

INTRODUCTION

In this issue of *The Wenshan Review*, eight contributors—including scholars, working translators, translator-scholars, and poet-translators—offer their reflections on this question: how does the inescapable subjectivity of the translator—and by this we mean their beliefs (both examined and unexamined), preferences, politics, linguistic and cultural fluency, gender, memories, and even their inner life—shape the literary and linguistic intervention that we call “translation”? And this question, of course, implies others: can the subjective translator’s transformative presence in a text be objectively observed? Can it be curtailed or, even more radically, is it possible for the translator-as-subject to be erased, or at least effectively hidden from view? And if so, is the perfect transparency that such erasure ideally achieves even desirable? What, when all is said and done, are the allegiances and priorities that make translators who—or in some cases what—they are, as they influentially but elusively curate and render literary texts for differently-linguaged readerships, and what imprint can—or should—the hand of the translator leave on the finished product?

We cannot pretend to be the first to recognize the inescapable conundrum presented by these questions. For centuries, writers (including translators who were literary authors and essayists in their own right) worried about the ways in which the translator would inevitably get in the way of an accurate translingual rendering. It is famously alleged that Joachim Du Bellay (ca. 1522-60) in his patriotic appeal to the defense and enrichment of the French language through translation and imitation first raised the concept of “*Traduttore, traditore*” (“Translator, traitor”) in the Italian language, an adage that would resonate with a similar counterpart in the poet-critic’s own mother tongue: “Traduire, c’est trahir” (“To translate is to betray”). No matter which Drydenian translation strategy—metaphrase, paraphrase, or imitation—translators decide to adopt, it was feared that they would find themselves, if not obviously hampered by their own peculiarities and whims, then, as John Dryden (1631-1700) so wittily put it, confined to “the compass of numbers and the slavery of rhyme. ’Tis much like dancing on ropes with fettered legs: a man may shun a

fall by using caution; but the gracefulness of motion is not to be expected.”¹ Whether dancing or falling, is it possible for translators to do either without betraying their own style, experience, and culture—in short, their own subjective presence?

Subjective involvement on the part of the translator demonstrably manifests itself in many of the most celebrated translations, including those by St. Jerome (347-420), Edward Fitzgerald (1809-83), Charles Baudelaire (1821-67), Lin Shu (1852-1924), David Hawkes (1923-2009), Xu Yuanzhong (1921-2021). The enriching timbre of their voices notwithstanding, sometimes a translator’s subjective presence may be deemed to have overwhelmed a given work. One thinks of a judgment made by the critical tribunal over which Matthew Arnold (1822-88) presided, and wonders whether it was “the translator’s subjectivity” that made Cowper’s translation of Homer Miltonically un-Homeric, Pope’s elaborately artificial, Chapman’s idiosyncratically fanciful, and Francis Newman’s pedantically ignoble.

When we first came up with the idea of this special issue, we had particular questions in mind: how do translators walk the fine line between the sin of omission and the sin of commission, or between self-expression and self-effacement in their soulful, and earnest, transmigration of a lyric work? What standards, if any, might be set in advance in order to ensure the transmission of the lyric expression of the original text? Or, alternatively, how might a translator go so far as to explicitly signal their active participation in the transmission of a literary work, without somehow betraying certain aspects of that work? But what we learned is that the very notion of “subjectivity” was more multivalent, and more contested, than we anticipated.

As a quick glance at the Contents will show, the unaddressed, open-ended question of what, exactly, “subjectivity” means functioned as a particularly useful wild card in the shaping of this special issue, drawing an almost impossibly wide range of answers to an otherwise straightforward question (all the more striking for their distribution across such a modest number of essays). Now it is evident that the range of responses in itself provided one possible answer: that subjectivity is so pervasive an element of translation that almost

¹ Dryden, John. “The Three Types of Translation and Steering Betwixt Two Extremes.” *Western Translation Theory from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. 2nd ed. Ed. Douglas Robinson. London: Routledge, 2002. 171-75. Print. (p. 172)

any serious consideration of translation takes it—in one form or another—into account.

