2012

Shamrocks and Chopsticks: Representations of Nationalism in Two Chinese Translations of James Joyce's Ulysses

Kelley Shannon McLaughlin
Bard College

Shamrocks and Chopsticks

Representations of Nationalism in Two Chinese Translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*

Kelley S. McLaughlin

Shamrocks and Chopsticks: Representations of Nationalism in Two Chinese Translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*

A Senior Project Kelley S. McLaughlin
Conducted Under the Tutelage of Lihua Ying
Bard College
2011-2012

Acknowledgements

I need to express my sincere gratitude to Ross Greenwood and Leng Sining for their help in procuring materials; Liu Ziqian, Leng Sining and Zhang Jin for their insight as Chinese people; Cassandra Olson for sharing her knowledge of Republican and Communist Era propaganda as well as for being the first civilian victim of my introduction; Willem Molesworth for sharing his knowledge of post-colonial literary theory; Luisa Lopez and Alexandra (Sasha) Patkin for being even further off the deep end than myself every step of the way and for Bloomsday celebrations; and Jeannette Benham, for bottomless mugs of tea and tedious hours of staring out the window, trying to find the perfect word. Also, thanks are owed to whoever first decided that putting leaves in a mug with hot water was a good idea. Without constantly refreshed infusions, the tea in my system would have dried up long ago and left me with nothing but blood, and blood is nowhere near strong enough to get you through a project like this.

For their infinite patience with my infinite questions—and timely answers!—at all hours of the day, I would like to thank professors Gregory Moynahan, Andrew Schoenbaum, and Terence Dewsnap.

Most importantly, I am indebted to my primary advisor, Ying Lihua, for putting up with my many months of insanity, my unceasing questions, my immovable stubbornness, and my frustration on this journey. Not everyone would have agreed to let me tackle a topic as challenging and obscure as this, and even fewer would have been willing to learn as much as she did to accommodate me. Somehow, we both survived, and I suspect that has a lot more to do with her than with me.

Photo courtesy of Ross Greenwood

“A nation that keeps one eye on the past is wise.
A nation that keeps two eyes on the past is blind.”
~Anonymous
The Garrick pub in Belfast, Northern Ireland

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION

> "No, the fault lies with the artists," Claire went on. "The writers, the singers, the tellers of tales. It's them that take the past and recreate it to their liking. Them that could take a fool and give you back a hero, take a sot and make him a king."[1]

These words were written to repudiate modern representations of 'Bonnie Prince Charlie'[2] as a hero of Scottish history, because in reality the man was nothing of the sort. Glorious depictions and fond memories of the young pretender exist because of something far more complex than a single man; he was vying for his throne, but in order to raise an army he had the inspired idea to stir up the nationalist sentiment of his countrymen—countrymen that he'd never met. That is why people honor him to this day, because he was a *nationalist*, because he was fighting—or at least pretending to fight—for his country.[3]

The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines 'nationalism' as "a sense of national consciousness exalting one nation above all others and placing primary emphasis on promotion of its culture and interests as opposed to those of other nations or supranational groups."[4]

When discussing James Joyce's *Ulysses*, one of the most intricate issues to engage is that of nationalism. Whether or not Joyce himself was a nationalist is a vexing question still today, but the fact remains that his novels, his short stories, and even his short drama *Exiles* are layered with levels of meaning, and chief among these buried messages are near-constant pro-nationalist/anti-loyalist references.

Emer Nolan has argued that "Joyce's unyielding pacifism strictly circumscribes any possible debate about his nationalist 'sympathies.'"[5] While it is true that the author Joyce would not have lifted a hand against the English, that does not mean he would not or did not lift a pen against them. Whether or not *Ulysses* can be understood as a nationalist epic, it does

reject violence and the stereotypically Irish notion of the times that renewal was a product of bloodshed, especially as romanticized by the celebrated poet and active nationalist Pádraig Pearse, himself executed during the fallout from the Easter 1916 uprising.[6]

The blatant satire surrounding the Citizen[7] in the twelfth episode of the text is confirmation of this; as Nolan argues, the Citizen embodies the stereotype of the Irish individual as a terrorist. He contrasts this stereotype against that of the Irish as poets, and claims that the two are not necessarily mutually exclusive, that the Irish poet and the Irish terrorist are merely two forms of what he calls "practically incompetent Celts[s]."[8] Thus even though the Irish Literary Revival was technically separate from the Fenian (Republican) movement, it was not in fact completely removed from it. Writers including Joyce, and even William Butler Yeats, fall into the category of the practically incompetent Celt, devoted to the doctrine of inaction, or as they themselves would have it, pacifism.

The Irish replacement of culture with politics has long aggrieved critics and historians, and Joyce hoped to rectify that conception of Irish literature by giving birth to something more modern, a "protagonist engaged with cultural memory and national identifications, but not eclipsed by them."[9] David Lloyd would carry the understanding of this particular construction one step further, to claim that this modern individual, who is the new nationalist hero, although physically separated from his nation, has found the 'spirit of the nation' and embodies the promised national unity that someday will reach his fellow men.[10]

What this all means is that, in fact, *Ulysses* is precisely all of that; a loaded non-violent anti-nationalist nationalist epic.

This project will explore *Ulysses* as a nationalist text from a Chinese perspective in three

steps. In the first chapter, I will examine the idiom of nationalism in the footnotes of two Chinese translations of *Ulysses* that were both published in 1994. In the second chapter, I will examine the translation of specific ethnic voices in the body of the novel itself. In the third chapter, I will further examine interpretations of *Ulysses* in the critical eye of the Chinese reader in order to firmly establish the perceived role of nationalism, the will of the translator, and the outcome of the translations in their intended audiences.

The 'why' of such a project may not be immediately clear to the unsuspecting reader, but it is inherently interesting that the first two translations of such a novel were both published in 1994. Given that that date is already seven decades after the novel was originally published, why was there such a rush to get it on the market that they came out one on top of the other? Maybe it is not important that both were published in the same year, but what the historical landscape of the 1990s was.

Ulysses made some ripples in China as soon as it hit the ground in 1922, just two decades after the Chinese began to really explore western literature, when the frenzied translation of the turn of the century had not quite died out yet. At the time, perhaps the style was too new and it was too daunting a task to translate *Ulysses* in its entirety. Of course, so many countries were reluctant to publish *Ulysses* because of its content that censorship certainly was an issue.[11]

Published at the end of the great wave of translation, it managed to catch the eye of some Chinese scholars, like the poet Xu Zhimo. Unfortunately, despite the efforts of Xu and others, it was a bad moment for *Ulysses*, because even though the individual was becoming the center of some scholarly thought under the care of Hu Shi, there was the Chinese crisis of nation that would overpower that, led by such writers and scholars as Lu Xun.

Up until the rise of the Communist Party and its control of the publishing industry in 1949, the principal factors working against *Ulysses* were its genre and style; the vast majority of Western literature being translated and Chinese literature being written at the time is classified as realist, and were meant to be accessible to the everyday reader, two things which *Ulysses* is not.

The two branches of this tendency, one embracing literary realism and one espousing literature for the everyman, in large part grew out of the May Fourth Movement, which began in 1919. The movement was sparked by the western powers' refusal to return German occupied land to China after the First World War. Instead, they recognized Japan's claims to those same territories, provisioned for in the Treaty of Versailles: Article 156 transferred the occupied territories to Japanese rule.

Students in Beijing hit the streets in protest of the Treaty. The revolution in 1911 to overthrow the Qing dynasty had wanted modernization, but the change effected by the replacement of one form of government with another had only whetted the public appetite. The May Fourth Movement in 1919 became an ideal medium for the expression of this desire: inspired by Western texts and thought, the students rejected the clan system, traditional morality, and Confucianism.

The social side of the movement had been initiated earlier on, in 1916, as coincidence would have it. There was a push from Chinese intellectuals to make culture more accessible to all social groups. To this end, the traditional system of writing known as *wenyanwen* (文言文), a language that required years of formal education to master, was replaced with a new system based on vernacular Chinese, called *baihuawen* (白话文), with the purpose of making writing

accessible and relevant to everyday life. The effect of this combined cultural and social revolution on translation practices was that most of the foreign literature being brought into China was realist.

Obviously, *Ulysses* came onto the international scene at an importunate time for western literature in China. China was faced with serious social and political problems, and radical Marxist ideology was believed to offer solutions. Leftwing literature dominated the Chinese market, and the Maoist regime took the position that literature should only be used to promote and extol the virtue of the laboring peasant classes. Unorthodox, blasphemous *Ulysses*, in all its bawdy glory and anti-heroism, would have been seen as in direct opposition to such a stance.

In some way, the lightening of the burden of history that *Ulysses* suggests would have suited the motives of the May Fourth movement and its iconoclastic stance, and later the Cultural Revolution. However, the May Fourth movement was preoccupied with enlightening the masses, and the Cultural Revolution was an absolutely isolationist movement that banned Western writing. Under the Maoist regime, speakers of Western languages came under suspicion. Additionally, the stark anti-heroism and focused attention on the individual as the ultimate would prevent *Ulysses* from being a top candidate for translation in such a political environment. Furthermore, this era in China was also marked by its almost non-extant output of any fiction with literary value; the figure quoted by Perry Link for the years 1949 to 1966 is an average of eight domestic novels per year,[12] and the bulk of these were fictional works of propaganda in support of Party policies and ideology. This is because almost immediately after 1949, the autonomy garnered by intellectuals between the overthrow of the Qing and during

the May Fourth movement evaporated. It was replaced by Mao's own Marxist/Leninist construction of intellectualism, which subjected artists and intellectuals to Party campaigns to eradicate individual nonconformist thoughts and actions.

In 1976, the Cultural Revolution ended, and with it the Maoist regime and its control over literary production. The movement that emerged was the so-called 'Root-Searching Movement'（寻根派）, which aimed to ground literature in traditional Chinese culture. Parallel and antithetical to that was the recommencement of relations with the West through Deng Xiaoping's Open Door Policy. The influx of foreign literature and literary theories resumed as China began to play a lightning round of the catch-up game.

Some of the better known authors that were translated in the 1980s and 1990s are Agatha Christie, William Faulkner, C. P. Snow, Eudora Welty, Norman Mailer, John le Carré, and Alex Haley. But aside from these more innocuous authors, other postmodernist writers were also introduced into China. Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel* (*La vie de Gargantua et de Pantagruel*) was translated in 1981, the first volume of Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* (*À la recherche du temps perdu*) in 1987, the first abridged version of Nabakov's *Lolita* and Márquez's *One Hundred Years of Solitude* (*Cien años de soledad*) in 1989, and Cervantes' *Don Quixote de la Mancha* was retranslated in 1994. Translating this particular selection of texts, as well as those of Virginia Woolf, Gertrude Stein *et al*, served the dual purposes of giving to the audience new and truly modern literature, as well as providing inspiration for contemporary Chinese writers.

All this is not to say that *Ulysses* was ignored in China until its translations in 1994. In fact, the opposite is true. Xu Zhimo was studying at Cambridge when *Ulysses* was finally published

in Britain in 1922. He read it immediately, and praised it in his usual extravagant tone,

> This novel is probably not unique just this year, but perhaps in this entire era. The last 100 pages is truly pure 'Prose'[13]; as smooth as cheese and as illuminating as the stone alters found in churches. Not only are there no capital letters, but there are also no bothersome punctuation marks at all, and it's not divided into chapters or sections or sentences. It is like a large bolt of white silk hanging down, a waterfall falling up, seamless—truly a great work by a great westerner![14]

In 1935, Zhou Libo[15] wrote *Joyce*, which opposed *Ulysses* entirely, as again would happen in 1950 with Zhu Guangqian, and in 1964 in the article "Review of the American Stream of Consciousness Novel."[16] In 1979, Qian Zhongshu used the language of *Ulysses* to explain the bizarre lexicon of the famous Chinese work *Records of the Grand Historian*.[17] And finally, in 1981, the second episode of *Ulysses* was published in translation in the journal *Selected Works of Modern Foreign Fiction.*[18]

Why *did* Jin and Xiao-Wen choose to translate *Ulysses* at a time when China was attempting to bolster its own sense of self? In his introduction to the text, Xiao wrote, "it doesn't matter whether or not you like it, it will always be this century's miracle of human literary creation."[19] He believed, too, that even if Chinese readers were not ready for this kind of literature themselves they should at least be aware that the West has such a text as *Ulysses*, and understand its artistic intentions and writing techniques. He believed when he first read it in the 1940s and when he translated it in the 1990s that it would have some effect on Chinese writers.

In Jin's introduction, much less emphasis is placed on his encounter with the novel. His self-proclaimed goal in the translation is to produce a text as true to the original as possible, with the hopes of replicating the effects of the original on an English reader in a Chinese reader as closely as possible. And though he never states it explicitly, the reason for such faith to the

text is that the text is so full of art, imagination, and creativity that only through such an 'original' reading can the reader fully comprehend the awesomeness of Joyce's creation.

In an interview that took place in 2005, Wen Jieruo said that she chose to approach *Ulysses* from the angle of nationalism, a fact which may prove very important when considered in tandem with how nationalism in the Xiao-Wen translation is presented. Otherwise, the most direct statement of purpose from any of the three translators claims that, "today, this novel has already become the most important English literary writing of the 20th century,"[20] but Jin does not say why this is so, just as Xiao does not when he calls it a "miracle of human literary creation." Yet since none of them even hints at another reason for translation, I can not ascribe any further motivations the translators might have had for translating *Ulysses*.

But besides being a great innovative masterpiece, is there anything else in *Ulysses* that attracts the translators to it?

One day during my junior year abroad, on a rainwashed street in the bustling city centre of Belfast—Chichester Street, to be precise—I came upon an unremarkable pub called The Garrick. On the side of the building facing opposite to the flow of traffic there are six lines of unsigned words. They say,

A nation that keeps
one eye on the past
is wise.
A nation that keeps
two eyes on the past
is blind.

There are no quotation marks, no progenitor.

This anonymous piece of wisdom is of the kind typically assigned to the island of Ireland, a nation that has been fixated on its own history for a thousand years, both politically and

culturally. Even up to this day it is a fragmented island, stewing in its own bitter past. Everything about it draws attention to the fact that both eyes are turned backwards. Evidence may be found in the Troubles, now 'officially' over. Yet when I was there in the spring of 2011, there were consistently bomb threats, and even a sectarian killing in Omagh of a young Catholic policeman named Ronan Kerr. Invariably, the festive marching season (Orange Order parades) and St. Patrick's Day are notorious for violence and rioting.

Literature, too, has suffered at the hands of this backwards-looking national identity, while simultaneously reaping the benefit of the tragedy it brought. Never mind the recent waves of conflict and post-conflict novels, plays, and films. We need look no further than Ireland's most prized poet, William Butler Yeats, and his contemporaries such as Augusta Gregory, George Bernard Shaw, John Millington Synge, George Moore, and so on. Together they formed and founded a movement known variously as the Celtic Twilight, the Irish Literary Renaissance, and the [Irish] Literary Revival. Each of these names speaks towards this attachment to the past, precisely as intended. The movement drew inspiration from thousands of years of history and mythology, and sought a return to those halcyon days of harps in Tara's halls and an Irish-speaking free republic. In conjunction with the analogous political movement (i.e. Fenianism) this revival cultivated bloody slaughter, martyrdom, civil war, and the partition of the island.

