqun, were proceeding much more appropriately, as they got rid of any marking.

This passage already reveals clearly interventions by the English translator obviously due to Protestant abstinence that totally omitted the ‘thirstyness’ (‘szomjasan’ < ‘szomja’ ‘thirsty’) in favour of a simply tempered down ceremony.
(«not much of a funeral», ...banjian 寒儉, resurfacing in the 1950s' translation as ben jiantan 很簡儉). Only later on, in the 1980s, the original meaning was restored again, by renkou gan chenlie, be bu shang jiu 人口幹震裂，喝不上酒—whether this was due to the German translation, explicitly consulted, or to the Hungarian original, may not be determined. At least, it shows clearly that Kang Siqun did not consult neither the original nor any other than the English translation.

As for Lu Xun's interventions in his brother's translation, he just lowered the key of 'ceremony' down to the 'burial matters', not mentioning the motivation for it—which might be an indication that he did not consult any then existing German translation.

Another most likely religiously motivated translational manipulation appears soon after when the taboo on the enunciation of God's name (considered as a curse, thus as a sin) in fundamentalist Protestantism is respected: The unambiguous »Istenem« is neutralized to »Dear me...«, and it is not surprising that Zhou Zuoren was at odds in handling this expression (and subsequently, Lu Xun had nothing to emend, because the space remained blank). German translators that followed were less inhibited, and translated »o du mein Gott!« and »Gott, ...!«, respectively. It is quite likely that Kang Siqun knew their translations (unlike what the previous reference may suggest), as well as the 1980s translators who might even have had some knowledge of Hungarian—at least it is what they are suggesting.

As for the equivalent of »hang—« (voice), it is certainly appropriate that contemporary translators opted for the 'gorge' (i.e. 'human voice') instead of the unspecific 'sound'.

Hiszen uramfia, egy nagy kaplan fiúk volt már a tanítócának. Az bizony jó fiú, kár, hogy nem segíthette még anyját, mert maga is csak kaplan volt eddig valami igen-igen szegény döbánsanál, messze Tótországban, hanem most,

for they already had a son, a priest, a very good son on the whole, only it was a pity he could not help his mother a bit; but he was very poor
himself, and lived a long way off in Wallachia, as chaplain to an old priest.

Z1a 已無子，方就職為神甫，弟其為修士已可，俾有子第亦頓失不得意。
L 莫事至不勝太佳，以彼己有 人難善而 然 ③
Z1a 方就職為神甫，弟其為修士已可，俾有子第亦頓失不得意。
L 敎師 人難善而 ④
Z1a 不能少助其學，遠在華僑一蘭若中，依母而居。
L 乃為母所哀也。

K3–4 [...] Die Schulmeistersleute hatten ja schon einen erwachsenen Sohn, den Herrn Kaplan. Er war ein guter Sohn, schade, dass er der Mutter nicht ein wenig helfen konnte, da er bisher selbs nur Kaplan bei einem sehr, sehr armen Pfarrer war, weit oben in der Slowakei.

B5–6 [...] Du lieber Himmel, die Lehrersleute hatten doch schon einen Sohn, den Kaplan! Wahrhaftig, ein guter Sohn; schade, dass er seiner Mutter nicht helfen konnte, da er bisher nur Kaplan war, bei einem sehr, sehr armen Pfarrer, weit im Slowakenland.

Kang4 [...] 因為他們已經有一個兒子，他是一位牧師，一個各方面都很好的兒子，可惜他幫不了母親一點忙；因為他自己很窮，住在很遠的布拉格，給一位老牧師做助教。

ZF2 [...] 但是，她為什麼要留下這個遺腹子呢？ [...] 小學教師夫婦已經有一個兒子，一位鄉村教師的。他的確是個好兒子，可惜他不能資助母親，因為在這之前，他只是跟著一位住在布拉格鄉村的很窮很窮的牧師當義務。

The paragraph introducing the situation of deceased widow’s son again strikes with the omission of an address to the name of God in the English translation which only appears in one single translation (Boháti 1950), i.e. »hiszen uramfia« ('for Heaven’s sake', literally 'son of the Lord'). The Catholic church organization poses a double problem: First, Lu Xun substitutes his brother’s equivalent shenfu 神甫 which is perfectly common for a Catholic priest by the term usually employed for Protestant ministers (muishi 牧師), probably because he did not know that ‘Upper Hungary’ was dominantly Catholic. 25 Though the English translation rightly renders »káplán« as »chaplain«, neither Zhou Zuoren nor Lu