In hindsight, then, this issue might just as well have been titled, not “Literary Translation and the Subjectivity of the Translator,” but something more suggestive of mutuality and interdependence—perhaps “Subjectivity/ Translation,” or conveyed in a graphic design that sets the two words in a visually intertwined figure of some kind. This is not to suggest, however, that there is no reason to the madness, or that subjectivity is therefore useless as a heuristic. To the contrary, a clear and telling pattern can indeed be discerned in this seemingly inchoate cluster of essays, one that sets the notions of “subjectivity” and “translator” in a mutually defining (rather than a unidirectionally delimiting) relationship, with each of the two terms deepening its counterpart in thought-provoking ways. Furthermore, we reasoned, where there is a “range” of responses to a single question, there is also likely to be a pattern, perhaps an implied sequence or continuum of yet-to-be-realized values or standards. And in this case, it became apparent that one especially salient and intriguing pattern can be organized around the identity of the effective translator, which ranges in scale from the most restrained and individuated entity to the most capacious and collective.

By placing these essays in a relationship that traces a progression from the particular, idiosyncratic, individual agent (who wrestles with those idiosyncrasies in trying to render their ideal translation), to the forces (for they can hardly be called agents) that facilitate and shape translations in the interest of ends—be they commercial, political, or even religious—that were likely ignored by the author, we are effectively drawing our readers’ attention to a slightly different problem than the one we set out to answer. Of course, read independently of each other, many of these essays raise in interesting ways the usual issues that drive translation studies: linguistic and conceptual (in)commensurability, translators’ ulterior motives, inadvertent misprisions, and even the relative value of metaphrase, paraphrase, or imitation. But, read in this particular sequence, the essays that comprise this special issue of *The Wenshan Review* ask its readers to also consider, in aggregate, the rather more elusive elements that are manifest in any translation: those that mark the tensions and intimacies coloring the relationships, betweenness, and movements across the very boundaries that make translation a necessary practice. It is this, after all, that constitutes the essence of translation.

Thinking along these lines, the reader will hopefully be drawn to reflect upon such things as the degrees of intimacy that exist between a text and its translator, or the complex play between psychological drives and societal imperatives that are exerted in any act of translation. The reader might notice as well the tensions that inevitably arise between the translator and any and all of the other agents involved in the process, from the author of the source text to the publication industry, from the imagined readership to the governmental agencies that impose various degrees of censorship. And, set firmly at the core of all of these relationships, of course, there is the most intimate level of betweenness to consider: that separating the translator-as-reader from the translator-as-writer, the act of reception from that of presentation. All of these, we would argue, bring us closer to understanding the texture of that ineffable connection between subjectivity and translation.

In this spirit, we begin our special issue with David Ball—who is most emphatically not a theorist, but a practitioner of translation—and his sharply delineated portrait of the translator as an autonomous agent. Ball pushes back against the tendencies of the most influential theories of the day, describing the many ways in which he functions as a free agent, choosing his source texts according to personal matters of taste and sympathies, upholding the right to translate texts that he and others may find profoundly abhorrent, and grappling always with the complexities of language. Here, the translator's subjectivity is easy to recognize as such: a subjectivity that corresponds to an individual "subject," a person bearing an identifying name and a (potentially, if not actually) legible biography. At the other end of the spectrum, we have translating entities that are almost impossible to reconcile with any idea of the human, let alone with the inner life we associate with subjectivity—even though identifiable people executed the task and appended their names. Thus, towards the end of our collection, we find Richard Rong-bin Chen, who applies directly the theories of Lawrence Venuti and André Lefevere, such that he obscures, if not excises entirely, any hint of the translator's internality and agency in the final product. In such cases, the effective translator—the agent that causes the work to appear in a different language—is contained by only the fuzziest of boundaries, and therefore may perhaps best be thought of as a composite rather than an individual entity. But reading these two seemingly oppositional articles in close proximity, one is overtaken with the sense that, first of all, Chen's composite-translating-agent (for want of a more descriptive

term), which motivates and executes a translation of Hemingway in response to, say, his targeted audience's feelings about the Spanish Civil War, is not so much non-subjective as it is poly-subjective. His is a translator that corresponds to a kind of hive-mind that, nevertheless, has its positionality and its intentionality.

It is our hope, as editors of this issue, that its readers will take seriously the importance of betweenness to the practice of translation, and read between the lines that divide essay from essay, and beginning from end.