Joyce, who was writing at the same time, watched this disaster from afar and with disapproval. His works, particularly *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man* and *Ulysses* stood against this rising tide of fatalistic nationalism. *Ulysses* would push the idea that the way to distinguish Ireland, the way to free her from the encumbrance of the oppressor, was *not* the

Hellenisation that Buck Mulligan offers,[21] but rather to cut the historical baggage and drop the desperate attempt to revive a dying language, turning one eye towards the future.

As I mentioned earlier, much of the literature that emerged from the immediate post-Mao era belonged to a genre associated with the Root-Searching Movement, which was ideologically not unlike the Literary Revival of turn-of-the-century Ireland. They were both movements nostalgically mapping the future of their nation in terms of the perceived greatness of their past. Given that both of the first two complete translations of *Ulysses* arrived after the waning of the Root-Searching Movement, is it possible that somewhere within the translations the three translators express their disillusion with that approach to nationalism, either through annotations to the text, in their translations of ethnic voices, or in their own commentaries on the translations? Did they understand the differences in types of nationalism? Did any critics pick up on a similar anti-nationalist theme? Those are the questions and issues that this research will investigate.

Reflections on the Translation of Western Literature in China

The twentieth century started with a bang in China—the Boxer Rebellion, encouraged by the high Qing court, in which all things foreign were seen as evil. This was followed in 1911 by the overthrow of the Qing dynasty and the establishment of China as a republic and Sun Yat-Sen as president in 1912. Sun is known for his ‘Three principles’: nationalism, people’s rights, and people’s livelihood. The Nationalist party, or Kuomintang, was founded in 1912 upon these three principles.

The losses of the Chinese against the English and the Japanese respectively in the Opium

and the Sino-Japanese wars spurred the Chinese to rebuild their nation employing western ideas, which in turn gave rise to an enormous wave of translation of western novels at the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth.

In the first two decades of that century, when the first wave of translation was taking place, the modern concept of nationalism was violently burgeoning in China. It would have been an ideal time to translate *Ulysses*. But as Xiao Qian wrote in the introduction of *Ulysses,*[22] he believed China was far too poor and underdeveloped to climb what he refers to as the 'ivory tower' that is *Ulysses*. To China, *Ulysses* was an ivory tower in two ways; not only is it not a realist novel, it is also a highly inaccessible work of literature. However, Xiao Qian did not mean to say that China would or *should* never have it; in fact he believed the opposite.

Historically, as well as contemporarily, texts were selected for translation because someone—usually the translator—thought there was some value to the readership of the target language, whether this value be literary, cultural, political, religious, or suchlike. The most obvious example of this are the myriad translations of Lin Shu[23] completed between 1899 and the year of his death, 1924. It has often been suggested that since Lin could speak no foreign languages himself, his selection of texts was actually given to him by his collaborators. This is hardly a fair assumption, since even though it does mean his scope of choices was limited, it does not in the least reduce the choice Lin had in deciding whether or not to translate any given piece. Furthermore, Lin always took great care in the prefaces or introductions of his translations to explicitly state what reason he had to do the translation and what value he saw.

It is true that much of the literature Lin worked with is mostly unknown today, but several pieces certainly stand out to the modern reader—not just scholars. These include such titles as

La dame aux camélias, *Don Quixote de la Mancha*, *Gulliver's Travels*, *Robinson Crusoe*, *Ivanhoe*, *The Old Curiosity Shop*, and *Uncle Tom's Cabin*. *La dame aux camélias* was the first Western novel that Lin Shu translated. He defended this choice by claiming that it is a foreign *Dream of the Red Chamber*, which is China's most well known text and is also frequently praised as the highest achievement in literature. Lin goes further to argue that the Dumas piece reflects an individuality in love that China lacked, even at the end of the nineteenth century.

He would later seek such similarities and lessons from other texts. When he prefaced his translation of *Allen Quartermain*, he drew parallels to *Records of the Grand Historian*, another of China's great texts. When he translated *The Old Curiosity Shop*, he said he had selected it for its representation of human nature. Referring to human nature, he said, "It is an eternal, no matter who they are, the Chinese or foreigners, cannot overstep it."[24] His mixture of motives, which included popular opinion, subject matter, perceived similarity to existing Chinese texts, and what "was needed," all had roots in a single intention. As Gao Wanlong puts it in an article on the subject, "to save the nation from subjugation and ensure its survival."[25] Likewise in his introduction to *Oliver Twist*, Lin would defend his choice as motivated for the good of the nation. He wrote, "What I regret is that there is no one like Dickens who can cite age-old malpractices and dramatize them in novels in order to inform the government of their existence. If there were, the transformation of Chinese society might be possible."[26] Yan Fu, another renowned Chinese translator, used a similar basis for selection, although he focused on sciences and social sciences rather than literature, his most notable translations being those of Thomas Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics*, Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty* and Herbert Spencer's *Study of Sociology*.

For this reason and for the other reasons enumerated above, the translation of Joyce's work was delayed until 1994. What was the nationalist situation in China like at this point in time? If it had been burgeoning violently when *Ulysses* was originally published in 1922, it was fast becoming a coherent, cohesive entity in the 90s and continues to do so today in such a way as to cause concern in some other nations of the world. Discussions concerning the future of China, which emerged from the ashes of the Cultural Revolution, sparked off great political and intellectual debate over the significance of nationalism early in the decade. This debate took many groups of well-educated people by storm; social scientists, humanities scholars and writers especially. Some groups, media among them, turned to history as a means of promoting nationalist sentiment, some suggest merely to further certain nationalist goals.

These choices all point to one thing: a strain of nationalism designed to relieve a crisis of nation such as China had been undergoing for almost the entirety of the twentieth century by rebuilding China—and its people—from words up. It began with this influx of Western thoughts, morals, ideals, which they hoped to glean a great deal from, much as the Japanese had done before them. This lingual reconstruction would be continued with considerably more vigor when the language reform began in 1920s with the takeover of vernacular (*baihua*) Chinese as written language, and was continued in the 1950s with the introduction of simplified characters and the mandatory study of standardized Mandarin in schools; this was all done in an attempt to unify and nationalize the language, giving the citizen a clearer identity.

Coincidentally—or perhaps not—when Xiao and Jin began their translation of *Ulysses* in 1990, China was at the end of another wave of nationalist revival not unlike the one Lin Shu

was working under. In the 1980s and early 90s as at the turn of the twentieth century, China looked to the west in its efforts to modernize and construct a modern national identity. After the lack of new literature during the Cultural Revolution, the ready-made literature pouring in from the west was conveniently pre-packaged with all the tools the emergent nation thought it needed, and accessing the western mentality through the literature that embodies it is a viable route because literature is easily accessible, easy to transmit, and covers the entire spectrum of topics.

Like with the intellectuals of the Celtic Twilight, a standardized *national* language and literature are intricately linked to nationalism in the Chinese context, which is almost antithetical to the Joycean approach to nationalism. For example, take *Ulysses*, considered to be a great Irish epic, despite the fact that it is written in English, i.e. *not Irish*. Yet at the same time, despite being written in English, it is being written *against* English, a paradox which will be explained in the next section.

Joyce, Nationalism, and *Ulysses*

Nationalism is a tricky topic with Joyce, because his work appears to the uneducated eye as being against nationalism, given the context in which it was written. He was working during the Irish Literary Renaissance, an era renowned for its nationalist literature—and for its literary martyrs. In the first two weeks of May 1916, the 15 leaders of the provisional government to the newly proclaimed Republic of Ireland, also known as the leaders of the Easter Uprising, were publically executed. Five of those men, Pádraig Pearse, Roger Casement, Thomas MacDonagh, Michael O'Hanrahan and Joseph Plunkett, were recognized writers for Yeats'

literary movement. For Joyce to distance himself from that movement—mover and shaker as he was to become—must have felt like a betrayal. But not only did he actively not involve himself in the movement; right in the midst of it he exiled himself from the island, and then proceeded to write a series of progressively more blasphemous novels about it. By the second work, *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, he was confiding in broad daylight the reasons for his irrevocable malcontent with home, motherland, and the Holy Roman Catholic church.[27] While other writers were dying for the cause, Joyce was in Zurich, writing *Ulysses*.

Fenianism, in some ways similar to Chinese anti-imperialist movements at the turn of the twentieth century, is a name often assigned to the nationalist movement that coincided with the Revival, a throwback to previous revolutions. It was a violent nationalist movement using warfare to push at their goal of 'liberating' the 'motherland' from 'oppression'. Joyce was opposed to violence, so the militant nationalism of his peers and countrymen offended him, and his own version of nationalism—if it can indeed be called that—sought an alternative route towards the goal of his hot-headed compatriots such as Pearse.

Joyce's strain of nationalism might be more aptly called 'internationalism'. J. Krishnamurti writes, "When you call yourself an Indian or a Muslim or a Christian or a European, or anything else, you are being violent… Because you are separating yourself from the rest of mankind."[28] To Joyce as to Krishnamurti, traditional nationalism is dangerous because it firmly establishes a dichotomy of self and other that will inevitably end in militant opposition to the other. However, an insistence on internationalism is just as dangerous as insisting on nationalism, because even though it is true that globalization is making the world increasingly smaller by eliminating borders, the lack of physical barriers makes individuals

more ideologically aware of ‘nationality’ and therefore more firmly separatist.[29] In essence, this is nationalism.

It is not for us, the reader, to decide whether or not Joyce loved his motherland, Ireland; but it is clear from his writing and from biographical details that his relationship to Ireland was very constrained. After all, a man does not voluntarily exile himself from his home if there is not something bothering him. Joycean nationalism lacks an aspect of modern nationalism; the belief that one’s nation will be better off individually rather than as part of a collective. Joyce’s nationalism is actually contrary to this assumption; it is a kind of love for one’s nation *without separating* it from the collective of all nations and without eliminating borders. That is not to say that he is esteeming other countries on the same level as he did Ireland, although he may very well have done so. It is more that he believed that Ireland would be better off in the world context rather than by herself. The historical Ireland that the other writers were drawing on for inspiration was always a land that *could* support its own lifestyle, but that suffered from the poverty and simplicity that grows out of the isolation intrinsic to existing on the periphery. What Joyce proposed was an Ireland *not* trying to escape back into the pagan past and that benefitted from globalization.

Yet it cannot be said *Ulysses* is *not* a nationalist text. He *was* writing it from exile, but still writing it about and set in Ireland. Joyce, exiled and transient as his life was, was aware of the true global nature of life at the time, at least in Europe and the greater Western hemisphere. In that way, then, if we consider Patrick Kavanagh’s line about universalism, “Parochialism is universal; it deals with the universe[30]” it is easy to see that Joyce’s use of dozens of world cultures and languages is really just a way to reinforce his subtle but intense focus on the

language and culture of Ireland.

And the degree to which it is Irish is compelling. The idiolect beneath all of the fanfare of the deconstruction of English is that of Ireland; it overflows with local slang, historical and contemporary cultural and literary allusions, hallmark Irish grammar structures, and Irish archetypes as they go about their hectic lives in Dublin. Furthermore, Joyce took great pains to incorporate as many place names as he could throughout the text, and to scrupulously time the main characters' movements through the city, so that it was as if they really *are* traversing Dublin.

Simultaneously, Joyce is satirizing the protestant north and the oppressive English—as he has done in his other works, most notably demonstrated in *Ulysses* by Deasy the Ulsterite, Haines the crazy Englishman, and other minor characters such as the mindlessly-violent English Privates Carr and Compton in the fifteenth episode.

Another indicator that *Ulysses* might not be as anti-nationalist as it appears, is Stephen and Bloom's constant thoughts and regrets about their treatment of women in their lives. This applies particularly to Stephen, who is burdened with the weight of 'killing' his mother, who is at once Ireland and the Church. He would not kneel down and pray on her deathbed. As for Bloom, he worries constantly about the affair Molly is having with Blazes Boylan, while he himself is verbally dallying with other women. Boylan is as jaunty a chap as someone representing Britain ought to be. And Bloom cannot stop thinking about the affair because he wants to get back in bed with Molly, which he does at the very end of the novel, as the reader is left to surmise from Bloom's actions in the seventeenth episode[31] and Molly's climax at the end of the eighteenth.[32] If Molly is Ireland, climbing in the sack with Britain, then Bloom's

mistress-by-post Martha is perhaps Trieste or Zurich or Paris, one of the places Joyce ran to when he exiled himself from Ireland. Yet Martha, wherever she is meant to be, is not 'Mary,' the sister who chose the Biblical better part, sitting at her lord's feet. So there is certainly some measure of modern nationalism in this work, even if Joyce is mocking the other archetypes, such as the milk woman in the first episode as the Sean-Bhean bhocht; Stephen's sister Dilly as Róisín Dubh; the Citizen as a seanchaí; and Robert Emmett as a martyr, all of which are character tropes used and abused by the Celtic Twilight to instill a feeling of love and duty towards the island[33] through adhering to a past made problematic by the language that created it.

In the case of Ireland, and perhaps many other nations as well, language *is* problematic. Most people seem to assume that a contentious situation arises and is followed in creation by the dialect used to describe it. Joyce believed the opposite; that the language comes first and the issues arise as a result of the language. For example, the words 'self' and 'other' were constructed, therefore giving rise to conflicts of self and other.

This message to turn one eye away from the history it has been fixated on is affected through the deconstruction of the English language and therefore the destabilizing of such conflicts. From the ashes, he takes up all the pieces and recombines them into a language that we call Joycean. Seamus Deane, a scholar of post-colonial Ireland, rejects the efforts of Irish writers to free themselves from the yoke of imperial language by distorting it into Anglo-Irish/Hiberno-Irish, because they have freed themselves from nothing. The major language, in this case English, is pre-established and pre-recognized, whereas the minor language is only in a state of "becoming," and as likely as not will never manage to debunk the

power of the primary language.[34]

Indeed, this may seem like a conflict of interests. It is not. It would be impractical and impossible to begin a language again, working from the base upwards. Besides, the idea is not to forget history or culture but to abandon a blind tradition that cannot see the forest for the trees. In doing so, *Ulysses* seems to say, Ireland can revive her once glorified name.

This message is buried in the form, in this case the language, for with Joyce the form is everything—or form *is* content, and the language is the hero. The text, ostensibly a universal tale, presents what could be argued to be one of the most vernacular novels ever written. But as Patrick Kavanagh has said and as it has otherwise been said in several different ways, the local is the universal. Even though Joyce strips the language and words bare, often of all but their earliest meanings in an effort to remove the jilted trappings of culture and history, *Ulysses* comes across as an extremely Irish work.

Tradition is mocked thoroughly and ruthlessly throughout the text,[35] from the absurdity of the Citizen—a traditional Irish seanchaí, to Bloom passing wind as he stands reading the martyr Robert Emmet's exhortatory speech from the docks. Consider *The Odyssey,*[36] perhaps the most famous epic in the western canon, for which Joyce's novel was named, and which the plot was taken from. That tale is named for its great hero, Ulysses or Odysseus, and from his great deeds and adventures in the *Illiad* and the *Odyssey* grew an entire tradition of hubristic heroes. Juxtaposed with that is Joyce's mythopoeiac alternative of the same name, *Ulysses*, and its protagonists, Stephen and Bloom. Protagonist; not hero. They are anti-heroes. The implication is clear; if you take a hero and drop him into everyday life and make him carry out those same deeds in the quotidian world, they become misadventures and stray perambulations

rather than heroic deeds. The hero is nothing, an unattainable ideal constructed from the past for the present. The past is not all it appears to have been. Joyce laughs at Homer's great man; a weak man indeed. Joyce himself is known for shatteringly—and irreparably, for himself—deconstructing the tradition of language, as well as the traditional form of the novel.