25 In this respect Wang Xirong errs when assuming that Lu Xun was more familiar with (Christian) religious matters (see »Guanyu “Shengai ji” yigao«, 61; again in »Lu Xun Zhou Zuoren heyi “Shengai ji” shougao yanjiu«, 闫書高語譯論《神蓋記》手稿研究 [A Study on the Manuscript of »Notes on a Godly Cover« Jointly Translated by Lu Xun and Zhou Zuoren], Dongyue congkan 35,1 [2014], 29).
Xun were familiar with the cleric’s function as the aide of a priest——a function that is accurately reflected by Kang Siqun’s fujiaoshi 副教士.

An almost more interesting yet ambiguous case is the English rendering of »Tótország«, the Hungarian term for ‘Slovakia’, as »Wallachia«. This geographical denotation is used for at least three different areas: 1) a principality on the territory of present-day Romania, established in the early 14th century and dissolved 1859, then under Russian protection; 2) the Moravian Wallachia in the Beskidian mountains of the Czech Republic, bordering Poland; 3) the Moravian-Bohemian Wallachia, Czech Vysočina (‘highlands’). This multiple usage already points to the meaning of ‘remote area in general’, well attested in German. It is, by analogy, well possible that at Mikszáth’s time »Tótország« was employed in this sense (because the Slovak mountains were indeed far away from the Hungarian heartlands), and that the English translator therefore translated it as »Wallachia«, certainly aware that it did not denote any of the three regions mentioned above. Yet the Zhou brothers were not aware of this connection, and thus could hardly identify the area as ‘Slovakia’, as their follower Kang Siqun—and unlike Kálmán (»weit oben in der Slowakei«) and Boháti (»weit im Slowakien«), and the contemporary Chinese translators (Siluofake xiangxia 斯洛伐克鄉下).

The English translator seems not to have been very familiar with bureaucratic functions and titles in the Austrian-Hungarian empire, as he skipped the ‘head of a local court’ (Hung. szolgabíróval, German Stuhlrichter), yet still allowed Zhou Zuoren to translate by the rough equivalent xiangguan 鄉官 (‘county official’). Note the interesting variant for ‘Catholic priest’ that appears in Hungarian, namely the popular and slightly ironic pap that makes it definitely unambiguous it is a follower of the pápa (‘pope’).
They rose on our entrance, and in a singing voice said: »Vitajtye panyi, vitajtye!« (Legyetek űdvözölve urak!) [Slovak spelling »Vitajte páni, vitajte!«]
When the narrator, accompanying his friend, the 'country official', visits the local school, the pupils are welcoming the visitors in their local, in Slovak. This is given by the writer in the original language, which in turn gives Lu Xun the opportunity to provide the possibly first Chinese transcription of Slovak ever attempted. On the same occasion, he is probably inventing a pattern of translatorial annotation, giving both the meaning and the pronunciation of the passage in a foreign language (foreign to the language of the main text-body, of course) that has ever since been employed times and again: Zhou Zuoren had already inserted an annotation, in the conventionalized mode of writing two lines between the lines usually employed to be filled with one single writing-line, saying 'meaning translates as »good morning, gentlemen«. To this Lu Xun adds an annotation saying 'sound translates as weiduoqi, poni', such that the so-to-say exoticizing effect is preserved for the translation. Should be noted that the writer in turn employed the Hungarian transliteration of Slovak, rather than the original spelling.

Besides these details, the illustrations above also make clear that the MS paper provided by Kinseedō was somehow carelessly printed, not producing a strictly right angle between between the double-lined frame and the lines defining the writing-space.
The passages presented above reveal a striking extent to which delicate issues were considered taboo by the English translator (or his editors). The questions asked to pupils about 'how many Gods were existing, and in which country they were living' were considered too delicate to be included. Yet they are just the prologue to another, much more incisive act of censorship, as well be seen below.

The learned Latin vocative *amice* (from *amicus*) is, as the Slovak passage above, strictly adapted to Hungarian spelling (*amice*), but ommitted in the English version by mere and simple translation. The shift in register is therefore not possible in the Chinese translation, yet even if there a been a hint to it, Zhou Zuoren would have encountered serious difficulties, seen the register he is using.
Zügel sagte: "已十四年。吾幼君聞，知君明吾言矣。"


[...]