Before turning to the summation of those essays, however, it seems appropriate to confront yet another instantiation of translational betweenness: that which divides theory and practice. Those of us who have worked on the frontlines of translation as translators, theorists, or translingual literary scholars who must deal with both, recognize the tension, if not the absolute disconnection, between theory and practice. This dichotomization is common across many disciplines (one thinks readily of theater vs. performance studies, art practice and art history, composition and music theory, or filmmaking and film theory), but it is no less intriguing for that. Recently, one co-editor of this journal issue, Paula Varsano, conducted a casual but rather telling experiment in the context of a colleague's methodology seminar at her home institution in the US, the University of California at Berkeley. She was curious to find out what relatively naïve, but well-educated bilingual readers believed to be most essential in the practice of translation. The following is an account, in her own words:

Recently, I was invited to talk about translation in a methodology seminar for first-year Asian Studies MA students at my institution. The students in the program come from all over the world, and specialize in a range of disciplines, from literature to economics, and from political science to art history. Their interest in Asia aside, the members of this particular group seemed to have little in common, except for one thing: all of them work across at least two languages. They read and analyze texts in Chinese, or Japanese, or Korean, or Hindi, as well as in English, but participate in seminars and write research papers (including their thesis) exclusively in English, inserting as appropriate translations of portions of the primary or secondary sources that

they consult and cite. Just a handful of the students specialize in literature, but all of them profess an abiding interest in it.

The aim of the methodology course is to both introduce the various research methods and theories they will need in order to produce original research, and train them in casting a critical eye on any methods or theories they adopt. Given these goals, a presentation on translation methods would typically involve an overview of the most common translation theories, followed by an expressed preference for a particular one, and conclude with an interactive close reading of an exemplary translation (in my case, that would be a translation of a particular poem, since classical Chinese poetry is my field).

But this time, instead, I presented them with a task.

I distributed to the class a handout containing a well-known eight-line “regulated poem” by the Tang Dynasty poet, Wang Wei, certainly familiar to those in the class who grew up in China or Taiwan, and perhaps to others as well. The handout provided them with the full poem in its original language, but only a partial translation: the first and fourth couplets, with nothing but a large blank space between them. This was the space into which their own translations of the two middle couplets were to be inserted—developed on the basis of the word-for-word literal rendering of the two central couplets, printed at the bottom of the page. After introducing some basic facts about the poet, explaining the fundamental workings of the syntax of its five-character lines, and presenting the context and overall meaning of the poem, I asked them to try their hand at translating those middle couplets. Quietly, they went to work. Occasionally, a student would look up, ask a technical question, and return to their task; but mostly they were silent, and very intent.

After about twenty minutes, they had all put down their pens. Each one in turn then read the translated poem aloud to the class, from beginning to end, including their own couplets. Differences among the renderings were noticed, but only silently; rather than discuss those translations, I surprised the students by asking them to reflect on the *process* they had just undergone, and to describe

what they thought they had been trying to accomplish—what they were attempting to capture in their translations, and why. Their responses were as varied as they were surprising.

Three students said, without any hesitation, that they wanted to convey to the imagined reader the feelings that they themselves—as primary readers—experienced upon reading the poem. One student said she wanted to use her translation to convey the unique beauty of “the Chinese tradition,” but didn’t feel equipped to do so, as she was lacking in sufficient knowledge. Another, a native speaker of Chinese, said he wanted to translate the “sound” of the poem. Yet another, a non-native but fluent reader of Chinese, said he wanted to find the “right words” and “just have it make sense” in English. And, finally, one student—clearly the most sophisticated reader of classical Chinese poetry, and perhaps of literature in general—said she really wished she could find a way to transpose into English the rich ambiguities that make the original poem the subtle verbal work of art that it is, but that her grasp of English was not quite good enough.

And here is what no one said: I want to capture in English what Wang Wei, the poet who wrote the poem, seemed to be trying to convey, himself, as a person who wanted to express a feeling, an idea, a subjective experience.

These students, of course, are not experienced translators, let alone professional ones; and only one of them—who is planning to pursue the PhD—imagines herself engaging deeply with literary texts in the future, dedicating herself to understanding them in their historical, spiritual, and cultural context and then transmitting that understanding to an audience, present and future. The others have no such goals, and are happy to read and engage in translations as needed, on their way to (and, as often as not, *as* a way to reach) other destinations. But the casualness of their encounters with translation, and their utilitarian purposes, do not diminish the importance of those encounters. These young people exist in a world where they confront translated works on a regular basis, both in and out of the classroom. They read, watch, and listen to a range of genres delivered through a variety of media, have access to subtitled and dubbed films from around the world, and even have friends from other countries

with whom they only converse via translation from their respective native languages into the common secondary language of English.