Reception of *Ulysses* in China

Given that *Ulysses* was received with esteem by some in China, enough so that the stream-of-consciousness style interior monologue that Joyce is famous for would be imitated by several authors,[37] it is no surprise that the translations were well received. The sheer volume of scholarly articles written in Chinese on *Ulysses* since 1994 is indicative of a deep fascination with the text. The warm reception was not just limited to scholars, either. During a previous project that evaluated the two 1994 translations, I read at least 20 articles discussing the advantages and disadvantages of each, especially towards the common reader, which indicates that there was a viable readership of that definition looking for the solution. In fact, the reaction was positive enough for a third translation to be done in 2009 by Zha Qunying.

Other countries, notably Poland, have also shown a great love for the novel. Indeed it has been translated into about two dozen languages. Why? The Spanish were the most vocal on this front, with three translations. According to Spanish critics, these translations are an "undeniable sign of the value of the Catalan language,"[38] they "give prestige to the undeniable cultural value of the Catalan language,"[39] and symbolize "a considerable accomplishment for a language, a literature and a culture that had suffered from a ban on translations."[40] *Ulysses* is a book that empowers the target language, in the case of Catalonia, a language that had long

been suffering from a lack of outside influence. Languages, like cultures, are living things that grow and morph according to environmental influences. New words grow out of Joyce in English, words such as 'Joycean' and 'tragicomic'[41] that are in common usage among literary scholars today; perhaps translators hoped this kind of growth and development could revive their own stagnating languages.

However, coming as they do in the midst of the Root-Searching Movement for China, which might be considered equivocal to the Irish Literary Renaissance in aims, the two 1994 Chinese translations of *Ulysses* could have been made to carry the same weight there and then as it had in its original context. Like-minded post-Mao literature that emerged around the same time as these translations included the works of Su Tong, Mo Yan, Liu Heng, and others. In novels like *Nineteen Thirty-four Escapes* （《一九三四年的逃亡》）and *The Town of Olive* （《橄榄镇》), published respectively in 1987 and 1989, there is a re-appropriation of history to prevent it from being subjugated to the popular master narrative of history—the master narrative written during the Mao era. As Xiao Bing Tang says, "The spectacularization of history also points to a recognized need in postrevolutionary Chinese culture to search for a new identity, a new self-cosciousness that can claim a different history than what has been instituted in the past forty years or so."[42] But in addition to claiming a different history than that mandated by the Maoist regime, these authors recognized a need to distance themselves from the history they intend to reclaim.

That is because history is a notoriously unreliable narrator, in China as in every country. The old adage says, 'beauty is in the eye of the beholder', and certainly the same is true of history. *Ulysses* is a sort of anti-nationalist nationalist novel that reminds us we must—at all

times—keep one eye turned to the present and future. But do translators pay attention to this? Do the translations demonstrate an awareness of nationalism? In their translations, does the message come across? Do critics pick up on any such message? And if the answers to all of these questions are in the negative, is there a conspicuous absence of reference to the topic?

CHAPTER 1

Where Terrorists and Poets Meet: Two Translations of *Ulysses*
An Examination of Attention to Nationalism in the Footnotes

> "I'd fooled myself into thinking I'd some poems in me while I was in Dublin. It was like hanging old clothes out to dry. Everyone in Dublin was a poet, maybe even the bombers who'd treated us to their afternoon delight."[43]

Given that both the Jin and the Xiao-Wen translations are modern translations and in large part dedicated to the preservation of Joyce's original intentions, the footnotes, introductions, post-translation notes and interviews are the most open areas for the translators to express their own feelings and interpretations of specific moments in the text. It seems appropriate, then, that if indeed the translators had a secondary objective in translating *Ulysses* other than the obvious reason of sharing this masterpiece with an enormous part of the world's population, that it would manifest itself in the footnotes. Since my own reading of *Ulysses* relies heavily upon it being an anti-nationalist nationalist epic, I will focus on unpacking the footnotes.

This chapter will examine representations of nationalism in the footnotes to both translations, focusing on Irish nationalism, but also drawing on any other relevant representations of nationalism anywhere, especially in England.

Across the entire eighteen episodes of *Ulysses*, there are constant references to past nationalist phenomena, as well as to those contemporary to the given setting of the novel (June 16th, 1904) *and* those contemporary to the publication of the novel 18 years after its setting (February 2nd, 1922). These references manifest in many different ways; lines of poetry, song lyrics, food packaging, obscure names listed in stream-of-consciousness, flyers, lucky tokens, posters, and so on. Because the Chinese reader is at the mercy of the translator to provide information on points of confusion, particularly the obscure or buried ones, how the three

translators approach these references is an important question for two subsidiary reasons. One, the translator dictates which references get a footnote, which in turn decides the reader's angle of approach. And two, the translator dictates what information about the reference is provided, whether or not the reader checks other sources, this influences how the translator intended the story to be perceived.

What I found was that while both the Jin and the Xiao-Wen translations documented such references, their explanations are in large part empirically phrased. Occasionally, there are footnotes that are either dubious in nature or outright incorrect in their information; but these are few and far between. What *is* striking about the footnotes is the discrepancy in quantity between the two. The Xiao-Wen translation documents as close to every single reference as possible, with the Jin translation giving maybe one third as many. Even if the latter approach springs from Jin's desire to keep the general understanding of the translation as faithful to the common understanding of the original, it means that Jin was selective. That in itself is a level of subjectivity that cannot be ignored when considering the overall effect of the translation.

The second interesting aspect to the footnotes in both translations is that even through all their striving to represent the truth of a large number of nationalist references, they under-represent or fail to notice the significance and huge import of some of the more obvious indicators of nationalism in the original; such as Bloom's lucky shriveled black potato, Deasy's wild inaccuracies and infinite tediousness, the recurring theme of the House of Keys, Privates Compton and Carr's bastardized English, and the Citizen's potential Ulsterite allegiance. How they do choose to discuss these issues will begin to reveal the translators' awareness of subtle differences among nationalisms. This is a topic that needs to be further explored, and that will

be addressed in this chapter.

What do the footnotes in these two translations say about nationalism as a theme in *Ulysses*, or at least in these two translations of it?

Pro-National Examples

Despite the fact that Joyce would not identify himself or his work as being nationalist in any sense and especially not in the Irish tradition, the framing of ostensible nationalist themes, symbols and individuals are often either pro-nationalist or anti-antinationalist. The examples in this section are here because they reflect positively on the Irish nationalist movement. Whether or not those references that appear pro-nationalist are actually intended to demonstrate the author's partial or complete acceptance of the movement is irrelevant in this situation; what is important is how the translators perceive and relay information about them.

Example 1:
"Crouching by a patient cow at daybreak in the lush field, a witch on her toadstool, her wrinkled fingers quick at the squirting dugs. They lowed about her whom they knew, dewsilky cattle. Silk of the kine and poor old woman, names given her in old times. A wandering crone, lowly form of an immortal serving her conqueror and her gay betrayer, their common cuckquean, a messenger from the secret morning."[44]

Silk of the kine and poor old woman[45] are both names given to Ireland, used and created by the Irish literary revival to personify Ireland in their texts. This is a partial description of the old milkmaid who visits the Martello tower apartment each morning, bringing fresh dairy to Stephen, Buck Mulligan, and Haines. She is discussed almost entirely in terms of the poor old woman, although in the text it is specifically stated that not only does she not speak Irish, she does not recognize it when Haines—the Englishman—attempts to hold a conversation with her.

Both Róisín Dubh and the poor old lady are considered as personifications of Ireland, much as Uncle Sam is the personification of the United States. The two women listed above are not empty objects made symbol by association; Róisín Dubh is the dark bud waiting to burst into bloom, and the poor old lady is a poor old lady put out of her house by strangers, who have taken her beautiful four green fields[46] from her. They are, in other words, themselves Ireland, although Joyce chooses to subvert the archetype of the poor old woman in order to mock the writers of the Irish Literary Revival, who like Ireland/the poor old woman, would not recognize Irish if it were being spoken to them. He stretches the irony even further when it is an Englishman speaking to her in her own 'native' tongue.

Footnote from Jin Translation

"'牛中魁首'指爱尔兰牛，因软草丰盈而特别壮美，爱尔兰文学中曾以此象征爱尔兰。'穷老太婆'也是神话中的爱尔兰的形象，但是她在真正的爱国志士面前的形象是妙龄美女。一说爱尔兰文学过去以这些形象代表爱尔兰，是因为英帝国统治者禁止提到爱尔兰。"[47]

('Chief of the cows' refers to Irish cows, because the soft grass is very nutritious and beautiful. In Irish literature, this was once used to symbolize Ireland. 'The poor old woman' is also a mythical image of Ireland, but before the eyes of legitimate, noble-minded patriots, her image is that of a beautiful young woman[48]. Another interpretation is that in the past Irish literature used these symbols to represent Ireland because the ruling English empire forbade mentioning Ireland.[49])

This annotation to one of the most overt references to turn-of-the century Irish nationalism is interesting for two reasons. First, Jin's description of 'Ireland' focuses on the fact that the grass is 'soft', 'beautiful', and 'nutritious', all apt adjectives for the land in question, but also applicable to the grass of other countries. The same is true of his selection of words to describe the word 'patriots.' Even though his interpretation of the poor old woman was the same as the revivalists', he states it as his own position. He also uses the words 'noble-minded' to modify

the word ‘patriot’. In Joyce’s time and earlier, the ‘legitimate’ patriots were those willing to go to war for Ireland, but not in a noble-minded way. Their noble ideal not withstanding, those “noble-minded patriots” were terrorists, people willing to blow up the English and any civilians that got in their way in order to achieve their goal of freedom from the oppressor. Yet Jin either ignores the fact of violence completely, or glorifies it.

Second, Jin’s claim that the use of the name ‘Ireland’ was prohibited is unfounded. The way he frames the fact distances him from it. He uses the word ‘*yishuo*’ for ‘one interpretation’, which makes it clear that this theory is not his own. He also does not state whether or not he agrees with the theory, but his decision to include it in the annotation suggests at least a willingness to accept it as fact: the phrase ‘*yishuo*’ explicitly states that it is ‘one’ interpretation, and therefore there must be several others that he was aware of. His willingness to believe that the English imperialist regime would resort to such extreme measures probably stems from his own experience, since parts of China itself have at various times in the last two centuries been under the rule of England, Germany, France, Russia, and Japan.

What this footnote suggests is that Jin identifies with the idea of anti-imperialism and is perhaps in favor of violence in order to attain independence. It also suggests that Jin does not differentiate between types of nationalism as Joyce did, so that ‘noble-minded patriots’ and ‘terrorists’ are actually ostensibly equitable. Or, if he does make a distinction, he is not on Joyce’s ‘side’ per say, instead siding with the patriots, or at least not criticizing their methods.

Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation

“毛皮像绢丝般的牛，最漂亮的牛和贫穷的老妪均为爱尔兰古称。”[50]

(Dewsilky cattle, silk of the kine, and the poor old lady are all ancient names for Ireland.)

Dewsilky cattle is a reconcstruction of ‘silk of the kine’, and all three names are *not* ancient, but rather names invented during the nineteenth and twentieth century for inflammatory purposes. Based on the sheer volume of annotations, there is no reason to doubt[51] that Xiao and Wen are aware of the origins of these names, although it is possible that they were misinformed of facts and did not look into the matter themselves. The assumption of age is important to notice because it factors significantly into the Xiao-Wen understanding, which is presented in a more understated way.

Instead of choosing to embellish the truth of the imperialist situation in Ireland, which would suggest a general identification with any nation facing oppression from an *outside* power, the Xiao-Wen translation emphasizes the truth and legitimacy of the Irish nationalist movement. It does so by extending the movement’s history with the word ‘ancient’ and thereby establishing roots upon which the nationalists can stand in the mind of the Chinese reader, which simultaneously defuses the power of the British empire. This is a shade different from anti-imperialism; it is a strong affiliation *with* the Irish, and a recognition of the *Irish* sovereign power rather than a direct denial of the oppressor. It does not deny the oppressor but the oppressor’s right to exist at all: clearly the Irish and their desire for self-sovereignty came first if the poor old lady is an *ancient* name for Ireland.

This is problematic, because the reason the poor old lady became a symbol of Ireland is *because* the English invaded Ireland and confiscated her land, thus reducing mother Ireland to an old woman whose beautiful green fields are inhabited by strangers. It is, of course, also possible that Xiao and Wen were trying to emphasize the *length* of oppression by stating that these phrases are all ancient names for Ireland, which is correct in the fact that by Joyce’s time,

Ireland had been under foreign sovereignty for nearly eight centuries. However, if this is the case it is also a gross oversight on the part of the translators, because it makes the English out to be more evil than they were, since occupation of Ireland did not rest solely in their hands. If this was the goal of the Xiao-Wen translation, then it follows the same logic as the Jin translation, in that the translators were exaggerating the degree of oppression by the English.

Example 2:
"Where are our missing twenty millions of Irish should be here today instead of four, our lost tribes?"[52]

"We thank you from our heart, John, for this right royal welcome to green Erin, the promised land of our common ancestors."[53]

Both of the above quotes speak of Ireland in terms of Canaan, making an outright and unabashed connection rather than mere comparison. Ireland is Canaan, Canaan is Ireland. The "lost tribes," referring to the lost tribes of Israel—the nation without a home, and the "promised land" of Canaan—are both now Irish, as perhaps they were always; Ireland lost her most fertile and mythologically rich province to the English, and the country was pseudo-permanently divided, while the famine drove millions of desperate Irish citizens to emigrate and never return.

Also germane are the connections the rabble at Barney Kiernan's draw between Irish militant nationalism and Jewish nationalism, in this case Hungarian-Jewish—also militant. The rabble themselves are keen on making that same connection, gossiping that it was the Hungarians that created the cell system of terrorism[54] and that it was Bloom himself that leaked that particular blueprint to the Irish paramilitaries. In the same episode of the text, when asked what nation he belongs to, Bloom answers that he is Irish, thus literally uniting militant Hungarian Jew and militant republican Irishman into one being.

(No footnote from Jin)
Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation
“这里把爱尔兰比作迦南（应许给以色列人的土地）。”[55]

(Here Ireland is being compared to Canaan [the promised land of the Israelites].)

If this were a footnote in any western-language translation of *Ulysses* there would be no issue whatsoever in the information’s presentation, because the story of Canaan is not only extremely well known but also a frequently used literary trope. However; given that this is a Chinese translation, whether or not this is enough information to get the seriousness of the reference across is unclear; the very fact of the parenthetical information’s existence seems to point to the contrary. There are other brief mentions of Canaan in the footnotes of the Xiao-Wen translation, but they are equally as shallow.[56]

In terms of the Israel/Palestine conflict, while China is and has been calling for a two-state solution, it has also notably favored Palestine. For example, in 1975 China stalwartly supported a United Nations resolution which made Zionism a form of racism, and when the resolution was rescinded China did not partake in the voting. Three years later, when Mao’s regime ended and Deng Xiaoping took control, he curtailed Chinese support for militant Palestinian groups, but still officially recognized the state of Palestine just five days after it declared independence in 1988. In 1991, Chinese involvement in the conflict was more limited, but China still voted to give Palestine more rights at the UN. More recently, in 2006, China refused to call Hamas a terrorist organization, despite its militant nature.

