

Neocolonialism in Translating China

Guoqiang Qiao

Shanghai International Studies University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>



Part of the [American Studies Commons](#), [Feminist, Gender, and Sexuality Studies Commons](#), and the [Translation Studies Commons](#)

Dedicated to the dissemination of scholarly and professional information, [Purdue University Press](#) selects, develops, and distributes quality resources in several key subject areas for which its parent university is famous, including business, technology, health, veterinary medicine, and other selected disciplines in the humanities and sciences.

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Recommended Citation

Qiao, Guoqiang. "Neocolonialism in Translating China." *CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture* 20.7 (2018): <<https://doi.org/10.7771/1481-4374.3327>>

This text has been double-blind peer reviewed by 2+1 experts in the field.

The above text, published by Purdue University Press ©Purdue University, has been downloaded 175 times as of 11/07/19.

This document has been made available through Purdue e-Pubs, a service of the Purdue University Libraries. Please contact epubs@purdue.edu for additional information.

This is an Open Access journal. This means that it uses a funding model that does not charge readers or their institutions for access. Readers may freely read, download, copy, distribute, print, search, or link to the full texts of articles. This journal is covered under the [CC BY-NC-ND license](#).

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture

ISSN 1481-4374 <<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb>>
Purdue University Press ©Purdue University

CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture, the peer-reviewed, full-text, and open-access learned journal in the humanities and social sciences, publishes new scholarship following tenets of the discipline of comparative literature and the field of cultural studies designated as "comparative cultural studies." In addition to the publication of articles, the journal publishes review articles of scholarly books and publishes research material in its *Library Series*. Publications in the journal are indexed in the Annual Bibliography of English Language and Literature (Chadwyck-Healey), the Arts and Humanities Citation Index (Thomson Reuters ISI), the Humanities Index (Wilson), Humanities International Complete (EBSCO), the International Bibliography of the Modern Language Association of America, and Scopus (Elsevier). The journal is affiliated with the Purdue University Press monograph series of Books in Comparative Cultural Studies. Contact: <clcweb@purdue.edu>

Volume 20 Issue 7 (December 2018) Article 3
Guoqiang Qiao,
"Neocolonialism in Translating China"
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol20/iss7/3>>

Contents of **CLCWeb: Comparative Literature and Culture 20.7 (2018)**
Special Issue **A Critical Response to Neocolonialism. Ed. Guoqiang Qiao**
<<http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/clcweb/vol20/iss7/>>

Abstract: In his article "Neocolonialism in Translating China" Guoqiang Qiao analyzes the neocolonial phenomenon that occurs in the process of Chinese literature's "walking-out." Taking examples from Howard Goldblatt's translation and neocolonial ideas that Goldblatt advanced in his essays, interviews and speeches and those Chinese writers, critics and professors who practice self-colonization, he analyzes their neocolonialism with the challenging concepts of neocolonialism and self-colonization and thus aims to cope with the phenomenon of colonization and self-colonization in the area of Chinese literature's "walking-out."

Guoqiang QIAO

Neocolonialism in Translating China

The movement of globalization was to be essentially multi-directional, equal participation in common values in world economy, politics, culture, education, etc. Yet in reality, the current movement of globalization in most cases is exercised one-directional, namely, from the developed countries to the underdeveloped. In the developing countries themselves it is a form of neocolonialism that makes the underdeveloped and developing countries comply with the so-called global standards. The underdeveloped and developing countries are forced to do what they are demanded by the developed countries so as to avoid sanctions. Thus, globalization in this sense becomes tendentious and will result in a kind of "outward trappings of international sovereignty" (Nkrumah, ix). National political policy is subject to the so-called globalized standards.

The essence of this globalization is in reality a new means of colonialization, denoting a control that is exercised less through military invasion but more through the so-called globalized standards stipulated and implemented by the developed countries. This neocolonialism initially emerged in the post-World War Two period and further developed during the 1960s and 1970s and went in full range in the 1980s and is still in practice at present.

The concept of neocolonialism is applicable, by reference, to all colonial ideologies proposed and supported by those who have prejudice or enmity against the underdeveloped and developing countries. In other words, similar to the controlling structure and mechanism of so-called globalization, this unhyphenated term of neocolonialism conveys a message of continuity of colonialism and an idea of upgraded domination of power over the underdeveloped and developing countries encompassing every area, including not only in economy and military, but also in education politics, culture and literature. This not-so-old term of neocolonialism is thus affected out into a brand-new, of which the integration into the world that people of underdeveloped and developing countries have been anticipating turns out to be tantalizingly vain hopes. In reality, such integration is nothing but an adaptation or rather, a conversion to the Western world.