For all their reliance on translation in so many different arenas of their cosmopolitan lives, it is fair to say that they rarely worry about what any given translator may have felt about the works they rendered. It is unlikely that they are attuned to the translators' efforts to replicate sound; nor—if the translation was successful—are they particularly surprised that it ends up making sense. In other words, although at least some of them wanted to showcase their intervention as translators, they seem unconcerned—as readers—with the interventions of the translators on whom they rely. Not that this is unusual or even objectionable. We all know that, with the exception of scholars who are looking for evidence to support a thesis, what most readers (or viewers) seek to understand is the work's intent—its meaning—and not the translator's response to it.

How does this apply, then, to the issue at hand—the imbricated nature of subjectivity and translation? This experiment compels us to ask: what lies at the base of this profound disconnection between a person attempting to translate a work, and that same person reading another's translation? Why would someone aspire to foreground their subjective presence in their translations, while desiring self-erasure in the translators on whom they depend? Without turning this rather random handful of students into exemplars of either the practice or reception of translation, we can nevertheless take to heart the reality that, as much as we would like to rationalize the process, any such rationalization should be met with the utmost skepticism. While translation always attempts reliable communication, it goes beyond that goal and connects individuals through language: individuals who may well make different choices when faced with the same text for reasons that are simply overdetermined. It is wisest, then, to eschew formulas, and to cultivate instead an awareness of patterns. In doing so, we accept that translation theories, observations, and experiences, including those that are offered on these pages, are precisely (and only) as good as the conceptual limits they adopt. If we take seriously, too, Benjamin's anti-theoretical account of the translator's task, then we understand that the effect of any translation far exceeds anyone's capacity to account for it.

In the first essay of this collection, "A Translator's Subjectivity and the Process of Translation: The View of a Working Translator," David Ball, former President of the American Literary Translators Association and Emeritus

Professor of French Literature at Smith College, reflects upon his lifelong practice as a literary translator, working across the border of French and English languages and literatures. Taking up a contrarian position against the theory-driven conversations prevailing in the field of translation studies today, and bristling against the stubbornly vague restrictions suggested by the term “subjectivity,” Professor Ball offers a fine-grained critical analysis of his own process as a free and autonomous reader/translator, taking us from the selection of a text (that he himself finds objectionable both morally and aesthetically) to the key linguistic choices he makes along the way to completion. An explicit testimony to one’s power to intentionally suppress one’s own subjective tendencies when donning the mantle of the translator, this essay rejects out of hand the types of theory that make individual autonomy seem impossible. Arming himself, too, with definitions of “subjectivity” found in the *Oxford English Dictionary (OED)*, he ultimately emerges as a translator with a firm sense of ethical obligation to both his source text and his reader, who takes ownership of his own “aesthetic preference” and engages in an intentional “negotiation between conflicting imperatives” (11). This is, as noted above, our opening example of the most sharply defined scope of the subjectivity of the translator.

In our next essay, “Bias and Values in Translation: The Unspoken in Roald Dahl’s Children’s Novel *Matilda* and its Translations in Taiwan,” Chen-Wei Yu—engages in a Lacanian and Freudian psychoanalytical interpretation of Roald Dahl’s representative juvenile literature, *Matilda*, and goes on to demonstrate how Dahl’s unspoken intentions—particular aspects of his unconscious that manifest in the novel—are, in turn, filtered through and further transformed by the unconscious of two of its Taiwanese translators. In Yu’s psychoanalytic reading of *Matilda*, gaps in the narrative reveal Dahl’s unconscious desire to compel the rebellious Matilda to submit, ultimately, to paternal power. Yu’s comparative study of two Chinese translations of *Matilda*—by He Feng-Yi 何風儀 and Chang Tzu-Chang 張子樟—respectively, lays bare the conscious and the unconscious interactions the translators conduct with the unspoken messages in the source text. According to the author, He’s innovative translation not only gestures toward a rejection of Dahl’s intent to subjugate Matilda but also empathizes with the children whereas Chang’s rendition, which remains largely faithful to the original text, accentuates Matilda’s autonomous agency and adheres to Dahl’s intention to

tame the child heroine. The two translations diverge in ethical judgement, narratorial perspective, and target audience, such that each points to the other in a fruitful contemplation of the road not taken. In a sense, this essay delves even deeper than Ball's did in its focus on the translator as subjective individual, but calls into question—through the implementation of a psychoanalytic reading—the autonomy, not just of the translators, but also of the author himself.