Thus a representation of Ireland as Canaan is a conflict of interests and a conundrum in the mindset of Chinese citizens. In the translators’ frame of reference, the Palestinian cause resonates strongly with the Irish one; and the militant Zionism of the Hungarian-Jews (i.e.

Bloom), which China categorized as racism, is understood and condemned as the activity of ethnic extremists.

Example 3:
"Who…drive…Fergus now
And pierce…wood's woven shade…?"[57]

"…shadows…the woods
…white breast…dim sea."[58]

These groups of words are partial lines taken from William Butler Yeats' poem, "Who Goes with Fergus?" The poem explores the dichotomy between thought and action, and wonders who will ride out with Fergus. Fergus was a mythological warrior of great renown that was selected to lead the charge against Ulster and Cú Chulainn, and so in a way might be construed as the true Irish hero, although perhaps that is not true in light of the fact that he yielded to Cú Chulainn in battle.

The poem is a call to action; though Yeats himself would not act, it was an uncomfortable inaction that fit him like a shirt too small through the shoulders; he was always attempting to relieve the discomfort.[59] The lines as spoken in *Ulysses* are mumbled by Stephen as he recovers from a blow to the face, just after two streetwalking English privates named Compton and Carr gang up to get a rise from him. The response of the young Irishman, at last defeated by the English, regrets his inaction and asks who now will save Ireland.

Footnote from Jin Translation

典出《谁与佛格斯同去》，有关诗句为："谁愿和弗格斯去一固驾车，/深深地刺透树林的浓荫？/……/他统治着树林的深处，/统治者朦胧海洋的白色酥胸。"[60]

(This is an allusion to "Who Goes with Fergus?." The full lines are, "Who will go drive with Fergus now,/ And pierce the deep wood's woven shade,/……/ And rules the shadows of the wood,/ And the white breast of the dim sea.")

This is linked to an earlier footnote in the text explaining that W. B. Yeats wrote the poem, “Who Goes With Fergus?” originally as a song in his play “The Countess Cathleen.” He then goes on to say that Joyce once praised the song as the world’s most beautiful lyric poem.[61]

Footnotes from Xiao-Wen Translation

“这是《谁与佛格斯同去》一诗头两行的片段。全句为：“而今谁与佛格斯一道，骑车穿过密林织成的树林？”[62]

(These are parts of the first two lines of “Who Goes with Fergus?.” The full lines are, “Who will go drive with Fergus now,/ And pierce the deep wood's woven shade?”)

“这是《谁与佛格斯同去》一诗第 10 行和第 11 行的片段。全句为：“他不管辖树林的阴影，混沌的海洋露出雪白的胸脯。”[63]

(These are the tenth and eleventh lines of “Who Goes with Fergus?.” The full lines are, “And rules the shadows of the wood,/ And the white breast of the dim sea.”)

The Xiao-Wen footnotes are also linked to an earlier footnote in the text, saying that the lines are from the poem “Who Goes With Fergus?” by William Butler Yeats. The same note also explains that it is rumored that the Irish Fergus emigrated and became the first king of Scotland.

Cú Chulainn and Fergus were mythical champions selected to battle each other, each symbolically tied to the land: Cú Chulainn for Ulster and Fergus for the rest of Ireland, again another microcosm of civil war—and ethnic discord. Just before he is attacked, Stephen calls himself a patriot, but only *in re* loyalty to the English crown. He refuses to revoke his insult to the king, which is the reason Private Carr hits him. It is at this very moment that it is clear that Stephen (Joyce) would rather ally himself with Ireland and everything that entails, than with the north and the throne. It is also clear that, despite all of the satirization of nationalist

types in previous scenes, Joyce cannot escape the fact that neutrality is not a viable option. He must act either the poet or the terrorist or both, and Stephen becomes the satirized nationalist type: he tries to fight but gets knocked down, he tries to recite poetry but can only remember parts. The nationalist is impotent.

Perhaps it is also the moment of realization for the translators. It is suddenly apparent that the geographical and ethnic divisions historically created in Ireland makes anti-imperialism a matter of inner-Ireland ethnic separatism. More importantly, this piecemeal poetic recitation undermines the patriot (Stephen), rendering him powerless in the face of his enemy, the imperialist. What good is it, Joyce asks, to have control over words or weapons if you cannot put them to good use because of meekness—or in the case of Ireland, size?

This construction of nationalism is directly antithetical to the outlook of all three translators, at least as far as their annotations suggest; they frame references to anti-imperialist violence and sentiment as praiseworthy, no matter how unsuccessful. Often the references made in *Ulysses* are subversive and intended to be critical of such sentiment. The structural format of annotation allows the translator to provide a different subtext, by secluding selected pieces of evidence and offering what *may* be partial or uninformed information.

Neither of these footnotes does justice to the nationalist requirement of the lyric itself, nor explains the important mythology of Fergus, nor the significance of the lyric's placement in the text. Surely the fact that non-violent, anti-Ireland Stephen[64] mutters this call to arms on behalf of republicans could be construed as a first sign of his surrender to the inevitable instinct to protect that to which one was born. Either that, or it is Stephen crowning himself

champion for Ireland. If he cannot stand against the English for old Erin, then there is no one who can. Others, like Buck Mulligan with his plan for “Hellenizing” the island might try, but they will not succeed. Yet the translators did not choose to present the information in that way.

One possible explanation is that the ironic placement of the deconstructed poem is too subtle a reference for the translators to interpret, but this explanation cannot be supported either way. Another related explanation would be that the translators are unaware of the differentiation between types of nationalism, as an institution as opposed to Joyce’s own understanding of the word. Yet if this was actually the case, then such references as the Jacob’s biscuit tin, Yeats’ poem, and Ireland as Canaan would not go unremarked on, because they are all incidents aligned with Chinese nationalism: the nation as a whole, unified against ethnic separatism and against imperialism.

In this instance and throughout the footnotes, the most likely explanation for the silence of the translators on certain subjects is that they have no conscious agenda to portray these incidents of nationalistically-charged phenomena as either commendable or deplorable; rather, the translators are products of the environment they live in, and ideas of a nation united with itself would be celebrated whereas ideas of nation divided against itself would be misunderstood and dangerous. The translators’ own experiences of colonialism in China would naturally put them in opposition to the imperialism of the British Empire, while anti-nationalist dissidence from known scholars like Joyce would be so far beyond their ken that they would likely not notice it, which is the most plausible reason for the significance of Yeats’ poem going unexplained.

Anti-National Examples

Just as with the examples above, it is not necessarily the case that these are actually intended as negative examples of nationalist sentiment. But because characters such as the Citizen reflect negatively on the nationalist cause as represented in *Ulysses*, and because Joyce is known for his aversion to violence, there is certainly a precedent for understanding the text as standing in opposition to nationalism. How does the information provided in the annotations represent these iterations of rendering the romanticization of Ireland's nationalist movement as absurd?

Example 4:
"Gaptoothed Kathleen, her four beautiful green fields, the stranger in her house."[65]

Kathleen, gaptoothed or otherwise, is a reference to the short drama written by Yeats and Lady Augusta Gregory for the Abby Theatre during the Irish Literary Revival titled "Cathleen Ní Houlihan." Cathleen is the original manifestation of the Sean-Bhean bhocht archetype, better known as the poor old woman. As previously noted, the four green fields are the four provinces of Ireland, the stranger in the house is England, and Cathleen is the personification of Ireland come knocking for justice. The potential of Cathleen is magnified in this example because of the explicit, straightforward placement of her with the fields and the strangers.

References to Kathleen in Joyce are in large part intended more as criticism of the Literary Revival than anything else. The movement sought to restore Irish-Celtic culture to Ireland, but the culture and myths it returned were generally inventions of the artists rather than historically accurate. Kathleen, or the poor old woman, is perhaps the best example of such, and Joyce highlighted her as a beacon of hypocrisy: the Revivalists were no different from the English,

trying to impose a foreign culture on the native population, and Kathleen herself is a stranger in the house.

Footnote from Jin Translation

“凯慧琳为爱尔兰神话中女王，在叶芝剧本《胡里痕的凯慧琳》（1902）中以缺牙老妪形象出现，四块绿田之古爱尔兰四省，外人之英帝国。”[66]

(Kathleen is a mythical Irish queen, and in Yeats’ play “Cathleen Ní Houlihan” (1902) she appears in her gap-toothed poor old woman form. The four green fields are the four ancient provinces of Ireland, and the stranger the British empire.)

The description of Kathleen as ‘mythical’ and a ‘queen’ dates the translation. It wasn’t until the latter half of the twentieth century that critics of Yeats’ work begin to consider the poor old lady in terms of her mythical potentiality. Much of the ensuing literary discussion focused on Cathleen as a national sacrificial myth, drawing on both pagan and Christian rejuvenation sacrifices, as well as the long history of martyrs for the Irish cause.

Here, the reference to Kathleen as a myth demonstrates a tendency to justify relatively modern agitation through invocation of the distant past.

Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation

“在叶芝的剧本《豁牙子凯思林》中，凯思林这个贫穷的老妪象征着失去自由的爱尔兰。她说她那四片美丽的绿野（指爱尔兰的四省，阿尔斯特，伦斯特，芒斯特，康诺特）都被夺走了。‘家里的陌生人’指英国入侵者。”[67]

(In Yeats’ play “Cathleen Ní Houlihan[68],” the poor old woman Cathleen symbolizes an Ireland that has lost its freedom. She says her four beautiful green fields [meaning the four provinces of Ireland, Ulster, Leinster, Munster, and Connacht] have all been snatched away. ‘The stranger in her house’ refers to the English intruders.)

The original quotation cited above is an unbiased set of images, yet this annotation to those images qualifies them with the words ‘snatched’ and ‘intruders’. ‘Snatched’ is a brutal and underhanded way to take something from someone, just as the word ‘intruder’ is a very pointed and disparaging description of a stranger. What these strong words entail is an

identification with the Irish hatred of their oppressor. Ostensibly, this grows out of Xiao's own life experience: when he was teaching at the School of Oriental and Asian Studies in London, he became an active member of the China Campaign Committee, which opposed the Japanese occupation of China. The hostility of the words 'snatched' and 'intruders' is also indicative of a tolerance for violence in defense of the nation.

Example 5:
"Potato I have."[69]

This is a thought that passes through Leopold Bloom's mind as he leaves the house on Eccles Street, and it refers to the shriveled black potato he carries with him as a lucky talisman. It was a gift—an heirloom—from his mother, and he doesn't go anywhere without it. It is ironic that 'an heirloom' potato is considered a lucky charm, particularly because Bloom considers himself an Irishman born and bred, and because the Great Famine[70] is the biggest disaster in Irish history. The diseased heirloom potatoes were a huge factor in the historic potato famine that resulted in the deaths of hundreds of thousands and forced millions more people to emigrate from home and heritage. The fact that his mother gave it to him is indicative of Joyce's own feelings about Ireland, as Stephen said in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, "Ireland is the old sow that eats her farrow."[71]

(No footnote from Jin)
Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation
"土豆是布鲁姆亡母的纪念品。他总把它当做护身符，随身携带。"[72]

(The potato is a memento of Bloom's dead mother. He considers it a talisman and carries it with him everywhere.)

Since the famine is the defining moment of Irish history in reference to Ireland from the outside (Western) perspective, it seems remarkable that in this annotation to Bloom's potato that neither Jin nor Xiao-Wen identified it. That it is kept in memoriam of his mother is

secondary to the irony of an heirloom potato being worshipped as auspicious by a man who purports to belong to the nation whose population was reduced by half because of potatoes.

Example 6:

“You think me an old fogey and an old tory, his thoughtful voice said. I saw three generations since O’Connell’s time. I remember the famine in ’46. Do you know that the orange lodges agitated for repeal of the union twenty years before O’Connell did or before the prelates of your communion denounced him as a demagogue? You fenians forget some things.”[73]

These lines, spoken by Mr. Deasy to Stephen, are representative of the kind of long-winded and severely misinformed tirades that characterize him. While the reader can suppose that Deasy is old enough to remember at least vaguely both the “famine in ‘46” and Daniel O’Connell, the details of this speech are twisted to suit his own conscience. In fact, the Orange Order as an institution never lodged for repeal of the Act of Union, although there were a number of members that individually resented it. Secondly, he himself summarily denounces O’Connell, The Liberator of Ireland, while simultaneously claiming that the Catholic Church did the same, at the same distinguishing between himself and Catholics. Then, further proving his ignorance, he lays blame on the Fenians for misremembered history *and* calls Stephen a Fenian.

It is not that Deasy necessarily believes that Stephen specifically is a Fenian, more that he slots a larger group of individuals into that category, in this case all Catholics. By no stretch of the imagination is that a true statement, nor would it be if only considered in context of Stephen, who—like Hamlet—feels that the motherland is a prison.

Why is Deasy characterized this way?

Quite simply put, as a person, Mr. Deasy is a Northerner and an Ulsterite. For whatever reason, all Northern Irish characters in Joyce’s work receive similar treatment, usually paired

with derogatory descriptors of their voices, if nothing else. For example, in *Stephen Hero*, it is written of one character, “He spoke in a high-pitched voice and with a cutting Northern accent.”[74] The reader knows Mr. Deasy is an Ulsterite not only due to his distinctions between himself and Stephen through the word ‘you’, but also because he himself makes it very evident; at the very end of the second episode, Deasy sings, “*For Ulster will fight/And Ulster will be right.”*

Footnote from Jin Translation:

There are actually five footnotes appended to this paragraph: one gives a brief history of Daniel O’Connell, one explains the famine, one explains the Orange Order and its agitation to repeal the act of Union, the fourth note explains that all Catholics admired O’Connell and that none of them—no matter how disillusioned with his policies—would have given him the title of ‘demagogue’, and the fifth note addresses Stephen and the Fenians.

What are the possible reasons for including a footnote that states that the Orange Order lobbied for the repeal of the Union of 1800, which never happened on an institutional level? There is a straightforward reason for this, and that is simply that if the Orange Order *had* done so, it would imply a common goal between the ‘orange’ Irish and the ‘green’ Irish: to keep the republican movement in parliament separate from the Westminster parliament. In the footnote, Jin *does* mention the fact that one of the founding principles of the Orange Order was that it did not want Ireland to separate from England; however, he does not provide the reason *why* the Order did not want Irish parliament to be converged into Westminster. They inadvertently ignore the fact that the reasons were different, which creates the illusion of ethnic unity, which is an issue China is struggling with even today, with more and more minority groups jostling to

legally establish their differences from the Han majority.

But the final footnote, on Stephen and the Fenians, is the most striking. Appended to the final sentence of the paragraph, it reads,

> “分尼亚协会”是一个爱尔兰民族主义组织，主张通过武装暴动脱离英国。该组织成立于一八五八年，最活跃的时期是十九世纪六十年代，至七十年代后逐渐消亡。斯蒂芬当然不可能是这一组织的成员。[75]
>
> (The “Fenians” were an Irish nationalist organization, which used and promoted primarily militaristic force to separate from England. It was founded in 1858 and was most active from the 1860s to the 1870s, when it slowly died out. Of course Stephen could not be a member.)