Kang9–10 "他們全都是好孩子", 我的朋友說， "可是怎麼的，他們好像全長得一個模兒？" / 小學教員看上去有點兒為難的模兒，跟著就用坦白、開明的態度回答說： "唔，你瞧，先生，夏天所有的格羅呼哇的那人全到地理去工作去啦，一直到秋天都只有我一個人在這兒。" （他的嘴角上掛著一絲微笑。） "先生，你懂了吧？" / "你在這兒多少年了？" / "十四啦，先生。我從您的問題裡看出來：您已經明白啦。"

[...]

The censorship, then, goes still a step further, but now it evidently not originating from the (?British) translator, but from his American editors: The whole paragraph in which the magistrate is delicately inquiring the schoolmaster about the striking fact that all his pupils resemble eachother, is deleted—almost a whole page in the British edition. That the schoolmaster suggests that he himself is the father of most of his pupils has of course a sexual connotation that appeared inadmissible to the US publishing house. Or, to put it more precisely: The British publisher Jarrold & Sons who organised the 1900 edition of the translation, probably sold the publishing rights to Harper & Brothers who in turn reserved the right to publish the translation both in Britain and in the United States—this is what the imprint ”New York and London“ suggests.27 This is also ultimate evidence that Zhou Zuoren (and with him Kang Siqun, as

comes out clearly in his translation) had at hands the British edition, and not the American.\(^{28}\)

Another slight distortion of a Latin expression, namely *domine fráter* ('brother in the Lord') is occurring, which is strangely rendered as *dominie* in Worswick, and therefore not marked particularly at all in Zhou Zuoren’s version, except by the common *jun* 舅, yet still experiences the emphasis *lao fuzi* ('old master') in Kang Siqun’s translation, not surprisingly dissolving making the Christian connotation disappear, and with the religiously grounded, yet ceremoniously expressed equality among interlocutors.

Finally, the lack of precise knowledge with the Zhou brothers about the topography and economy involved in the narrative, and clearly expressed in «[going] down to the plains», made escape to them their full meaning, and resulted in a fairly unspecific *ye* (only in part relieved by *tianye* 田野 'open cultivated land' in Lu Xun’s emendation), and also the original verb *wang* 往 substituted by *fu* 赴 does not make clear that it is denoting 'magnates' land'.

---

\(^{28}\) As there has never been a new English translation, it remains yet unclear on which of the two different Worswick editions the repeatedly reprinted Hungarian English edition of 1962 was based, rev. by István Fekete [1900–1970] (Budapest: Corvina Press, s.a.).
Erde; zu jeder Minute konnte er mähen, was er nötig hatte: Geduld, Hoffnung, Trost, Zufriedenheit.

Kang16 照這樣情形是沒有大的前途的，可是他對於這些事的想法也漸漸的習慣了，要是有了什麼不愉快的念頭，他就用祈禱來排解，他是在自己的土地上，在那塊生出果子來的地上祈禱；他隨時都可以從祈禱中獲得那些他所需要的——

Plate 7

*MS of Shen’gai ji, f4r.*
The by far longest insertion on the whole translation MS is on the recto of the 4th folded sheet (conventionally »4a«). Though the hand-writings of the two Zhou brothers resembled each other even more than in later times, i.e. from the 1920s onwards, and it could be contended that the insertion is by Zhou Zuoren, and even more so the interventions on the insertions (see Plate 8). Assuming that the intervention is his, one might wonder why he originally skipped the passage. Mere negligence put aside, it is not unlikely that, despite his knowledge about Christianity, the abrupt shift from the discussion of unclarified land-ownership problems in the village that is preceeding the passage to the metaphorical usage of ‘land’ of prayer from which ‘fruit may be harvested’ in the new priest’s ‘character perspective’ might have confused him, so that he left the passage aside for possible omission.

Another interesting aspect in this passage is the author’s skilful hybrid from several Paulinian missives in the New Testament, in which the qualities of «patience, hope, comfort, content» are combined with «prayer», the key activity necessary in metaphorically ‘reaping the fruit’.