Neocolonialism in the field of literature might be more complex and subtler than in the field of economy, politics and military, which is exercised through means of interaction with translators, editors and reading public. In the disguise of globalization and with an excuse of reception, the translation of a certain literary work, for example, written by writer from a developing country, is demanded to accord with first of all the native language of the recipient nation. Yet in order to be in accordance with the native language, let say English, the translation, has to conform to the cultural norms and policy stipulated or required by the English-speaking countries. Thus, in the process of translation, translator, particularly the translator who is an English native speaker, produces consciously or unconsciously a sense of superiority over the translated, since s/he turns the subject of the translated into an object of translation and thus makes the object "inauthentic"—failing to exist as a whole an independent literary work of a certain nationality. On the other hand, the process of this kind of translation also makes language fail to be a straightforward communication of meaning. In order to attract the reading public,

the translator makes efforts to control the meaning of the text by revising, rewriting and adding or deleting of words, paragraphs or even chapter(s) in the original works and thus deprives the original author's control of the text. There should be some elements of negotiation in the process of translation, such as cultural signs, images or symbols and some particular expressions and the related meanings. However, due to the heterogeneity of culture, the translator's word expression, imaginative range and value orientation differ from in this case the original text. The vibrant account or lively narrative drive that well reflects the national literary tradition becomes insipid or irrelevant in the process of translation.

Howard Goldblatt is a telling case in point in this kind of neocolonialist translation. He has translated many Chinese literary works into English, such as Chen Ruo Xi's *The Execution of Mayor Yin and Other Stories from the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution* (1978), Liu Heng's *Black Snow* (1993), Mo Yan's *Red Sorghum: A Novel of China* (1994), *The Republic of Wine, A Novel* (2012), Jia Ping Wa's *Turbulence: A Novel* (2003), *Ruined City, A Novel* (2016), Xiao Hong's *Field of Life and Death & Tales of Hulan River* (2006), etc. to name but a few. He has received several awards for his translations, such as National Translation Award for translation of *Notes of a Desolate Man* by Chu T'ien-wen (2000). Some of his translated novels are collected in Penguin Modern Classic, such as *Red Sorghum: A Novel of China*, *Rice, A Novel*, *Garlic Ballad*, etc. Goldblatt's translation of Chinese literature is a fact of major contribution and significance to the Chinese literature's "walking-out" to the Western world. No doubt, without his efforts, it might take longer time for the West to know Chinese literature and a Chinese writer to win the Nobel Prize in Literature.

However, Goldblatt is of neocolonialist in terms of his translation of Chinese literature. He is highly selective in his choice of translating Chinese literary works, which he does not by the quality of the works, but by his understanding of the Western reading public—the market. He made a statement that "I won't choose to translate the literary work if it is not welcome by the foreign market, even though the Chinese readers love it. I look at the literary work with a 'foreigner's' eye" (Guo, "Goldblatt, A Translator" <http://www.eeo.com.cn/eobserve/Business_lifes/Art/2009/03/24/133257.shtml>; all Howard Goldblatt's remarks in Chinese quoted in this essay are my translation unless otherwise is noted). The talk titled "Authors and Translators: Anxious, Mutual Benefit and Occasional Fragile Relation," which he gave on the Literary Session of the 11th Annual Academic Conference sponsored by Shanghai Social Science Association on October 23, 2013, indicates his high-toned conversion to the foreign markets. That is, he does not regard Chinese literary works as a kind of particular spiritual product that are fully equal to any other national literary works either at an individual level or at a collective level, but as an ordinary commodity that is specifically identifiable with a particular national flavor that is Chinese.

In order to know what Goldblatt means by mentioning "a 'foreigner's' eye" and "the Western market" in his statement, one need first of all to have a brief survey of the literary works that Goldblatt has chosen to translate and how he translated them.

Goldblatt's preference for this translation is worth noting. Roughly, the Chinese literary works that he has translated can be divided into two categories: (1) display of the faultiness of China's society and the social system, the fatuous authority and ignorant national trait as represented by Mo Yan's novels;

(2) description of the particular structure of Chinese old family, exposing the life-or-death struggle within a Chinese family with a stress on the hatred and murderous relationship between human beings, particularly between husband and wife, wife and concubine, sister and brother as represented by Su Tong's novels. Although in different style, these categories of novels commonly demonstrate the ugliness and evilness of human nature reflected in Chinese society and Chinese family. His comment on Su Tong's novels further reveals his speculative partiality. He said, "I like his [Su Tong's] novels, particularly his *Rice, A Novel* and *My Life as Emperor*. *Rice, A Novel* is particularly well written. Darkness is throughout the novel, and there are no positive characters and events at all in the novel [...] All are about the bad side, overriding any good side. So I would say his description of the characters' internal lives is really rich and I basically agree to the notion that human being is born to be evil" (Ji, "An Interview with Goldblatt" 48). It might be tough to say that he assigns to his role of translating those works that reflect the "darkness" or the "bad side" of human being or rather, Chinese. But, it would be no other way to comprehend his comment.