Our third article, “Gilberto Owen: Between Translation and Creation,” by Juan Carlos Calvillo, provides our special issue with a unique Mexican perspective. By broadening our conceptual field to incorporate both the translator as individual go-between and the translator as creator, this article asks us to look at specific, intrinsic motivations that shape the dual achievements that such an agent seeks. To explore this phenomenon, Calvillo draws on the works by Gilberto Owen (1904-52), an important Mexican avant-garde poet of the *Contemporáneos* generation whose translation practice and scope constitute a core component of his own creative works. With copious textual illustrations, including Owen's signature poem “Sindbad Stranded,” Calvillo demonstrates how the process of literary translation is deliberately undertaken by this Mexican poet to incorporate the themes, techniques, interests, and aesthetics of the source English, French, and Italian works of literature into his own imaginative process. By so doing, Owen recasts the act of literary translation itself to imperceptibly form and ferment his own subjectivity as a creative author working in the Spanish language as spoken in Mexico.

Matthew Mewhinney's essay, “Translating ‘Jamesian Precisions’ in Natsume Sōseki's *Light and Dark*,” serves as a most suitable counterpoint to that by Calvillo. Like Calvillo, Mewhinney also considers, if indirectly, the creative realm of transcultural inspiration, but does so with a twist: one of the translators he discusses, John Nathan, opts to make salient the otherwise subtle foreign literary influences that shape the original source text. The case at hand is particularly vexed by the fact that the source of influence resides in the literary culture—not of the author, but of the translator. To show how this works, Mewhinney engages in what we might call a two-way translational investigation. He compares and contrasts John Nathan's 2014 English translation of Sōseki's unfinished 1916 Japanese novel *Meian* (which he titles *Light and Dark*) with the 1971 English version rendered by V. H. Viglielmo, *Light and Darkness*. Deploying a tripartite layout of carefully chosen bilingual textual illustrations, the author points out that while Viglielmo's translation

tends to adhere to the original language and style, Nathan's rendition is subtly, artfully shaped by his own interpretive, and quite intrusive, subjectivity: one that not only imitates Henry James' microscopic examinations of human consciousness, as embodied in the free indirect discourse that would become the hallmark of his novelistic innovation, but that also harks back to brother William James' own analyses of human psychology as laid out in his *Principles of Psychology* (1890). The term "Jamesian Precisions" in the title does kill (at least) two birds with one stone—two human birds in the case, for it refers to Sōseki's embrace of the "precisions" that characterize the work of Henry and William James, and it further signals translator Nathan's own care for precision, that of situating Sōseki's work in the global context of literary and intellectual history.

In "Translating Hemingway: A Case of Cultural Politics," Richard Rongbin Chen broadens our scope even further to examine the unique translation history of Hemingway's celebrated novel, *A Farewell to Arms*, in four different countries around the globe: France, Italy, Spain and China. In most cases, the individual literary translator's agency is subject to relentless tests and such nonpoetical factors as partisan ideology, political ambience and cultural manipulation, all of which tend to prevail over literary and aesthetic considerations. Western theorists of translation associated with the so-called "cultural turn" in translation studies, such as André Lefevere, Lawrence Venuti, and Anthony Pym are among the theorists who figure large in this study, as Chen argues that Lefeverian manipulation theory can be used to galvanize the Venutian preoccupation with cultural, political and economic concerns. Pym, too, is marshalled as a guide for the contextualization of translation practice on a global scale, offering what is known as the "five W's": "Who translated what, how, where, when, for whom and with what effect." Chen's case-study approach to the translations of Hemingway's novel into French, Italian, Spanish and Chinese defends the validity of "translation as cultural politics," and stands as perhaps the largest-scale, most capacious conceptualization of the translating subject in this issue, so much so as to obviate the role of individual subjectivity altogether. Nevertheless, as Chen recognizes, a distinct and nuanced resistance to these various extrinsic forces is manifest in the Chinese translation, an observation that speaks volumes for the steadfastness of some translators' intrinsic literary subjectivity.