30 Should be noted in this context that the critical edition of the MS by Wang Xirong ‘Shen’gai ji’, Shanghai Lu Xun yanjiu no 4 (June 1991), here particularly p. 39, does not reflect Zhou Zuoren’s own interventions (if they are his)—which is the only shortcoming in an otherwise ground-breaking work.
31 Cf. «Rejoicing in Hope, patient in tribulation, continuing instant prayer.» (Rom 12.12) «But the fruit of the Spirit is love, joy, peace, longsuffering, gentleness, goodness, faith. / Meekness, temperance: against such there is no law.» (Gal 5.22–23), and many others, quoted according to the King James Version—would be revealing to examine which terms were employed in then (before the Chinese Union Version [联合本]) available Chinese Bible translations. In any case, to two-character compounds stand out in Zhou Zuoren’s translation.
Plate 8
MS of Shen’gai ji, f 14r (Top, Parts).

H13 — Glogova kutya fészek — mondta Urszinyi, — Hja, bis nem a nyitrai püspökség, de kí tehet rola? Sovány nyáj, sovány pásztor, Ki kell állani. Dániel még rosszabb helyen volt az oroszlánokkal. Ezek végre is csak birkák.

W-US17 — Glogova is a wretched hole, he said, but not every place can be the Bishopric of Neutra. However, you will have to put up with it as it is. Daniel was worse off in the lions' den, and after all these are only sheep.

Z4a 說語云勒曰：「格羅戈列良為貧塗，而安能處處皆為樂園，汝所當遍遇而安之耳。」

Z4a （——）但以當居於此時，遙惡於此，此則僅羊而已。


Kang16  “格羅柯瓦是一個狗窩”，他說，“可是也不能個個地方像維特拉的主教區吧，（——）別管怎麼樣，你就將這樣過下去吧。但以理在獅子窩裡的情形還要壞些呢，這些到底還只是些羊啊。”

ZF17  “格羅柯瓦是一個狗窩”，馬勒蒂尼說。“唉，這可不是尼特拉主教區呀！可是又有什麼辦法呢？能群服，牧人也服。你要堅持下來，但伊瑞跟獅子在一起時的處境比這要壞得多。這裡的畢竟是一些綿羊呵！”

The preceding passages obviously abound in imagery with Christian, Biblical or Church reference. It is striking that the translator to English skipped the sentential 'meagre flock, meagre shepherd' which of course refers to the 'pastor'—or 'priest'. Might he have considered even this popular wording a sacrilege to the office? In any case, he also tempered down the 'dogs' hole', in order to avoid the theologically undesired parallel to the »lions' den«. Left alone on this aspect, Zhou Zuoren had to cope with the »wretched hole« which he in turn again neutralised to a 'meager area' (jirang 鬧壤). That he fully capitulated in view of the (wealthy) »Bishopric of Neutra«, the territorial Church body first attested in 880 CE, is understandable—and simply substituted it by 'paradise'. Lu Xun in turn tried to get rid of it, but to no avail. Yet Zhou Zuoren was apparently familiar with Daniel's story from the Old Testament.

Not only Zhou Zuoren, but also Kang Siqun seems to have followed the English translation exclusively, because 'meagre sheep...' only appear again in the contemporary Chinese translation by Zhang and Feng.

It is an almost neglectable detail that Zhou Zuoren was not clear about who is speaking, and attributed the comment on the place Glogová to the priest's local guide Urszinyi, rather than to the priest himself, given that in the translation personal pronouns are used much more frequently than the clear names.
A Systematic Assessment of the Manuscript

The motivation for the later insertion of the passage on f4r mentioned above remains unclear, even if it was indeed by Zhou Zuoren. Yet in the case of markers for ‘inversion’, it is becoming even more difficult to attribute them to one of the Zhou brothers; only thorough material-physical examination would be able to clarify the issue.

While some of the terminological proposals made by Lu Xun in their first occurrence (e.g. jiaoshi 教師 > shushi 師傅) and not repeated in further occurrences, they are tacitly accepted by Zhou Zuoren and appear in the subsequent chapters. In others, such as shenfu 神甫 > mushi 牧師, Zhou Zuoren insists on his version which is not edited by Lu Xun. We may gather from this Lu Xun applied his amendments chapter by chapter, or simply that the brothers who lived together had a permanent oral exchange. It is striking, however, that Zhou Zuoren has put the date of 5 Mar 1909 (yiyou nian er yue shisi ri 已酉年二月十四日) at the end of chapter 3, followed by the term ‘finally revised’ (gaizheng 改正) which may in turn be as a sort of ‘approval’ or even ‘authorisation’. Chapter 4 ends unceremoniously with the indication ‘end of part i’ with no ‘approval’. There are clearly less interventions by Lu Xun in chapter 4 which is certainly not an indication that Zhou Zuoren would have adapted his translation style to Lu Xun’s expectations and standards, but rather to the loss or at least loosening of interest by both, certainly motivated by the poor perspectives for publication.