Indeed, a postmodernist writer sometimes opts to saturate a literary work completely with the "bad side" particularly when s/he is very pessimistic about life or human being or her or his living environment. Nonetheless, choosing to translate those works that are full of "darkness" or "bad side" is quite another thing, which indicates not only his literary preference and aesthetic taste, but also his understanding of Chinese literature and literary position and value orientation.

There are many precepts and criteria to judge the quality of a novel, which has to do with both the consciousness and conscience. It would be queer to boil down the literary and aesthetic quality of a novel to the throughout "darkness" or "bad side". A critic who has literary common sense would know that a good novel or a well portrayed character is not entirely based on the demonstration of evilness, which will blot out the richness of a literary work and result in being conceptualized and stereotyped. On the other hand, a good novel might come to term with historical or social specificity; it also might handle richly textured personal experiences such as merry encounter with old friend, the vicissitude of life or thwarted love. Is it possible that Goldblatt who has been in the circle of literary translation for decades and would have known it quite well can overlook all of these completely? Of course, the answer is most likely "No."

In 2008, Goldblatt summarized the American readers' expectation of Chinese literary writings, which helps disclose the American readers' ideological or political value orientation. He said, "Americans are keen on the literary works that satirize, criticize or deliberately speak against the Chinese government. For example, they would definitely like to read a novel about a chaotic family rather than a novel about a harmonious family" (Luo, "Goldblatt: Americans" 121). Indeed, it is an illuminating summary that spells out the nature of American readers' expectation if Goldblatt's summary is true and precise. Literary work can be satirical and critical. In other words, literary work should neither avoid writing about the ugliness and evilness of a society, nor should it only be a synonym for ugliness and evilness, either. That American readers' position Chinese literary works on a value dimension that associates with ugliness and evilness only indicates at best their deep-rooted white supremacy. At worst, their abnormal addiction to ugliness or evilness denotes American's neocolonialist superiority over the Chinese. Later

in elsewhere, Goldblatt further specifies American readers' three idiosyncratic interests in Chinese literature, namely, more sex, more political and more detective (cf. Goldblatt, *Sketches by H. Goldblatt* 221), revealing a general inclination that lays a lopsided emphasis on the abnormality of Chinese people and therefore, to grasp the discourse which produces and reproduces contempt and thereof antagonism against Chinese people.

It would be uncertain to say that Goldblatt has developed a peculiar hobby for evilness and ugliness, since Goldblatt used to prefer Chinese literary writings that describe something tender, sentimental and humane. Among Chinese writers, he is most fascinated by Xiao Hong, to whom he devoted his heart and soul (cf. Jiang, "Goldblatt and Xiao Hong" 68-71). He admits that it is Xiao Hong who sent him on the road of translation and made him a professional translator of Chinese literature. Now that he has no such kind of peculiar hobby, what ignites him to focus on the evilness and ugliness? The only possible answer is that he as a translator has been influenced by his reading public or the market, which is cultivated and nurtured by white supremacy or rather, the neocolonialism, and eventually is reduced to a state of inauthenticity—he neo-colonizes himself through carrying out neocolonialism in his choice and process of translation.

The concept of neocolonialism is comprehensive, and spans a long period of time that includes both the period of colonialism and post-colonialism and locates in anywhere that is invaded and controlled directly or indirectly by white hegemonic powers "via political, cultural and above all economic channels" (Childs and Williams 5), even in the disguise of globalization. America was used to be colonized by many European countries. Yet, the irony is that the American people who live in an era of post-colonialism develop an intimate relationship with the colonialism they suffered rather than a feeling of anti-colonialism they boasted, particularly when they obtain the hegemonic power with a belief that they can maintain maximum direct or indirect control over the other nations. The concrete manifestation is that they have no patience with the differences of other nation's cultural tradition and demand cultural subservience and political obedience to them. For them, these differences embody heterogeneity and thus have property and traits of otherness.

Furthermore, the neocolonial strategy in terms of translation indicates a language of monocentrism, regarding translation as a medium of power and demanding that translation defines itself by seizing the language of the center and re-placing it in a discourse fully adapted to the foreign, let's say American reading public or market but ignore the other's heterogeneity. Specifically, they adopt a strategy of deleting and rewriting to abrogate or deny Chinese writer's individual style, narrative features and value orientation that reflects the characteristics of Chinese culture. In case of Goldblatt's translation, one of his strategies to inoculate his neocolonialism is his smart choice of word expressions and political savvy of image structure. For example, in Mo Yan's *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* that he translated, when she earnestly hopes that her daughter-in-law gives birth to a son, Shangguan Lü, the mother-in-law, prays for Mother Buddha (or Guanyin Bodhisattva, the Goddess of Mercy in Buddhism), which is an old convention for Chinese people. Goldblatt's smartness is that he translates the Chinese Mother Buddha into Western Christian God or sometimes confusing the Chinese Buddha with Christian God and therefore, encodes Christian concept with Christian image in a Chinese novel. On the surface it seems

nothing but an unavoidable cultural adaptation in translation. Nevertheless, the nature of this cultural adaptation in essence results in Christianization and an eventual cultural neo-colonization.