In the other footnotes amending Deasy’s misinformation, there is also a sense of correction to be gleaned from certain emphatic grammar structures that carry slightly negative connotations, although Jin never outright says that Deasy *is* incorrect. Instead information is provided directly contradicting Deasy’s argument with facts. The footnote above uses the phrases “*dangran*” (of course) and “*bu keneng*” (not possible) to negate Deasy’s all-inclusive use of “you Fenians” and demonstrate that the idea that Stephen could be a Fenian is ludicrous. Likewise, in one of the earlier comments on this paragraph, the phrase “*bing meiyou ren*……”[76] was used to qualify the statement that no Irish Catholic of the time would have called O’Connell a demagogue, “*bing*” being an emphatic structure applied to negative statements that implies a tinge of ‘naturally’ or ‘of course’.

The leap from the society’s active dates to the statement that Stephen was not a member suggests a correlation between the two; that due to the dates Stephen *could not* have been a member. The fact that it is not the idea of ‘militaristic force’ that prevents him from being a member confirms that Jin does not perceive differences in types of nationalism. Perhaps this is because historically in China the only way to attain the ideal of self-sovereignty was by means

of violence, or perhaps it is simply societal conditioning that allows for the use of violence to protect the motherland.

Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation

Like the Jin translation, the Xiao-Wen collaboration provided several footnotes for this paragraph. There is one about Daniel O'Connell, one briefly mentioning the potato famine, one explaining the Orange Order and their reasons for agitation against the Union, and a fourth note explaining the Fenians. Interesting to consider is the fact that the note touching on O'Connell goes into great depth on his agenda and makes him appear to be a demagogue, as accused, although it also does clarify that in reality it was the English government that labeled him as such.

The fourth footnote, which describes the Fenians, also goes into specifics on the foundation and active dates of the society, although it adds a detail that Jin missed; that the Fenians were a race of people that long ago conquered and lived in Ireland. The end of the fourth note touches on the issue of Stephen, and says,

这里，迪希把芬尼社社员一词作为激进的共和党人的俗称来用的。[77]

(Here, Deasy refers to Stephen as a Fenian, vernacular slang for members of the radical rebulican party.)

In this particular fragment of the footnote, Xiao and Wen *do* detract from the notion that Stephen was a Fenian, but replace one absurd notion with another by allowing Deasy to say—not inaccurately, in terms of slang at least—that Stephen is militantly nationalistic; the former neither Stephen nor Joyce would have allowed himself to be called and the latter perhaps even less so.

It is difficult to surmise what Xiao and Wen intended from this footnote, especially since

they do not define what they mean by ‘radical republican party’ and who *specifically* the party opposed. If Xiao-Wen had made such a statement, it would have shown their position on the movement, whether it was opposed to imperialism, ethnic separatism, or both. In this case no allegiance was specified.

In neither instance is there any hint that something about Deasy is not quite right, other than his grasp of history. The fact that such a representation of Northerners is commonplace and suggestive in Joyce’s work is not mentioned. Even though both translations show an understanding that Deasy has an inaccurate grasp of history, neither translation elaborates on this characterization. It might be said that they understate the inaccuracies by not explicitly stating that he is wrong, which suggests that the insinuation of ethnic separatism was something culturally alien or taboo to the period of translation.

Example 7:

“Seabloom, greaseabloom viewed last words. Softly. *When my country takes her place among*.
Prrprr.
Must be the bur.
Fff! Oo. Rrpr.
***Nations of the earth*. No-one behind. She’s passed. *Then and not till then*. Tram kran kran kran. Good oppor. Coming. Krandlkrankran. I’m sure it’s the burgund. Yes. One, two. *Let my epitaph be*. Kraaaaaa. *Written. I have*.**
Pprrpffrrppffff.
***Done*.”**[78]

Both the Jin and the Xiao-Wen translations provide a translation and acknowledgement of this portion of Robert Emmet’s speech from the docks just before his execution for his part in the abortive rebellion against British rule in 1803. The full text of these lines reads,

> Let no man write my epitaph: for as no man who knows my motives dare now vindicate them, let not prejudice or ignorance asperse them. Let them and me repose in obscurity and peace, and my tomb remain uninscribed, until other times, and other men, can do justice to my character; when my country takes her place among the nations of the earth, then, and not till then, let my epitaph

be written. I have done.

These words are some of the most memorable and famous words ever spoken by an Irishman. In the original text of *Ulysses* as seen above, Bloom stands reading them from a flyer posted on a wall, passing gas at the most overt Ireland-loving discourse. His actions suggest that either he does not identify with the martyrdom of the famous nationalist or that he disapproves of the cause itself, or both. Irish he may be, but a patriot Leopold Bloom is not, an idea reinforced by encounters with the Citizen in the following episode.

A closer examination of Robert Emmett will reveal that he is not much of a hero: he led two failed rebellions against British colonial rule, the second of which *he* tried to stop almost as soon as it had begun because he saw blood spilled for the first time and did not wish to see more shed. It is tempting to assume that it is due to his weakness as a revolutionary that neither translation places any import on Robert Emmett, especially after the earlier suggestions of compatriotism with the Irish cause, but that is only one possibility. Another interpretation is that the irony and subversion of the moment is so blunt, and that the bodily humor is so universal, that a footnote was not necessary to relay Joyce's ambivalence towards the martyr and his dying words.

The Xiao-Wen footnote explains the disruptions to the speech as Bloom trying to hide the sound of his flatulence beneath the sound of the passing tram.

Example 8:
"*Lamh Dearg Abu*, he drank to the undoing of his foes, a race of mighty valorous heroes, rulers of the waves, who sit on thrones of alabaster silent as the deathless gods."[79]

"*Lamh Dear Abu*" is Irish for "Red hand to victory!" It is an old battle cry, based on the story of two chieftains fighting for kingship of Ulster. A race would be held, and whoever crossed the line first would take power. When one of the men saw he would lose the race, he

cut off his hand and threw it across the finish line, thus winning the race and control of the province. Ever since, the Red Hand of Ulster has been a signifier of the province. In Joyce's time, during the year that *Ulysses* was published, 1922, the Anglo-Irish Treaty (1921) put partition into effect and Northern Ireland was separated from the Republic and made British.

What all that means is that when the Citizen utters the phrase, "*Lamh dearg abu*," the reader must understand that in context he is declaring himself as an Ulsterite. Much later, in the 1970s—a fact which you will see neither translator mentions—the Red Hand Commandos were founded. They were, and still are, a loyalist paramilitary group. The Citizen goes on to decry against his enemies, who he describes as "a race of mighty valorous heroes," far from the disparagement the reader expects from the man capable of viciously insulting Bloom for pointing out that Jesus was a Jew. To the Citizen, national identity is at least as important as religious identity, if not more; so why when given the opportunity to denigrate the English does he compliment them?

It may seem that I am making a mountain out of a mole hill with this example, but the Citizen is truly *the* character the most devoted to Ireland, at least superficially. His habits and patterns of speech are the most quintessentially Irish in that he frequently uses colloquialisms, Irish words, Hiberno-English reconstructions of Irish grammar into English, et cetera. He is a member of the Gaelic Athletic Association, which supported the originally Irish sports. He talks like a seanchaí, or a famous Irish storyteller. He is described in terms of Cú Chulainn, the great Irish hero of myth. Yet perhaps the fact that Cú Chulainn—also called the Hound of Ulster—was an Ulsterman himself is more important than the reader originally thought.

Footnote from Jin Translation

"爱尔兰语：'红手获胜！'，接红手为爱尔兰某些部落表示，亦为奥尔索普

啤酒商标。”[80]

(Irish: ‘Red hand to victory!’, referring to the red hand that is the mark of certain tribes, and is also the trademark of Allsopp brand ale.)

In earlier examples, I have begun to show the possibility that Jin’s annotations to *Ulysses* intimate a sympathy towards the turn of the century Irish nationalist cause, probably because of issues of imperialism in China during his lifetime. There have also been vague vindications of militaristic force to overthrow the rule of the British empire within Ireland. With Garret Deasy, the Ulsterite, there is the possibility of one annotation being either misinformed or an expression of anti-sectarian sentiment, but the annotation above, specifically the words ‘certain tribes’, is a patent confirmation that it was the latter.

‘Certain tribes’ is too vague a phrase for Jin not to have known which ‘certain’ groups they were, in this case the O’Neill family and all individuals from the area known as Ulster. This includes residents of the following nine counties: Cavan, Donegal, Monaghan, Antrim, Armagh, Down, Fermanagh, Derry/Londonderry, and Tyrone. In other words, the Red Hand of Ulster is a symbol that brings the issue of ‘ethnic’ separatism to the foreground of *Ulysses*, and pushes the issue of anti-imperialism away.

As Joyce finished writing *Ulysses* and tried to market it for publication, Ireland was in a state of civil war over the issue of British rule. The loyalists, the majority of which lived in the northern counties (i.e. Ulster), wanted Ireland to remain a part of the empire, whereas the nationalists wished *all of* Ireland to be its own sovereign nation. The geographical divide, aligned neatly if not completely with the sectarian divide, was largely created in the nineteenth century during the plantation period, when the English monarchy settled loyal Englishmen and Scotsmen in the northern land, which had the most fertile soil for farming.

The original, primarily Catholic farmers and owners of the northern land were forced south, creating the dichotomy of allegiances Ireland is still known for today: protestant/loyalist versus Catholic/republican.

At the end of the twentieth century, especially in the early 90s, China, too, was plagued by a series of separatist terrorist activities along border regions, mostly with Inner Mongolia, Xinjiang, and Tibet. At the time, most of the activists were not lobbying for independence. Instead, they were vying for religious freedom, economic policies that favor the local, and opposing the One-Child Policy, as well as expressing concern over nuclear testing and environmental issues. Beijing officials began to utilize the activity to promote Chinese nationalism as a "unifying ideology." There was no need for ethnic minorities to petition for unique treatment, since they were also part of the national Chinese identity.

In this period of time, representations that reinforced ideas of ethnic separatism would not only have been taboo, but the topic would have been a very controversial one that people probably avoided. If that was indeed the case, then little wonder if 'Ulster' was replaced with 'certain tribes'.

Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation

"红手是爱尔兰古代省份阿尔斯特的标记。也是奥尼尔族的家微图案。奥尔索普拍瓶装啤酒即以此图案作为商标。"[81]

(The red hand is the insignia of Ireland's ancient province of Ulster, and is also the crest of the O'Neill[82] family. Because of this, Allsopp brand ale uses this picture for their trademark.)

Since the Xiao-Wen and Jin translations were published within months of each other, and therefore both emerged in the midst of ethnic separatist terrorism, why do Xiao and Wen choose to include the very information that Jin found too dangerous?

It would be easy to assume that they felt some kind of affiliation to ethnic issues: a simple internet search turns up the fact that Xiao's family is Mongolian. Yet the same search also turns up the fact that he attended a Christian missionary school, whereas above he is almost laudatory concerning anti-imperialist sentiment. A second consideration of the annotation suggests that maybe his Mongolian lineage is just misleading biographical information. Like the Jin footnote, the annotation above does not include the violent history of the red hand, nor does it include any kind of indication that Ulster is—in the minds of the more extreme nationalists and loyalists—"ethnically" diverse.

Example 9:
"An illuminated scroll of ancient Irish vellum, the work of Irish artists, was presented to the distinguished phenomenologist on behalf of a large section of the community and was accompanied by the gift of a silver casket, tastefully executed in the style of ancient Celtic ornament, a work which reflects every credit on the makers, Messrs Jacob *agus* Jacob."[83]

Although certainly a small detail, the Jacob's biscuit tin is significant. It is hurled at Bloom by the Citizen at the close of the 12th episode, after Bloom has stated that Jesus was a Jew. The tin misses Bloom completely.

Jacob's Biscuit Factory, located in Dublin, was one of the four principle defensive bases for the republican rebels during the Easter Uprising of 1916. It was one of two bases[84] where there were known instances of rebels using paramilitary violence against citizens who were attempting to depose them or in some way render them impotent, such as by destroying their territorial barriers. This is precisely what Bloom is doing to the Citizen, or at least so the Citizen believes, so he attacks the civilian—in this case, Bloom—using the greatest power he knows; militant Irish nationalism.

Additionally, the Jacob's factory was owned by Quakers, who are renowned for their

pacifism. By making an article of pacifist paraphernalia a bomb in open caricature of the Easter 1916 uprising, Joyce is once again undermining the shared interests of the Literary Revival and the uprising, displaying how absurd he considered the situation to be.

Footnote from Jin Translation

“雅各布公司为都柏林一饼干厂，agus 为爱尔兰语‘和’，表示厂名中两个雅各布均为厂主。”[85]

(Jacob’s is a Dublin-based biscuit factory, ‘agus’ is Irish for ‘and’, representing the two Jacobs in the factory name.)

Footnote from Xiao-Wen Translation

“这是以都柏林饼干制造商W.雅各布与R.雅各布为老板的一家股份有限公司。”[86]

(This is a reference to Dublin’s joint stock company limited biscuit factory owned by W. Jacob and R. Jacob.)

Much as with the Citizen’s alternate identity, the buried identity of the Jacob’s biscuit tin is not acknowledged by either translation. The biscuit tin is a minute and very subtle detail in comparison to the flagrantly Ulsterite declaration that the citizen made, which also went unacknowledged in both. The translators’ silence about the Citizen’s loyalties is potentially cultivated from the governmental hostility towards any kind of separatism. The official reaction to separatist violence both in the 1990s and since 2008 has been to say that these acts are committed by small extremist groups, and that the best way to prevent future attacks is nationalism, which will theoretically unify the nation. That is what the government wants: a populace focused on the fact of being Chinese rather than on the fact of their different minorities. This idea of nationalism is also a justification of or reaction to anti-imperialism, which fleshes out the potential explanations for the translators’ esteem of Irish proceedings

against the colonial force of the British Empire.

The Jacob's Biscuit tin is not an ethnic separatist symbol, at least within the scope of Ireland: it pits Ireland against the British Empire, and in 1916 the nation had yet to be legally divided into two separate entities. So why is the historical and more importantly nationalistic background of the biscuit tin unaddressed in *both* translations? There is a logical explanation. Jacob's Biscuit Factory, was, as previously stated, notorious for incidents of paramilitary violence against civilians, although it should be said that the 'civilians' in questions were not innocent bystanders: they were individuals that attempted to impede the revolutionaries. In essence, a miniature civil war, which *is* inner-ethnic separatism.

Throughout the footnotes, the translators' experiences and the mindset ingrained in them during their formative years as Chinese citizens influences their presentation of material to the audience. If Jin, Xiao and Wen understand the nationalism buried in *Ulysses* as *purely* anti-imperialist, then that is how the reader will understand it, as guided by the information provided. Since the translators are not keyed in to the separate nationalisms inherent in the text, such as ethnic separatism and anti-imperialism, only the sentiment that the translators can relate to is perceived and relayed.

The imperialists are the enemy of this monogenealogical mentality, but because of the unified nature of it, the only group of people included in 'imperialists' are the British and those who explicitly associate with them. At least up until this point, when there's a question of allegiance between internal groups, the translators give them the benefit of the doubt, such as in the case of the Orange Order and, to some extent, Deasy. Likewise, when it comes down

to a question of militant sectarianism, as with Zionism and the Irish Republican Brotherhood, those too go unexplored.

Yet perhaps this phenomenon is somehow due to the subtlety of the references, or a perceived insignificance. But what about the different voices of the characters from different "racial" backgrounds? Surely they should be more indicative of the translators' awareness of different types of nationalism and how attuned they are to the subtlety of the text.