Several emendations by Lu Xun are based on factual knowledge, e.g. that in Hungarian the family name is preceding the given name (as in Chinese), so that a personal name undergoes the following transformations: Majzik György > György Majzik > 喬治摩士克 > 摩士克喬治 (f2v line 3). A similar case are the Latin and/or Japanese terms added to English plant names (passim). In the end, however, Lu Xun became sloppy, and left the (slightly distorted) ‘dahlia, fuschia’ (f8v line 13) as Zhou Zuoren had put them down.

Also the Latin phrase in chapter 4 Deus est omnipotens ‘God is omnipotent’ (H37, W-Us43, f8v) goes totally unnoticed both by the translator (who possibly believed that added phrase «which was equivalent to saying…» represented a sort of translation) and Lu Xun, and did by far not enjoy the sophisticated treatment of the welcoming formula in the class-room pronounced by the pupils. This gives way to hint to the fact that in three instances explanations given about Slovak customs with the respective terms, of course given in Hungarian or in Hungarian transcription by the author, and represented as footnotes in the original (H30,
Findeisen · Mikszáth’s Szent Peter esernyője by Zhou Zuoren and Lu Xun

H31, H37, H37), yet inserted in the running text in round brackets by the English translator (W-US 18, 36, 37, 43, 44), suggesting another more distant narrator, have been recognized by Zhou Zuoren as ‘notes’ strictly speaking, i.e. as necessary explanations for the reader unfamiliar with Slovakia, and thus represented in two lines within the writing space for one by Zhou Zuoren (Wang 40, 51, 52, 56, 57).

One of these ‘notes’ is in fact referring to the term of «magnates” used above with regard to the peripheral situation of Slovakia with regard to Hungary. However, in Mikszáth’s note the very same term is introduced as a label for the «fifteen richest peasants in a Slovak village [that] are called ‘mágnás’ [Hungarian] or “magnates”.» (W-US 37). As a matter of fact, socio-historical analysis employed «magnates» (Magnaten in German) ever since the late 19th century, denoting the status of huge land-ownership in the Pannonian basin. The originally popular term for the less poor among the poorest has thus become a sociological category (of which Miksáth was not aware)—possibly comparable to the kulak first of Tsarist Russia, then transformed into a decisive (sociological) category in the early Soviet Union (cf. the ironical usage of kulak in contemporary Slovak for denoting any person offensively displaying wealth).

5 Some Conclusions

It is now established that Zhou Zuoren use the 1900 Worswick translation, more precisely its first British edition where US-American editors had not yet purged the passage alluding to the possibility the village’s schoolmaster might be the father of most of his pupils. Kang Siqun’s 1952 translation, based even on the very same copy used by Zhou Zuoren (as he had borrowed him the book in his possession), does therefore not reproduce the (additional) censorship measures introduced by US editors.

The Zhou brothers’ knowledge about the situation inside the Austro-Hungarian empire was limited, despite their lively interest in the situation of ‘small oppressed peoples’32 which was, however, concentrating on political struggles geared towards ‘national liberation’ within a concept of the nation-state, much along the lines of discourse against the Manchu last dynasty, and thus blinded towards less spectacular constellations.

A number of interventions (considered as ‘emendations’) by Lu Xun do by no means improve the translation’s quality, but on the contrary result from insufficient knowledge, such as in the cases of shenfu > mushi, xuexiao jiaoshi > sbushi, etc., extensively commented above. However, in matters of ‘style’ (or xiuci 修辭), his emendations succeed in removing most of the unelegant intricacies of common late 19th-early 20th century clumsy translation styles.

Worswick’s translation has a number of flaws, some of them misleading or even producing misunderstandings from the side of the Zhou brothers, and others simply due to Protestant puritanism (as in the outright censured US edition). The frequent use of Latin in passages that might be ‘theologically’ delicate prevented Zhou Zhouren, then not yet familiar with the language, from falling into the biased trap prepared by the translator. Yet he was also held astray from a number of expressions by which later, more informed translations, draw a lot of the the original flavour.