Goldblatt's another strategy for his neocolonialism is to delete many paragraphs or even a whole section in his translation of Mo Yan's *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*. For example, about nine hundreds and forty-one words in Chapter thirteen are deleted, with which Mo Yan describes Mother's good heart in an evening when she drinks the fish soup and tells a story about the north-east part of Gaomi County; another one thousand four hundreds and twenty-five words, with which Mo Yan talks about the war of excrement and urine between German army and Chinese army in the same chapter, are deleted. Goldblatt also deletes a whole Chapter 39, in which Mo Yan uses eleven thousand five hundreds and thirty-eight words to relate Niaoer Han's life in a waste mountain for fifteen years in Hokkaido, Japan, etc. (cf. Wu 138-139).

Goldblatt complains that it is the editor who demands such deletion rather than he, the translator (Li 57-60). In addition, he claims that his deletion is "all with the approval of the author" (Goldblatt, *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* xii). Goldblatt might be wronged in a sense; however, the deletion that does happen in whatsoever way in essence is a refusal of the categories of the other's cultural expression, in which "its aesthetic, its illusory standard of normative or 'correct' usage, and its assumption of a traditional and fixed meaning 'inscribed' in the words" (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 37). Therefore, deletion for him as well as for his editor is adopted as a tool and utilized to abrogate the differing cultural experiences. As a consequence, the English readers will have no access to a broad spectrum of the Chinese cultural and societal experiences.

Goldblatt's neocolonial position in his translation is also tactically manifested in his introduction to Mo Yan's *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* through highlighting the impotence and deterioration of China's society and humanity that Mo Yan exposes in the novel. By rights, Goldblatt is not necessarily to argue about Mo Yan's position as a translator. Nevertheless, he contends by emphasis that Mo Yan "transcend(s) or refute(s) specific occurrences or canonized political interpretations of history" (Goldblatt, "Introduction" in *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* xi). His smartness is that all his arguments that navigate readers to be "in defiance of more standard historical fiction in China" (xi) are sophisticatedly articulated, interweaving the introduction with the main plot of the novel, the common sense knowledge with the visceral imagery that Mo Yan represented in the novel and in the parallel of the historical events in modern Chinese history, albeit "Japan's defeat in Asia in 1945," "a bloody civil war between Mao's and Chiang's forces," "a bloody involvement in the Korean War," "the disastrous 'Great Leap Forward'" and "Cultural Revolution" (xi). Thus, by this particular sophisticated way of articulation, Goldblatt tactically grasps the right of control of Mo Yan's novels and insinuates his neocolonialist concept of history into readers' reception.

What is more, Goldblatt got an essay published on a Chinese journal after Mo Yan's winning the prize, advising how to get Chinese literature "walked-out." He argues about in the essay the general status and future development of Chinese literature, demonstrating his new attitude toward Chinese literature, or rather his new strategy to further exert his influence on the development of Chinese literature. Specifically, at the outset of the essay, he raises three questions: What is Chinese literature? Can only

serious literature be the type of Chinese literature that can be introduced to the world? Can we say that Chinese literature has walked out after the Chinese has won the Nobel Prize in Literature? (Goldblatt, "How Can Chinese Literature Walk Out?" 18) These three questions are in fact rhetorical questions, which do not mean that he does not know the answers but mean that he intends to redefine the concepts of Chinese literature and the serious Chinese literature and the relation between the walking-out of Chinese literature and the Nobel Prize in Literature. For him, Mo Yan's literary works belong to serious literary works and his winning of Nobel Prize in Literature does not mean the success of Chinese literature. He maintains that the serious literary works are for the elite only but not for the common people. Thus, in this sense, the real success for Chinese literature's "walking-out" should be the "walking-out" of Chinese popular literature rather than the serious literature, because the former will be better received than the latter.