CHAPTER 2
Potato Potahto: Two Translations of *Ulysses*
Translating the Voices of Segregated Politicized Ethnicities

"The language of the conqueror in the mouths of the conquered is the language of slaves."[87]

In every country there are a multitude of different voices, varied in accent and in dialect. In literature, these voices become archetypal of certain castes, geographies and so on. In English, this prolificacy of voices includes such recognizable dialects[88] as Cockneys, Kiltartan, black dialect, Scots, Chicano, Yinglish, Chinglish, as well as many other lesser-known forms. Chinese easily has over 40 spoken dialects. Although many of them are not mutually intelligible, nationalist linguists emphasize the fact that they are all derivative of Mandarin: a fact which is crucial to understanding the Jin and Xiao-Wen translations.

In *Ulysses* as in Joyce's other works, there is a gradient of ethnic voices, the most emphatic discrepancy falling between the 'pure' Irish voices and the 'pure' English ones. The voices that come between and therefore might be expected to be treated more mildly are those of the Northern Irish and the Anglo-Irish, what we might call 'hyphenated' voices.

In Joyce's esteem, the expected order of descent from 'favored' to 'scorned' ethnic voices is Irish, Anglo-Irish, Northern Irish, English. This is because the Anglo-Irish, while technically being mostly of English descent, were also comprised of Irish converts to Protestantism (Church of Ireland) during the time of the Penal Laws, which stripped Catholics of their rights. Also, in Joyce's experience, the visible portion of the Anglo-Irish social class—while taking their social cues from English practices—*were* heavily aligned with Irish nationalist sentiment. More prominent individuals from this group from the turn of the twentieth century that Joyce

knew personally were Lady Augusta Gregory, William Butler Yeats, George Bernard Shaw, and John Millington Synge. They were all members of the Literary Revival, vying for the return of Celtic culture.

The Northern Irish are allotted a lower rung because of their vastly British ethnic composition. Because of the plantation period, the northern counties were predominantly Protestant and Presbyterian in population, and the majority of citizens were also loyalist. Unlike the Anglo-Irish, who only took their social cues from English custom, northerners were English, or at least generally perceived as being so. And Joyce, aurally oriented as he was, was repulsed by the high-pitched high-speed northern accents, a disgust which evolved into a synecdoche-esque distrust of the individuals who spoke with it.

The aim of this chapter is to establish the spectrum of these ethnic voices in the original text of *Ulysses*, and outline Joyce's use of them in relation to the idea of nationalism. At the same time, it will explore the textual representations of these different voices in the1994 Jin and Xiao-Wen translations. Examples were carefully culled from the novel based upon my understanding of the different characters' 'national' identities, as well as based upon my understanding of typical patterns of speech for all groups involved.

These 'ethnic voices' or this 'nationalist language' can also be discussed in terms of Hiberno-English and the Joycean negative of that, the Queen's English. In this examination of nationalist language, the category of Hiberno-English voices includes the following aspects; Anglicized Irish words, Irish words, and Irish grammar constructions. This is the most important aspect of the chapter, because the Hiberno-English of Joyce is actually a reconstruction of his otherwise deconstructed English throughout the rest of the text. It is a

defining moment of uniqueness in *Ulysses*, the facet that makes it a novel in English and yet against English. It is also one of the most potent pro-nationalist arguments available to critics, because of the sharp divisions drawn between the ex post facto Republic-of-Irelanders and the English and ex post facto Northern Irelanders through this language created by Joyce.

The temptation will be for us to say that because English is such an etymologically multicultural language that it is a good medium for representing several different 'ethnicities', but that because written Chinese is an essentially monocultural language that it would be difficult or even impossible to create different ethnic voices. This is an invalid argument for two reasons. First, the linguistic category of Chinese contains over 40 dialects, and it would be relatively easy for the translators to assign each Irish and English ethnicity a particular dialect of Chinese, or at least aspects of them so that readers would understand that the language of given characters is nonstandard and not uniform, as well as being intended to be understood in certain ways. Second, *Ulysses* is built on a language that has been torn apart and reassembled in piecemeal fashion, regardless of standardized grammatical and syntactical structures, and for the translators of such a book to attempt to communicate that in the standardized form of any language is impossible. The daringness of the language gave *Ulysses* the success it enjoys today. Since the translators were already going to need to bend and break rules of original linguistic structures, it would have been easy to create a few obviously vernacular and disparate voices that the readers could understand.

First and foremost is the voice of the pure Irish, the purportedly most potently Irish character being the Citizen, who is constantly mixing pure Irish words and phrases into his

sentences.

Example 1:
"Never better, *a chara*, says he."[89]
(*my friend*)
***"Bi i dho husht*, says he."[90]**
(*Be quiet/shut up)*
***"Sinn fein amhain!"*[91]**
(*We ourselves alone!*)

It is interesting and relevant to note that even though the Citizen is the only character to really use any pure Irish words in his daily conversations,[92] the kinds of Irish phrases that he makes use of are elementary and common in usage. It seems unlikely that he knows Irish on any higher level than just stray words picked up from grandparents or parents. Even the last one, '*sinn fein amhain*', is just a political slogan probably often heard going around the taverns. Thus Joyce maintains his image of the Citizen as inadequately Irish while simultaneously making him the most quintessentially Irish citizen he possibly can.

From Jin Translation

"再好也没有，a chara，他说。"[93] (Couldn't be better, a chara, he said.)

The other two lines of Irish given above were maintained in their original form in the Jin translation, and after each as with the example above, a footnote was given informing the reader that the language is Irish and translating the Irish into Chinese. The only thing noteworthy about this is that Jin failed to copy the original Irish "*Bi i dho husht,*" and instead wrote, "Bii do ushsht."[94]

From Xiao-Wen Translation

"再好不过啦，我的朋友，"他说。[95] ("Couldn't be better, my friend," he said.)

"不许出声！"他说。[96] ("Be quiet!")

"我们自己，"'市民'说，"我们自己就够了！[97]"("We ourselves," the Citizen said, "We ourselves alone!")

Both the second and third notes are accompanied with footnotes explaining that they were

both originally phrases in Irish, the Sinn Fein note also explaining the origin of the words in the work of D. D. Sullivan.

Unlike the Citizen, however, the rest of the cast use Anglicized Irish words; that is to say Irish words and expressions that have been transliterated into English. (Italics added)

Example 2:
Bloom: "ignorant as a *kish* of *brogues*"[98]
(*cis*- basket, and *brog*- shoe)
Narrator: "To the door of the bar and dining room came bald Pat, came *bothered* Pat, came Pat, waiter of Ormond."[99]
(*bodhar*- deaf)
Simon Dedalus: "Ben *machree*…"[100]
(*mo chroidhe*- my heart)
Molly: "…he used to amuse me the things he said with the half *sloothering* smile on him…"[101]
(*sligheadoir*- artful)

In this case, although Jin obviously understood the Anglicized Irish words because he translated them correctly, he did not differentiate between those and the standard English words. There is no indication in the language of his translations that there *is* something different about particular words, nor does he annotate them. The only peculiarity is at the phrase, "ignorant as a kish of brogues." The Jin translation reads, "……大皮鞋似的字认不了一筐……,"[102] which translates roughly as 'so ignorant that he doesn't know a basket of words the size of big leather shoes." The second half of the phrase, "*da…zi renbuliao yikuang*," is a Chinese colloquialism equivalent to the original Irish. The same is also true of the Xiao-Wen translation, except that the "kish of brogues" is accompanied by a footnote that says in the west we say an idiot's brain grows on their foot, and that the basket of shoes implies further ignorance. Nowhere does it say, after all that effort, that the basket of shoes is an Irish expression, or that it happens to be very similar to this Chinese expression.

Following that, the Hiberno-English is represented by a series of grammar structures

plucked directly from the Irish and transplanted into English. Chief among these is the 'and + present participle' construction of a sentence.

Example 3:
"…and Alf trying to keep him from tumbling off the bloody stool… and he talking all kinds of drivel…"[103]

From Jin Translation
"阿尔夫还得扶着他点儿，免得他从背时的凳子上翻下来……可他还在不停嘴地胡址……"[104]

(Alf still having to support him a little, to keep him from tumbling off the unlucky stool…but he still talking all kinds of drivel…)

From Xiao-Wen Translation
"他差点儿从该死的凳子上倒……阿尔夫试图扶住他。他嘴里还喋喋不休地说着种种蠢话……"[105]

(He nearly falling off the bloody stool…. Alf trying to support him. He still talking all kinds of drivel…)

In Chinese, there is no conjugation of verbs. All verbs exist in the infinitive and change tenses based upon context. The conjunction 'and' is also rarely used, which makes any attempt at representing this particular Hiberno-English construction difficult. I have translated the verbs above into the present participle based on the English, but in Chinese this would not be as anomalous a construction as it sounds in English. The 'and' in the original English rearranges the stress on words, which the Chinese translations do not capture, nor do the translations make a note to acknowledge it. It is also noteworthy that the phrase "*diedie buxiu*" in the Xiao-Wen translation, which means 'to witter on', is a literary or educated expression and is therefore inappropriate in this instance.

It feels as if the translators have fallen into the same trap that a lot of Joyce critics have in the past; they assume that because Joyce was a pacifist and because he had 'escaped' from Ireland that there is nothing to the Irish aspect of *Ulysses* other than Ireland being what Joyce

knew best at the time of writing. This is an illogical assumption given the careful attention paid to the voices of the characters. For example, both Bloom and Stephen speak eloquently, Stephen without any readable accent at all, and Bloom with only minor slips into a lilt. Yet here the narrator of the twelfth episode, an unknown in company of the 'quintessentially' Irish Citizen in Barney Kiernan's, speaks vernacularly in keeping with the rhythm of the rest of the episode.

Other similar linguistic constructions borrowed from Irish are condescendingly put into the mouths of the more undereducated and quaint characters, such as Simon Dedalus, Alf Bergan, and Molly Bloom. (Italics added)

Alf Bergan: ***"Sure I'm after seeing him*** **not five minutes ago, says Alf, as plain as a pikestaff."**[106]
('Sure' as an interjection, and the 'after + present participle' construction, meaning that something has been done before the present action. For example, "I'm after seeing him" means "I just saw him.")

Molly: **"…*I wonder do they see*** **anything that we cant staring like that when she sits at the top of the stairs so long…"**[107]
(Use of 'do' in place of 'if')

Bloom: **"What *do* they *be* thinking about?"**[108]
(Use of 'do' and non-conjugation of the verb form 'be' rather than 'are')

This category also includes Buck Mulligan's mockery of it, mixing all the various structures together into long, breathless sentences that seem unintelligible even to English readers.

Example 4:
"'Twas murmur we did for a gallus potion would rouse a friar, *I'm thinking,* and he limp with leching. *And we* one hour and two hours and three hours in Connery's *sitting* civil waiting for pints apiece.
He waited:
And we to be there, mavrone, and **you to be unbeknownst *sending* us your conglomerations the way we to have our tongues out a yard long like the drouthy clerics *do be fainting* for a pussful."**[109]

Buck Mulligan rarely says or acts seriously except via satire and mockery, in this case the

lilting brogue he resorts to when pretending to be rural. Here, he is chastising Stephen for not meeting them with money at the pub for pints. It is a petty complaint and Mulligan realizes that, so he uses the voice he associates with pettiness, the vulgar one of the uneducated Irish masses. More importantly, it is in the style of J. M. Synge's writing; a combination of western Irish grammar structures such as might be found on the Aran Islands mixed with English language.

What is interesting about the translation of these particular lines is that there is a definite sense of the translators attempting to surmount the obstacles of the 'and + present participle' construction, the issue of non-conjugation, the non-usage of the conjunction 'and', the use of an 'infinitive verb 1 + present participle verb 2' construction ("and you to be… sending"), and the 'do + infinitive verb 1 + present participle verb 2' construction ("do be fainting"). This means that there is an awareness on the translators' part that the English is non-standard. The Xiao-Wen translation especially so, because it includes a footnote explaining that '*mavrone*' was originally in Irish, although the Chinese "*guaiguai*" that the translators use is actually more often used as an exclamation of surprise than as an endearment. It also then goes on to explain that the language of these few lines is in the style of Synge, with his mix of colloquial Irish grammar and English words.

For example, the Jin Translation uses the character '*an*' for 'I' and '*anmen*' for 'we' to colloquialize the voice, '*an*' being from a rural northern dialect, meaning 'I/me/we/us', and that is the extent of his attempt to vulgarize Mulligan's rant. But then he also uses this same '*an*' later for the voices of the English soldiers, indicating that there are no layers of vernacularism in the different voices, other than differentiation of social class.

In China as in every country there is a standard language and there are regional dialects. Officially, dialects fall below Mandarin on the hierarchy of languages, but they are still privileged by the speakers. The best example of this is Shanghainese. In Shanghai, speakers of the local dialect are considered more educated than speakers of Mandarin. Northern dialects, on the other hand, are considered not unlike the stereotypes of 'redneck' speech patterns: crude, rustic and unsophisticated. It works in this instance precisely because Buck Mulligan is mocking the Western Irish dialect as all of those things. The Xiao-Wen translation also relies on this northern dialect to make Mulligan's speech more vernacular.

From Xiao-Wen Translation

"我们曾嘟囔说，要足足的喝上它一杯，让行乞的修士都会起魔障。我正转着这个念头，他呢，跟姑娘们黏糊起来了我们就乖乖儿地坐在康纳里那儿，一个钟头，两个钟头，三个钟头地等下去，指望着每人喝上五六杯呢。"

他唉声叹气地说：

"我们就呆在那儿，乖乖，把舌头耷拉得一码长，活像那想酒想得发昏的干嗓子教士。你呢，也不知道躲到哪儿去了，居然还给我们送来这么个玩艺儿。"[110]

(We once murmured, to drain a glass would rouse a begging friar. I'm thinking, and he getting languid with the girls and we patiently sitting in Connery's, one hour, two hours, three hours waiting, wishing for pints a piece.

Sighingly, he said:

We just waiting there, *mavrone*, tongues hanging out a yard long, like parched clerics fainting for a drink. And we not knowing where you were hiding, still unexpectedly sending us your conglomerations.)

Xiao-Wen does not use '*anmen*', instead varying the language alongside the Hiberno-English, such as '*wo zheng zhuanzhe zhege niantou*', which is a replication of one of the present participle constructions: it *actually* says 'I'm thinking', with special emphasis being placed on the time of the verb contextually through the word '*zheng*', which means 'just' or 'just now'. Another such correlation in the language of the text is at "do be fainting for a pussful," for which Xiao-Wen use the phrase '*xiang de fahun*'. It means to want

something so much that the subject is fainting/near fainting. Just like the "I'm thinking," rather than being colloquial, this expression is outmoded.

There are examples of colloquialism in these lines as well, using the same northern dialect that Jin culled his '*an*' from. In the first sentence, '*qi mozhang*' is used to replace the word 'rouse' from the original. Usually '*mozhang*' is a slang term for being addicted to something, although in this case paired with the verb '*qi*' or 'to rise/give rise to' it seems to have a different meaning: to excite. In the following sentence, the phrase '*nianhu qi*' for 'limp' is also slang, for 'languid'. And in the final sentence of the example, '*wanyir*' is used for 'conglomerations'. It is used to mean 'souvenir' or 'trinket', and also—even more vulgarly—can be used as an insult to say, "What are you?," implying a degree of monstrosity. Here it is being used as a combination of meanings just as innovative as Joyce's own language. Other words from this passage also drawn from this same northern dialect include '*dunang*' (murmur), '*guaiguair*' (patiently), '*guaiguai*' (*mavrone*) and '*dala*' (drooping).