In his essay, “Stitch and Suture: Translating Emily Dickinson in Brazil,” Adalberto Müller draws on his own subjective experience of translating Emily Dickinson’s complete poems into Brazilian Portuguese, a project that took him more than eight years to complete, to shed light on the mysterious serendipity of poetry translation. He describes his method as “stitch and suture.” The act of “stitching” forces the translator to adopt an “editorial” position that ensures coherence and harmony within each poem as well as across Dickinson’s entire body of work. The process of “suturing” makes room for the instability of the Dickinsonian signifiers, including the Belle of Amherst’s ellipses, variants, alternatives, erasures, suppressions, and interpretative disagreements, which slant both her intellectual light and her poetic rhyme. Thus embracing what he recognizes as Dickinson’s regime of indeterminacy and integrating it into his translations, Müller demonstrates how Dickinson’s poetics inspires creativity in her translators, spurring them to search for ways to mimic her mode of elusive signification. In his own translations, meaning may only flicker in a discursive semiotic chain, or it may defy symbolic apprehension, in a way that evokes Derridean *différance*. And it is precisely this self-subsuming stance that, somewhat ironically, enables the literary translator to launch his work into a Benjaminian *Nachleben*—afterlife.

Taking us even closer to the most perfect—and also most troubling—example of a translator’s self-subsumption is An-Nie Hsu’s article, “The Invisible Translator and the Translator Concealed: The Case of the German Translation of *Mazu’s Bodyguards*.” Supported by an interview with the Taiwanese novelist herself, along with a plethora of quantitative and qualitative data, the author reveals how the translators’ subjectivity has been deliberately concealed by their German editor, whose commercially driven goals required as domesticated a rendering as possible. This example of the German translation of Taiwanese literature adroitly defends André Lefevere’s manipulation school. The story of how the German editor-translator, Ricarda Holms, brings to bear her editorial power in concealing her co-translators’ visibility and subjectivity also stands as a veritable study of Venuti’s “domestication” strategy. In conclusion, Hsu skillfully offers suggestions to future translators as to how they might more successfully and ethically ferry Taiwan literature onto Western soil; tellingly, her suggestion does not require the complete erasure of the translator’s subjectivity.

In our final piece, “The Mask of the Translator,” Jeffrey Yang presents a different kind of essay. A renowned American poet in his own right, and the poetry editor for *New Directions* (the publishing house that introduced Ezra Pound to the English-language poetry-reading world), Yang’s editorial career has been tightly connected with the problematics we address in this special issue of *The Wenshan Review*. Here, he offers a prose-poem series of vignettes not unlike some of the works of Anne Carson. Weaving his own poetics into reflections on translation’s capacity to converge multiple subjectivities, he subtly draws his readers into his own process of literary translation. Yang’s is a style that, if not quite Benjaminian, stands in counterpoint to David Ball’s opening argument, even as both are based on their respective real-world experience as working translators and authors. With intimacy and mystery, Yang’s kaleidoscopic vignettes bring to our attention an array of aesthetic and ethical questions: on poetry, art, translation, calligraphy, and patriotism, diaspora, the memory of his grandfather, and his grandfather’s longing for the recovery of the Chinese mainland. Then, unexpectedly, this carousel of thoughts and feelings merges in Yang’s translation of a portion of the Song Dynasty poet, Lu You’s (陸游 1125-1210) poem, “Feeling the Cold Upon Leaving the Gate as Autumn Night Dawn Breaks” (秋夜將曉出籬門迎涼有感 Qiuye jiang xiao chu limen yingliang yougan), which Yang renders as “Feeling the Cold Upon Leaving the Gate as Autumn Night Dawn Breaks.”

With this final essay, our special issue on the subjectivity of the translator (or subjectivity/translation) comes full circle. Perhaps the high-level perspective offered by translation theory makes more apparent the systemic conditions that allow translators like Ball and Yang to consciously eschew, modulate, or embrace their subjectivity while, in other contexts, theoretical discourse may tend to deprive other translators of that option. And, conversely, a bold focus on a flagrantly “subjective” translator can serve to remind us of the importance of the micro-decisions, essential to any translation, which are otherwise simply overlooked. We hope that this holistic view of the dynamic relationships that are in play—that join the work, the translator, and the translator’s real-world context into an ever-expanding sphere—might spur further considerations of how to recognize and value the subjectivity of all working translators (including its potential to be intentionally set aside by any

particular translator), and to keep our sights on the multiple, linguistically fertile relationships that it engenders.

Min-Hua Wu, Associate Professor
Department of English, National Chengchi University

Paula Varsano, Professor
Chinese Literature, University of California, Berkeley