Apparently, Goldblatt's argument that Mo Yan's winning of Nobel Prize in Literature does not mark the success of Chinese literature's "walking-out" is a glib excuse for his proposal to translate Chinese popular literature and therefore, to meet up the requirements of the foreign reading public, namely the market. The crux of the matter is that he sets popular literature against the serious literature and thus he can make popular literature as the mark and criteria for Chinese literature's "walking-out." There might raise a train of troubling questions: would he give such kind of proposal for American or British literary circle? Why should Chinese literary circle bother to discriminate serious literature from popular literature in terms of literary "walking-out" and the American or European literary circle do not have to make such kind of discrimination? What is more, why does he think little of Chinese serious literature even though he has translated Mo Yan into the winning of the Nobel Prize in Literature? And why does he bother to give up Mo Yan as representative of Chinese serious literature and look for someone else to represent Chinese popular literature? No matter how deeply informed his proposal and how deadpan an account he makes in his argumentation, the consistently ironic tone throughout his proposal denotes his confidence as a neocolonialist to dominate the whole thing of China's literary "walking-out," his disregard of China as a country with rich indigenous cultural and literary traditions and his stance of cultural decimation and political exclusion as every neocolonialist may assume. In other words, the proposal he advances frames his stance and motivation in regard Chinese literature as commodity for his English-speaking markets and therefore, to cash in on the translation of Chinese popular literature. In brief, the proposal he raises reveals his inner colonialist heritage of values that designates a new position of literary and cultural supremacy.

Thus, Said does not mean to pin a label of neocolonialist on Goldblatt or on any other foreign translators or critics who advance their proposal for Chinese literature's "walking-out." Goldblatt is a special case. His specialty is chiefly embodied in his colonial outlook on Chinese literature, namely, his turning the subject of Chinese literature into object of commodity or rather, his commercialization of Chinese literature conceived as a set of discursive practices of his neocolonialism in his translation, essays, interviews, etc.

Perhaps, Goldblatt's neocolonialist stance can be exposed more to the point through envisaging the facts of Chinese literature. The Chinese popular literary works that Goldblatt proposes to translate are

chiefly "martial arts novel" and "espionage novels," which are in fact cordially welcome both at home and abroad. For example, Jin Yong, a well-known novelist of "martial arts novel," is an entry in *The Literary Masters in the Twentieth Century Library*; and Mai Jia, a well-known novelist of "espionage novels," won Ba Jin Literary award (2007) and Mao Dun Literary Award (2008). In brief, these popular novels have taken up the position of best seller for decades. However, the "serious" Chinese literary works have got no such good luck. These examples showcase the success of popular literary works in China and the very roots cause for Goldblatt to propose translation of Chinese popular literary works. To put in other words, Goldblatt's criteria for his judgment of Chinese literary works and his translation are not based on the quality of the works but the quantity of the book circulation in the market. Thus, in this sense, what he does is more of an importation of printed commodity that is called Chinese literature through translation less as a messenger of Chinese literature as he has self-claimed.

Furthermore, Goldblatt's neocolonialism is also refracted in his judgment of modern Chinese literature. He attributes the obstacle to the Chinese literature's "walking-out" to "the influence of Chinese traditional literary structure and method." (Goldblatt, "How Can Chinese Literature Walk Out?" 18)

Indeed, to some degree Chinese traditional literary structure and method might not fit in with modern Chinese literature, nor are they suitable for foreign reading public. However, as a commonsense understanding, every national literature has its cultural and literary roots, just as American writer Isaac Bashevis Singer, a winner of Nobel Prize in Literature in 1978, observes in an interview: "The idea of roots is not to deny anything. You have to make the best of your origin and upbringing. [...] When you talk about a writer you always mention his nation, his language. Writers, more than any other artists, belong to their nation, their language, their history, their culture. They are both highly individualistic and highly attached to their origin" (Singer and Burgin 64-65). The question is that American writer Singer understands the significance of cultural roots, whereas Goldblatt regards Chinese literary tradition as an obstacle to the Chinese literature's "walking-out."

One might say that it is not a problem that one has one's own understanding of the issue of cultural root. Yet, for Goldblatt, it might be quite another thing. The problem is expressed in his remark that "Chinese writers write novels. Yet when they are translated into English, English readers and critics will read them as novel, and they will make their judgment based on the concept of novel. Therefore, some of the methods for Chinese writers are a matter of course, but when they are considered based on the Western tradition, they are defects" (Goldblatt, "How Can Chinese Literature Walk Out?" 18). As common sense, readers and critics in any countries can make their judgment according to their own criteria or their own personal taste. But Chinese readers and critics will not regard those which are different from Chinese literary tradition or methods as defects and tell the writers how to write according to Chinese literary tradition. On the contrary, Chinese readers and critics will appreciate these differences and try to figure out the newness or the specialties in them. These two different attitudes reflect at least the different peoples' mindsets toward the other nation's literature. Goldblatt's remark denotes a mindset of American-centric or Eurocentric conception of Chinese literature. For him, the American or European literature is the orthodox and therefore is universally significant; whereas the Chinese literature is local and limited and thus sub-category and has antipathetic literary values. By his

neocolonialist cultural logic, Goldblatt attempts to totalize in an overweening effort to master and explain everything and promote the neocolonialist monocentrism and therefore, to incorporate his translation of Chinese literature into his commercial project and furthermore his domination and hegemony.