However, the language runs into snags at omission of the subject relative,

"Here's this nobleman passed before."[111]

and at prepositions used in irregular ways taken from the Irish Gaelic usages

"Irish, Buck Mulligan said. Is there Gaelic on you?,"[112]

where it cannot be adapted without butchering Chinese beyond recognition and then adding footnotes to explain the debauchery. In general there is very little to distinguish the oddity of the Hiberno-English from the 'purity' of the rest of the text. In itself this would not be a problem, except that it is a distinct ethnic voice meant to be contrasted against the other "British Isles" voices—the Northern Irish, the Anglo-Irish, and the English voices. The instances of these voices in the text are few and far between, but when they do appear *how* they speak rather than *what* they say is important.

The fact that the Irish voice comes across most clearly not with Molly or Alf or the Citizen but with Buck Mulligan's burlesque of it means something. It might mean that because Mulligan's words are the most absurdly and obviously deviating from the Queen's English that it was made that much easier to pick up on, even in translation. Or it might mean that, given the perception of the Chinese language as one greater unified entity in spite of its dialectical divergence, that the significance of variation in the dialects and accents of English-speaking voices is lost on the translators. For example, someone in China who speaks Cantonese is still perceived as being Chinese, whereas someone in Ireland speaking with a British accent is *not* perceived as Irish.

The voice of the Anglo-Irish and the Protestant Ascendancy was also the voice of the Irish Literary Revival. According to A. J. Bliss in his article on Anglo-Irish language and literature,[113] malapropism is a particularly Anglo-Irish idiosyncrasy, and the twelfth episode is rife with it. Although the Citizen is never guilty of malapropism, there is a high instance of it in the speech of the people he surrounds himself with; Alf Bergan, the narrator, and Joe.

Example 5:

"I beg your parsnips, says Alf."[114]
(I beg your *pardon*.)

"They're all barbers…"[115]
(They're all *barbarians*.)

"The bloody mongrel let a grouse out of him would give you the creeps."[116]
(The bloody mongrel let a *bark*…)

"Who made those allegations? Says Alf. "I, says Joe. I'm the alligator."[117]
(I'm the *accuser*.)

"Me, says Alf. Don't cast your nasturtiums on my character."[118]
(Don't cast your *aspersions* on my character.)

Like the Citizen saying the phrase 'lamh dearg abu', the prolificacy of malapropism in the

parlance of his entourage is very telling. It is another jibe at the Irish Literary Revival and their nationalist tendencies. Again, the true-blue-Irishman, the Citizen who we now know to be either an Ulsterite or ignorant of the cause he stands for, surrounds himself with others claiming to be intense Irish nationalists, although perhaps not terrorists. Their idiom says something different about them; that like the writers of the Renaissance, they are trying to compensate for being genetically only half Irish by being 'violently' Irish in behavior, although they are unable to eradicate their roots.

It was ironic to Joyce that those most insistent on reviving dead Irish culture were genetic members of the Protestant Ascendancy, not members of the 'native' Catholic population that could rightfully—if they desired—be opposed to the intrusion of the English and their language. These self-revealing Ascendancy Citizen-ites in Barney Kiernan's are a further subversion of notions of 'Irishness' and nationalism.

These, too, are disregarded by the translators as unimportant or at least not critical to a reading of *Ulysses*, translated directly into the phrases that they should have been in English, without annotation. Is it an issue of subtlety, as the Jacob's biscuit tin potentially is? Or is it because the translators do not believe that differentiation between the voices is something that should be emphasized? Or better yet, is it because this representation of an Anglo-Irish speech pattern renders the subject unintelligent? The 'purer' Irish voices, like the Citizen's, are full of grammar structures that are not inherent to English, but the turns of phrase and constructions *are* natural to a legitimate language—Irish—while the Anglo-Irish with their malapropisms are manifestly incorrect, and Joyce's use of such is intended to mock them, to separate them from their compatriots.

These divisions on separate levels of language and identity are stereotypes that work against their own countrymen and is, in effect, a milder form of ethnic separatism. As we have seen before, ethnic separatism as an institution goes against the mindset of the Chinese citizen, who believes in the legitimacy of sacrificing the personal for the greater good. This notion, a remnant of the Mao era, has evolved into the less dramatic but equally as self-sacrificing idea of the ethnic homogeny of the entire Chinese state, which manifests itself in their treatment of Mandarin as one overarching structure that divides down into separate dialects but that is always one. Yet with his characterization of hyphenated Irish voices, as we see with both the Anglo-Irish and the Northern Irish, Joyce clearly demonstrates his associations of genetic superiority with the 'pure' Irish, splitting English and even Hiberno-English along "ethnic" divides, which offends the Chinese sensibility.

The next step down in the Joycean hierarchy is that of the Northern Irish. The best example of a northern voice in *Ulysses* is Garrett Deasy, although since he is well-educated his patterns of speech contrast very little with Stephen's. Instead, his information—although grounded in fact—is seldom accurate, and his long-winded rambles are both dry and tedious. In other words, Mr. Deasy is unpleasant to be around. However, in the fifteenth episode there is one very specific Northern speaker, actually called "The Orange Lodges," referring to the Orange Order, composed entirely of protestant loyalists to the English crown.

"You'll be home the night!"[119]

This particular usage of the article 'the' is a classically Northern Irish vernacularism, even today. Its appearance at this juncture in the text is minor, but given that there are so few Northern voices in the text, every instance of them is important, and any deviation from

Stephen's educated English is intentional and meaningful.[120]

Due to the fact that Chinese does not use the article 'the' or anything like it, it would have been impossible for a translator to replicate this phrase. Unfortunately neither translation comments on the anomaly, focusing on content rather than the form, which is one of the big problems facing translators of Joyce.

But language is *the hero of* Ulysses, and the sense of *Ulysses* as a nationalist text is in some ways defined by the voices of the minor characters. The voices discussed above, despite being a subversion of Irishmen and having their linguistic foibles, are still the voices of *Irish* characters. The defining moment of ethnic separatism versus anti-imperialism arrives with the translation of the English voices, because Joyce is not as kind to the English, "the bloody brutal Sassenachs and their patois."[121] They, too, are thin on the ground, but reach their pinnacle in Privates Carr and Compton, who pick a fight with Stephen at the end of the fifteenth episode. Interestingly, it is during this interlude that the protagonist makes the one and only proclamation that he is, in fact, an Irish patriot. After Bloom tries to defend him to the privates as a gentleman, Stephen adds, "Gentleman, patriot, scholar and judge of impostors."[122] In fact, all of those are things that the young soldiers are not, quibbling over Stephen insulting their king.

It is not their petty arguments that most defines their Englishness; it is their speech. One glance at the dialogue is enough to see that something is going on.

Example 6:

Private Compton: **"He doesn't half want a thick ear, the blighter. Biff him one, Harry."[123]**

Private Carr: **"I'll do him in, so help me fucking Christ! I'll wring the bastard fucker's bleeding blasted fucking windpipe!"[124]**

Private Compton's language, if less vulgar, is still just as rough as Private Carr's. Naturally, it is only the latter that comes across as being crass in Chinese, because obscenity is universally shocking.

From Jin Translation

"我来收拾他，操蛋基督助我！看我吧着操蛋杂种的倒毒操蛋臭气管拧断了！"[125]

(I'll clean him up, so help me fucking Christ! I'll wring the fucking bastard's unlucky fucking windpipe!)

From Xiao-Wen Translation

"我要干掉他，愿混蛋基督助我！我要扭断着混帐杂种的残暴该死混蛋的气管。"[126]

(I'll dispose of him, so help me bleeding Christ ! I'll wring the dirty bastard's cruel fucking bastard windpipe!)

In the Jin translation, the phrases '*caodan jidu*' and '*caodan*' for "fucking" both sound extremely rude, and of course the word '*caodan*' is extremely colloquial, and more importantly, extremely offensive. In the Xiao-Wen translation, the word '*hunzhang*' for "bastard" stands out as the most offensive and vulgar, and might have origins in a rural dialect. It is not as offensive as the '*caodan*' that Jin uses. For example, an educated man might use the word '*hunzhang*', but never '*caodan*'. In Chinese as well as in English, the speaker of these sentences sounds uneducated, violent, and low class. The speakers being soldiers, it is what the reader expects anyway. Aside from Haines and a prostitute that steals Bloom's lucky potato,[127] there are no other significant English characters in *Ulysses*, which means Joyce chose the privates to display England to its worst advantage, demonstrating disparagement and condescension more than anything else. Additionally, the inclusion of the privates allows for what follows, which is the 'uneducated' oppressor (Private Carr) unwarrantedly abusing (punching) the more 'urbane' oppressed (Stephen). It is, at least in terms of nationalism, the climax of the epic.

Here, as before, there is an understanding of the concept of anti-imperialism, and a willingness to get behind the idea of typifying the person of the oppressor as a villain and an uneducated blackguard. Joyce sets up layers of opposition with his different voices, but the only voices that the reader can see are different in these two translations are the voices of the 'pure' (i.e. non-hyphenated) Irish as represented by Stephen, Bloom and the Citizen, and the English as represented by Privates Compton and Carr. The ignominy of being one of the hyphenated voices is lost in a perceived battle for justice. To the translators, ethnic separatism is incomprehensible; to a degree, it is un-Chinese, and it is possible they never read it into the text.

It is unfortunate that the different English voices of *Ulysses* were not given more attention in these two translations, because they speak volumes about the intentions of the author. The effects of the few more carefully translated instances prove that the task of duplicating the different voices is not impossible. However, even if both translations had paid close attention to the distinct ethnic voices it is still unlikely that the Chinese reader would have picked up any of the defamatory undertones thereof. Without the annotation that neither the Jin nor the Xiao-Wen translation provides in *any* of these instances, other than the one small aside when Buck Mulligan is *pretending* to have a western Irish accent, the distinct voices of these separate identities are lost.

All in all, there is no significant presence in either translation of a nationalist sub-language, nor is there any momentous notational manipulation of nationalist references. However, silence is as telling as speaking, and the very careful skirting of the subject is a kind of avoidance.

Indeed, some of the lines drawn by the translators were very fine. For example, the Jacob's biscuit tin that the Citizen lobs at Bloom in the twelfth episode. It is a heavily nationalist and, more importantly, a heavily anti-imperialist symbol, and the incident that imbued the factory with those qualities is a well-known, oft remembered event. Yet it went unremarked upon, indicating a choice on the translators' part not to include this information. Why? Somehow it *must* go against the Chinese way of life and belief.

CHAPTER 3
An Irish Victory at Last: The Critics' View of *Ulysses*
The Role of Nationalism in the Eyes of the Chinese Readership

"Some people, says Bloom, can see the mote in others' eyes but they can't see the beam in their own."[128]

Having presented the reader with a detailed overview and interpretation of representations of nationalism and national ethnic voices in the Xiao-Wen and Jin translations of James Joyce's *Ulysses*, I must now consider the reception of the translations by the intended audience. As previously mentioned, both translations were eagerly received by Chinese readers. According to Patrick O'Neill in his *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*, the first printing of the Xiao-Wen translation sold all 100,000 copies within a matter of days, and that despite the fact that the cost of the book—$15—would have been the average weekly wage for the time. The first printing of the Jin translation, the first volume of which was published just a few months after the Xiao-Wen, sold out in a few weeks, and after the second volume was published in 1996, over 50,000 complete sets were purchased within six months.[129]

With such a high demand for the novel, criticism and critical analyses were certain to follow. Much of the criticism that came out immediately dealt with the quality of the translations themselves rather than delving into the body of the text, but responses to the story itself followed soon after, and this criticism is mostly focused on three aspects of the text: stream-of-consciousness, feminism, and nationalism. It is this third that this chapter is concerned with. How do the critics read nationalism in the text? Do they differentiate between types of nationalism? Is there discussion of the opposing forces of ethnic separatism and anti-colonialism? What passages stand out as important to the theme of nationalism in the mind

of Chinese readers? What does this mean for *their* understanding of nationalism, in contrast with those of the author and the translators?

In an interview conducted in 2005, Wen Jieruo said,

> Only if you understand Joyce's patriotism can you understand *Ulysses*. Joyce's knowledge is so extensive and profound that you can research him from any angle. I researched it from this angle because it is related to our nationality; like the Irish we too have been bullied and oppressed by foreign nationals, and reading *Ulysses* will produce this resonance.[130]

She refers here to previous critical analysis she had done of *Ulysses*. This statement is interesting on three levels. Firstly, rather than identifying Joyce's a-political tendencies, she categorizes and gives significance to "Joyce's patriotism" as one of the key factors in unlocking *Ulysses*. While I agree with this angle of interpretation, it goes against a lot of traditional considerations of the text because of Joyce's pacifism, which inherently rejects nationalism as a violent force. Secondly, unlike Jin Ti, Wen Jieruo is giving us explicit insight into her agenda, one which she presumably shared with her husband and co-translator, Xiao Qian. The fact that she has an agenda when she says that *Ulysses* might be studied from any angle but that she has selected this one proves it is reasonable to conclude that not only is this how she presents the text to be read, but also how she understands the text. At the very least, it is insight into the fact that she considers nationalism to be Joyce's main concern in *Ulysses*.

Thirdly and most importantly, she *wants* the novel to resonate with the Chinese reader—the intended audience—on an anti-imperialist or anti-colonialist note. It is "*because*" China, like Ireland, has suffered at the hands of foreigners, which in itself becomes an interesting project because this shared sentiment establishes the exact kind of 'us' and 'them' dichotomy that Joyce was trying to abolish with his own interpretation of nationalism, founded on internationalism. She is not incorrect in emphasizing the dichotomy, since Joyce himself

perverted the English characters and language as viciously and as often as he possibly could in *Ulysses*. However, as discussed in the previous chapter, there is a gradient between other ethnically 'Irish' and 'English' characters, and the most important fact that emerges from an analysis of their voices is that not a single one among them—"pure" Irish included—is entirely without blame or fault.

Whether or not this is a "valid" position for a translator of *Ulysses* to take is irrelevant: as Wen says, Joyce's work is so profound and so well-informed on a diverse range of subjects that the work can be approached from any direction with equal success. What this chapter will examine is how the translations' audience perceives the text of *Ulysses* in relation to the concepts of nationalism and patriotism.

In the Chinese articles, interviews, and theses read in preparation to write this chapter, I notice five focal points of nationalism shared by Chinese critics with regard to *Ulysses*. They are the malleability of history in all characters' hands, the Martello tower as a microcosm of Ireland, the relationships in the house on Eccles Street as analogous to the creation of relationships in colonized Ireland, Joyce's use of ethnicity in the two main characters, and Stephen's pre-*Ulysses* statement that, "…I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race."[131] I am going to focus on the works of Shen Fuying, Lü Liying, Wen Jieruo, Yu Hongying, He Zhongsheng, and Li Huaiyu as they represent the Chinese views of nationalism in *Ulysses*.

Ireland, the Martello Tower

In terms of political allegiance and behavior towards Mother Ireland, life in the Martello

Tower as portrayed in the first episode of *Ulysses* is a microcosm of the book as a whole: the plot, cast and setting of the first episode mirrors the greater journey of the rest of the novel. Stephen is easily read as Bloom, Haines as Deasy, and Buck Mulligan as the Citizen. According to Shen Fuying, these same characters are geographically allegorical on a macrocosmic level.