Nonetheless, the other side of the coin is that Chinese literature is trapped in a dilemma for its integration into the so-called community of world literature. The dilemma is that if it does not make efforts to get integrated into the community of world literature, it will be condemned for its backwardness or what might be called self-imposed isolation from the world. However, if it tries to get integrated into the so-called community of world literature, it is forced into a passive and awkward position: either being manipulated or being rewritten by the Western world, particularly by the U.S. The result is that Chinese literature is translated as monomorphic literature, namely, it is reshaped in thematic concerns, writing style as well as value orientation in the process of translation to cater for the Western reading public.

This phenomenon is in essence another kind of cultural neo-colonization, which happens basically by two forces: one is tempted or provoked by the white supremacist as neo-colonizer through intriguing means such as various awards and opportunities that the Chinese writers can demonstrate their talents on an international forum. The other is urged by Chinese writers' innermost vanity and practical interests. In order to obtain such awards, some of the Chinese writers take in cultural capitulation, entertaining the fantasy that they will be awarded and made well-known in the world if they are Western-oriented with changed thematic concerns, value orientation, aesthetic taste and the like. In this sense, they are culturally self-colonized—a new version of neocolonialism.

Social, cultural and literary ferment of the recent years is the breeding ground for self-colonization in literature and literary theory as well as literary translation. Mo Yan's self-colonization in his *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* is also embodied in his fermented depiction of sweltering rural chaos and uncertainty and human desires. The telling case in point is the love stories between Swedish Pastor Malory and several Chinese women and American pilot Babbitt with the Sixth Sister. Pastor Malory and Babbitt are two mysterious characters—nobody knows how they come to the North-East County and finds them any particular specialties that can attract women. What they do in the county is the incessant "love" with Chinese women. But what a love! The so-called love affair for them is nothing but fescennine or even obscene sexual intercourse. To say the least, it would not be a problem for Mo Yan to describe transnational love affair. The problem is that he raises our awareness by portraying the Chinese women characters that are all obsessed with the two foreign characters (Pastor Malory and Pilot Babbitt) and like very much to be controlled or manipulated by the foreigners and are most willingly to do anything for them.

In fact, besides yellow hair and blue eyes, Pastor Malory has nothing that can help distinguish him from other men in the county. He has neither interesting ideas, nor noble mind, nor decent manner. Nevertheless, Shangguan Lu, one of the representative leading women characters in the novel, loves him most and regards him as God among the seven men she has sexual affairs with. The episode of Shangguan Lu's "borrowing seed" (she makes love with Pastor Malory so as to get pregnant) further exposes her inherent subservience.

Another episode that deals with Shangguan Lu's inherent subservience is her scolding of her illegitimate son Shangguan Jintong when he attempts to commit suicide. She says, "That's right, Pastor Malory was your father, so what? Wash that stuff off your face and out of our hair, then go out in the street with your head held high and announce: My father was the Swedish Pastor Malory, which makes me an heir to royalty, and a damned sight better than the likes of your turtles!" (Mo Yan, *Big Breasts and Wide Hips* 387) Shangguan Lu does not feel ashamed of her illicit sexual intercourse with Pastor Malory at all; on the contrary, she degrades herself by forcing her son to make announcement of his illicit identity and boast an heir to royalty—she is converted to Pastor Malory heart and soul but she does it not out of love but out of the born-in subservience and sexual desire.

Another similar case is the three sisters' perverted sexual desire for American Pilot Babbitt, which further reveals their inherent cringe before the colonizing power that exercises its control over the colonized people by its false public bravado of a certain modern gadget. In a chapter where Babbitt learnt Sima Ku parachuting, the three sisters, namely, First Sister, Third Sister and Sixth Sister, were stricken dumb with mad sexual fancies when they see Babbitt. Being so charmed, Third Sister (Lingdi) believes that she has been "transformed almost completely into the Bird Fairy" (223) and jumps off the precipice as soon as she sees Babbitt bails out. Her death exposes her overwhelmed ignorance and blind admiration that the colonized people would have. However, the most perverted love is First Sister's sexual offer for Babbitt. She cries at the side of Third Sister's corpse, however, at the sight of Babbitt she "held up her purple floral pompon and got to her feet, a smile on her face. She stepped over the Bird Fairy's corpse, stared at Babbitt, and shifted her body under her loose black robe. Her movements were jumpy, like someone with a full bladder. She took a few mincing steps, threw away her floral pompon, and flung herself at Babbitt, wrapping her arms around his neck and flattening her body against his. "Lust," she mutters, as if feverish, "suffering" (228). This perversion indicates her mental disorder evoked not only by the "Lust" for a man, but also a "Lust" for being controlled. Sixth Sister fulfills what First Sister cries for. She regards Babbitt as "A god descending to the land of mortals!" (223) Her total devotion of herself to Babbitt under the parachute also indicates the passion that the colonized people usually assume—"her heart filling with reverence and ardent love for him" (223).

Mo Yan's experiences in literary creation seem to be justified and be awarded with this self-colonization. He develops a particular "muckraking impulse" and exposes the so-called dark side of China's reality by portraying characters that concern themselves passionately with sexual intercourse. His thematic concerns lead him to aesthetic perversity—he greatly indulges in depicting ugliness, distortion and evilness. The resultant tension and the socially conscious vision thereof he creates in his novels carry the full freight of his literary and ideological accumulations and develop a sensitive stance and nuanced voice for China's society and touch a nerve among neocolonialists. Furthermore, Mo Yan's historical enquiry into China's political movements such as "Land Reform" and its consequences invokes the apocalyptic vision of historical closure and reflects not only the crushing effects of the Chinese people's poverty, ignorance and obsession with sexual affairs while time remains but also a predictable reaction against most of Chinese traditional discourse.

The Chinese critics as well as Western critics share a kind of common premonitory sympathy and tremor of these perversities narrated in Mo Yan's novels. Yet, more to the point is that Mo Yan's winning of the Nobel Prize in Literature that invigorates the whole Chinese literary circle including the writers, the critics as well as the professors, who have long been anxious and restless or impatient to wait for the applause from the West, particularly since the government's call for Chinese culture's "walking-out." The shaping power of criticism plays an important role in China's anomic literary circle, featuring an increasing focus on self-adaptation to the Western world that has been partially characterized the modern China. A significant number of Chinese writers take special efforts to find ways to contact foreign translators for their works; still many writers drive their narrative to the very core of the Western inherent bias against Chinese people and Chinese culture, turning modern Chinese literary sensibility from suffering to pleasure and the structure of feeling from independence to dependence and thus establishing and defining modern Chinese literature as a distinctive literary genre of self-adaptation.

Together with the literary critics, many professors in China's universities join the chorus to sing high praise of this self-adaptation without any theoretical stringency, as their critical stance and viewpoints depart far from the richly conflicted literary imagination in the most vivid and engaging fashion that well refracts Chinese literary tradition and the Chinese people's modern life. The professors who work on theory of translation take trendy stance to the self-adaptation, developing a set of challenging concepts that are opposed to Chinese literary tradition but central to neocolonialism. For example, at the conference on "Literary Walking-Out from Mo Yan's Winning of the Prize" hosted by Shanghai University, a domestically well-known scholar asserted that "the translation of Chinese literature is to be done by translators from the targeted language" (Liu and Xu 6-17). Some other scholars already theorize Goldblatt's concept of translation, i.e. "translating is rewriting" with essays constructed on Western terms without a further consideration of its argument and logic (Wu 138-139). What is more, the major domestic newspaper and media invariably associate Mo Yan's winning of the prize with Goldblatt's translation, boasting the key role of Goldblatt played in the event. For example, *Liberation Daily* and *People's Daily* (overseas) applauds Goldblatt's contribution, entitling him as "the first midwife" of Chinese literary literature.

Chinese writers are no slower than the scholars to chase after Goldblatt. They set their nerves on edge to meet or expect to meet Goldblatt in hope that he would put their works on his table to wait in line for his translation. Willingly they would regard what he translates as a weather vane that indicates the general trends of Western idiosyncrasy and the direction that Chinese writers should follow. For better, the tension between the official push to "walking-out" and the personal rush to follow the Western trends urges Chinese scholars and writers to assume a pragmatic attitude of cultural cringe and become submissive as if they "live in a post-colonial neo-colonized world" (Spivak 166), For worse, some of the Chinese scholars sit down under the rule of "publish or perish". They find that Mo Yan's winning of the Nobel Prize and Goldblatt's translation are such good opportunities for them that they are overcome with joy that they can snatch the hot topic and strike up papers and thus survive. Such rallying-sense can bring together for common cultural and political purposes groups whose only link is a shared traumatic memory of oppression. To put in other words, the most phenomenal upsurge of Chinese

scholars' as well as Chinese writers' responses to Mo Yan's winning of the Nobel Prize in Literature and Goldblatt's translation introduce a new note that they are in fact "not able to express themselves, they must have to be expressed" (Said xi). This "not able to express" or "have to be expressed" in nature refracts the mindset of a group of self-colonized people.

Nonetheless, to say that those Chinese writers, critics and professors of not being able to express themselves but having to be expressed are self-colonized does not mean to broaden the historical and conceptual frame of neo-colonization, but to explain the phenomenon that is continuously present and continuously in process of becoming and transforming for a long period of time. Although the tangible or substantial ensemble of European colonial empires were dismantled in the second half of the twentieth century, the world is neo-colonized culturally, politically and economically in the name of globalization, which might be varied in form and degree but does not in nature. In this sense, the term of neocolonialism that is usually defined as the Western power that is "still intent on maintaining maximum indirect control over erstwhile colonies, via political, cultural and above all economic channels" (Childs and Williams 5) now can be redefined as well in reversal as *Western power's control over erstwhile colonies or decolonized nation via self-colonization politically, culturally and economically*. Self-colonization that affects the particular area of Chinese literature's "walking-out" at present inscribes itself in the nature of translation as an exchange of production and commodities, in those writers, critics and professors who are passive participants in the process Chinese literature's "walking-out" dominated by the West but active applicators of theories constructed by the West's terms and aspiring admirers of being internationally institutionalized by the West. Furthermore, this inscription makes the writers, critics and professors refuse to a position that empowers their rights as a writers, critics or professors and ultimately leaves them incapable of making right judgment and right decision or in a state of being a will-to-powerlessness. Their political and social statues at home and abroad reinforce one another, commonly subjugating them spiritually submissive and creatively impotent.

Works Cited

- Ashcroft, Bill. Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin. *The Empire Writes Back, Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literature*. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Childs, Peter and Patrick Williams. *An Introduction to Post-Colonial Theory*. London: Prentice Hall, 1997.
- Goldblatt, Howard. *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*. "Introduction." New York: Arcade Publishing Inc., 2004, vii-xii.
- Goldblatt, Howard (葛浩文). 《葛浩文随笔》(*Sketches by H. Goldblatt*). Beijing: Modern Publishing House, 2014.
- Goldblatt, Howard (葛浩文). 《中国文学如何走出去?》("How Can Chinese Literature Walk Out?"). Trans. Lin Lijun, *Literature Weekly*, July 3, 2014.
- Guo, Juan. "Goldblatt, Translator." <http://www.eeo.com.cn/eobserve/Business_lives/Art/2009/03/24/133257.shtml>.
- Ji, Jin (季进). 《我译故我在——葛浩文访谈录》("I translate and I am—An Interview with H. Goldblatt"), *Contemporary Writer Review*, No. 6 (2009): 45-56.
- Jiang, Shu Li (蒋淑丽). "Goldblatt and Xiao Hong", *Bookroom*, No. 2 (2014): 68-71.
- Nkrumah, Kwame. *Neo-Colonialism: The Last Stage of Imperialism*, New York: International Publishers, 1965.
- Li, Wenjing (李文静). 中国文学英译的合作、协商与文化传播——汉英翻译家葛浩文与林丽君访谈 (Collaboration, Negotiation and Cultural Communication—An Interview with Translators H. Goldblatt and Lin Lijun). *China Translation*. No. 1, 2012, 57-60.
- Liu, Yun Hong and Xu Jun. "Literary Translation Model and Translation of Chinese Literature." *Journal of Foreign Languages*, Vol. 37.3 (2014): 6-17.
- Luo, Yu (罗屿). 葛浩文: 美国人喜欢唱反调的作品 "Goldblatt: Americans Love Literary Works That Strike up a Discordant Tune". *New Era Weekly*, No. 10 (2008): 120-121.
- Mo, Yan. *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*. trans. Howard Goldblatt. New York: Arcade Publishing Inc., 2004.
- Singer, Isaac Bashevis and Richard Burgin. *Conversation with Isaac Bashevis Singer*. New York: Doubleday,

1985.

Said, Edward. *Orientalism*. New York: Random House, 1979.

Spivak, Gayatri. *The Post-Colonial Critic: Interviews, Strategies, Dialogues*, ed. Sarah Harasym. London: Routledge, 1990.

Wu, Ping. (吴萍)《翻译即重写——以葛浩文〈肥乳丰臀〉英译本为例》("Translation Is Rewriting—In Case of Goldblatt's Translation of *Big Breasts and Wide Hips*"), *Overseas English*, No. 9, (2015): 138-139.

Author's profile: Guoqiang Qiao teaches narratology, literary theory and American literature at Shanghai International Studies University. His interests in scholarship include narratology, literary theory and American literature. Qiao's major publications include *Narrated Literary History*, Beijing University Press (2017), *Saul Bellow Studies*, Yilin Press (2014), *American Jewish Literature*, Commercial Publishing House (2008), *The Jewishness of Isaac Bashevis Singer*, Peter Lang (2003), and "Frame, Preference and Memory in Literary History Narration," *Comparative Literature and Culture* (2018). Email: <qiaoguoqiang@163.com>