One of the earliest mentions of Haines is Buck Mulligan saying to Stephen that he's going to tell the Englishman about something clever Stephen has said. This is in reference to Haines' desire to collect and document the sayings of the Irish. In her doctoral thesis, Shen argues that the motivation behind this collection is to gather solid proof of the Irishman's buffoonery to present to his compatriots.[132] Or, as Shen says, "but the main real purpose of his [Haines's] trip to Ireland is to…fix Irish culture into the framework of his imagined stereotype."[133]

What is that stereotype? She cites the work of Raymond F. Betts when she says that "Some Englishmen refer to members of the resident populations as 'niggers'."[134] So while there is little to no supporting evidence in *Ulysses* for the fact that Haines has ungenerous intentions in collecting these phrases, his other behaviors and his identity as an English imperialist do lend Shen's theory credulity. During Joyce's lifetime and even a century before, English depictions of the Irish were unkind: in political cartoons, the Irish were often drawn with ape-like features; in conversation and political commentary, the Irish were often referred to as 'white negroes' and 'apes'; and in all genres of literature the Irish were represented by the stage Irishman, which is a common enough archetype today.

As Yu Hongying points out, the first episode also sees Haines pulling from his sidepocket a silver cigarette case adorned with an emerald-green cabochon glittering on top. Yu compares

this to “Henry VIII incorporating the Irish harp pattern into the British royal family coat of arms to show the rule of Ireland.”[135] Haines is an imperialist, and Ireland is completely in his hands. He offers Stephen a cigarette from this case, a reflection of his testimonial that they feel “…in England that we have treated you rather unfairly.”[136] They colonized the land, kept it neatly stowed in their sidepocket, and for consolation offered negligible compensation.

And according to Lü Liying, just as the English—colonizers of Ireland—established themselves as lord and master and forced obedience upon the local population, so Haines administers to Mulligan and Stephen in the tower, commanding them to cook eggs and to pay for the milk. One example of what Lü identifies as “Haines forc[ing] Mulligan and Stephen to do everything”[137] is when, with a smile on his face, he tells Buck Mulligan to “Pay up and look pleasant.”[138]

But if Haines is an imperialist, then Buck Mulligan is a betrayer, Irish though he may be. Lü Liying and Shen Fuying both draw on the moment when Stephen refers to Haines as the milk woman’s “conqueror” and to Mulligan as her “gay betrayer.”[139] Because of Mulligan’s friendly relationship with Haines and his tendency towards mockery it is unclear whether or not this is the case. What Stephen means is that Mulligan is a follower of the Empire, not necessarily in that he supports it, but in that he does not offer any resistance to it: like the Citizen, he’d rather sit in the pub and rag about the English, serving them when he sees them, than actually stand up and rebel.[140]

According to Lü, this category of Ireland’s “gay betrayers” is subdivided into two groups, the “jackals of British colonialists” and the “pleasure seeking Irish people.”[141] The specificity of this model separates Mulligan from the Citizen, because whereas the Citizen is merely keen

on the next pint, Mulligan scrambles to please Haines, ordering Stephen about without a second thought. Beyond that, Mulligan is happy enough to himself misuse Stephen (i.e. Ireland).

Shen, after recognizing this model, turns to another: Buck Mulligan as the Italian Master that Stephen serves. She argues that, "Joyce's…equal hatred of the Catholic Church and repulsion of the 'gay-betrayers' often escape contemporary critics' notice,"[142] even though the novel opens with Mulligan pretending to be a clergyman and performing a mock mass, a theme which is continued throughout the rest of the novel. The idea of Mulligan as the Italian Master does not contradict the image of him as the "gay betrayer" of Ireland: the Church is *also* gutting Ireland from the inside out, holding them in submission to a higher force that is equally as invasive as the English political and military presence.

For the Chinese readers, yet another indicator of Mulligan's betrayal of Ireland comes from the moment when Stephen is leaving for work and Mulligan asks for the key. Mulligan and Haines are well-off characters, but they make Stephen pay rent for the tower. With no option but to oblige, Stephen hands over the key and even as he leaves knows that he will not be able to return to "Ireland" that night. Yu draws a connection between the key and the final word of the first episode of *Ulysses*, "usurper," which she says "…points out that Stephen's home has been usurped."[143] Ireland's "gay betrayers" and England have conspired to lock the Irish citizen out of Ireland. Wen Jieruo likewise understands Mulligan's asking for the key as proof that these "gay betrayers" are just as guilty of "plundering" Ireland as the imperialists themselves.[144]

Identifying Stephen as an allegory for Ireland, Yu draws on the fact that Stephen's very first

words in the novel are to tell Mulligan that if Haines is staying, he is going. Yu, who authored a paper on the theme of national liberation in *Ulysses*, makes the argument that this ultimatum is evidence of Stephen's affiliation with Ireland.[145] Later, Lü also engages this idea. Even though the English and their jackals—Haines and Mulligan—are living in the tower, it is the perpetually impoverished Ireland that pays taxes for the land, as Stephen must pay rent for the tower. Yet Haines and Mulligan insist on keeping the key, of having the power.[146]

As explored in the previous two chapters, such an interpretation of life in the Martello Tower is to be expected. Both the Jin and Xiao-Wen translations display tendencies towards accentuating the dispute between the imperialists and the colonized country, most likely due to the translators' own experiences under foreign rule, especially during the first half of the twentieth century. As mentioned earlier, Wen Jieruo approached the translation of the novel from a patriotic perspective, *because* she knew it would resonate with the audience it was being translated for.

Yu Hongying's model of the relationships in the Martello tower emphasizes the evil of the British Empire and the "gay betrayers" of Ireland, as well as the feelings of hatred they give rise to in Stephen. She analogizes Haines's cigarette case as captive Ireland and definitively identifies Haines, i.e. the British, as the reason Stephen leaves home, i.e. Ireland. Like Wen's use of the word "plunder," Yu also employs accusatory words like the original text's 'usurper' to foreground her argument about the abhorrence of traitors to the nation, in this case Mulligan.

While the interpretations offered by Shen and Lü are not too far removed from that of Yu, they are noticeably less fierce. One clear example of this is in the fact that, rather than highlighting the activeness of Mulligan's being a "gay betrayer" through use of words like

‘plunder’ or ‘usurper’, they frame Mulligan as an individual who finds it easier to obey demands of the oppressor than to rebel. Another, perhaps better, example is that while Haines and Mulligan come across to these Chinese scholars just as unappealingly as later the English, “Irish” sympathizers to the English cause, and the impotent Irish pleasure seekers as they are expected to as the villains in this model, the hero, Stephen, does not come across as the strong Irish rebel that the Yu interpretation endorses.

One very probable explanation for this disparity is that both Shen and Lü are of a newer generation that did not ever experience colonization for themselves, whereas Wen and Yu were both alive during the Japanese occupation and genocide in China in the first half of the twentieth century. Where a very strong opposition and even loathing of imperialists would be instinctive to people who had lived through it, it seems less likely that people who were both physically and temporally removed from such an experience could begin to understand that, hence the emotional distance from the text for Shen and Lü.

In twentieth century Chinese anti-imperialist propaganda literature and art, individuals of the colonized nation (e.g. China) have predominately been depicted as resilient and strong, not just as victims. Stephen, the man who intends to forge the conscience of his race by leaving the country, is by no means a great nationalist hero, at least not in the way of Chinese anti-imperialist propaganda. But nor is he meek: he *does* stand up to the English, picking a fight with them over the king. So Lü’s analysis that “Here, Stephen the poor artist stands for the colonized Ireland people who suffer from the harsh ruling of the British”[147] is out of keeping with the implied positioning of the novel against imperialism by the translators and older critics, such as Wen and Yu. It does not change the voice of anti-imperialism, just shifts

the perception of the opposition's role: instead of actively ridiculing the English, this view victimizes Ireland and focuses on the powerlessness and inaction of the Irish people.

History in the Hands of Imperialists, History in the Hands of Nationalists

As discussed in the introduction, during the time that Joyce was writing *Ulysses* and before, both British imperialists and Irish nationalists were fabricating histories that favored their agendas. Most famously, the Irish Literary Renaissance used as a frame of reference a 'traditional' Celtic culture, which was predominately the invention of William Butler Yeats and Lady Augusta Gregory. The combined efforts of their respective works *Fairy and Folk Tales of the Irish Peasantry* and *Cuchulain of Muirthemne* established the foundation and setting for the movement to come. It was precisely because of this distortion that Joyce chose to dissociate himself from those writers: even if he was aligned with their cause, he did not condone their methods.

Chinese critics and scholars assign history's mutability the very same task: under their analysis it becomes a tool for both English and Irish nationalists to express and justify their reasons for particular behaviors and beliefs that might otherwise be construed as self-serving and inhumane. Shen Fuying interprets Joyce's perception of the movement as '*bi zhou zi zhen*', a phrase meaning 'to cherish something of little value simply because it is one's own'.[148] Interestingly, it is Shen and Lü who most engage with and actively oppose the manipulation of history, which might be due in large part to the generation gap between them and the rest of the critics.

Lü foregrounds his argument with the fact that since Joyce was a follower of Vico, he

believed that history as in institution is utterly human. It is therefore impossible for history to be built on solid fact; instead it is subject to the fluidity of time and memory. That Yeats and his Revival should misremember a couple of these ever-changing facts was not the issue: it was the use of wholesale distortion to alter reality, which created ““Xenophobic Cycloptic prejudice against ‘the other’.” [149]

As Yu writes, “Under the cruel control and uncivilized plunder of the English…[Irish] culture was dead.[150] Shen calls the process of imperialism a complete process of dispossession, drawing on the post-colonial theory of Seamus Deane. Haines, as the representative of the English, strips the Irish people of what it means to be Irish. When the old milk maid comes in the first episode, Haines speaks to her in Irish, and after she initially takes him for French, she assumes him to be from the west, the very heart of ‘traditional’ Irish values and culture. Thus the English became more Irish than the Irish.

As Deane and other postcolonial theorists have noted, history has always been the arena in which dominant groups firmly establish the boundaries of “the other” and “the self,” by discrediting and perverting the actions of “the other” while simultaneously legitimizing and absolving any sins or atrocities committed by “the self.” Haines’ most famous line of dialogue is evidence of this; as Shen points out, “Of course the Englishman Haines does not apologize for the tragedy brought on in Ireland by imperialization, instead finding an extremely fabricated excuse for the crimes of the colonizer,” or blaming history.[151]And Haines’ shirking of responsibility on behalf of the English is not limited to this moment of blaming history for the heinous actions of the empire-building process.

According to Shen, Stephen’s claim that all history moves towards one thing, “a shout in

the street," [152] is meant to say that history—represented by the sporting boys outside—is always a culture war. It is always the stronger culture that claims its victory as a manifestation of God, and in the second episode Garrett Deasy does just that. Shen writes of the moment, "Mr. Deasy draws the conclusion that history moves towards one goal, the manifestation of God." [153] Like Haines, he shifts the burden of imperialism off his shoulders while simultaneously reaping the benefits of it.

Lü very neatly sums up the issue at stake in the explanation he and Shen use when he writes, "Although Mr. Deasy aims to protect the interests of the British colonizers, he takes a disguise of justice."[154] Thus by remembering anti-Union Blackwood as pro-Unionist and by making the Catholic Church condemn the savior of Ireland as a criminal, history teacher Deasy is appropriating and rewriting Irish history, and it is a history that reflects negatively on the Irish and positively on his own ancestry—after all, Sir John Blackwood, his relative, was a Scotsman and Deasy has already told us that he is an Ulsterite, making him a of planter descent.

On the other side of the coin, and this is something that Yu, Lü, and Shen all discuss, the characters identified as nationalists in *Ulysses* are also guilty of distorting history as a means to an end, most notably the Citizen, who invariably moves history in a direction the exact opposite of what the imperialist characters were trying to do: whereas Deasy is trying to extol the virtues of the British Empire by disguising its failings, the Citizen is trying to glorify Ireland by embellishing past greatness. For example, Yu writes, "The Citizen inexplicably takes all the society's problems and pushes them off on 'sassenachs', using coarse language to curse them," which he follows by quoting the Citizen as he maintains that the little bit of

culture the English have was stolen from the Irish.[155] So in the very way that Deasy was rewriting Irish history, the Citizen rewrites English history.

Neither process of beautification escapes the attention of the Chinese critics. Yu, Lü, and Shen, also all identify the over-glorification. For these readers, the circumstances surrounding the act of fabricating history actually *both* perpetuate the cycle of oppression by the English: Lü claims that "Joyce…elevated the importance of the banning of alcohol to something related to national independence by citing the Irish journalist Robert A. Willson's slogan 'Ireland sober is Ireland free.'"[156] In this way, the Citizen and his equally one-eyed companions sitting in Barney Kiernan's pub and drinking the days away, trying to comfort themselves with memories of glory is surrender; they are only doing the work of the English for them.

To Shen, the manipulation of history is indicative of the pervasiveness of a "Xenophobic Cycloptic prejudice of 'the other'" in both nationalist and imperialist sensibilities. Her analysis explores the examples provided above, but goes even deeper into the manipulations, a task which culminates with the statement that "The Citizen's propaganda for the glory and purity of Ireland…[is] extremely similar to British colonialists' practice, mak[ing] the Jews and women as the scapegoats to shoulder the blame…," which is evidence of the fact that Haines, Mr. Deasy, and even the Citizen use not just the same tactics but also identical arguments to defend their positions as, respectively, British imperialists and Irish nationalists.[157]

Lü's earlier assertion that Deasy's fabrication of history is used as "a disguise of justice" is later followed by the qualification that, "from his distortion of history and putting all blames on the other, we can know that the justice is only the justice of pirates."[158] As evidence of Deasy's blaming, Lü quotes a section of dialogue between Stephen and Deasy. Immediately

after Stephen refutes Deasy's argument that "All human history moves towards… the manifestation of God,"[159] Deasy repositions his argument, blaming the women who "brought the strangers" to Ireland,[160] and the "jews"[161] in Britain who "…are the signs of a nation's decay."[162] The women he blames are the women that famously "destroyed" MacMurrough, O'Rourke, and Parnell, and he blames the Jewish race for ruining the British Empire, hence Ireland's only moment of greatness in "never let[ting] them in."[163]

The Citizen blames these same women for bringing "the Saxon robbers here,"[164] a fact which does not escape Shen. She says, "His logic in blaming a woman for misfortune in history is the same as that of Mr. Deasy when Mr. Deasy blames Helen..., Mrs. O'Shea…, Eve…"[165] She goes on to say that this is following the tradition of shifting the blame that should be on the shoulders of the oppressors/men onto the shoulders of the oppressed/women, since she draws a link between post-colonial literature and gender. Lü agrees with Shen on this, but adds that the Citizen's violent attack on Bloom at the end of the episode for saying that Jesus was a Jew is proof of his strong anti-Semitism. Besides these two tendencies, Lü points out, the Citizen also disparages other nationalities in an attempt to boost morale: the British Empire becomes a "syphilisation,"[166] and the French are a "Set of dancing masters…never worth a roasted fart to Ireland."[167] Lü, unlike Shen, sees this fabrication as supporting evidence for the fact that Joyce believes "Different versions may come out of a single event."[168]

Although Yu has some insight into the issue of fabrication, the works of Shen and Lü concern themselves primarily with the fabrication of history in *Ulysses*. Shen, whose stance is much stronger than either of the others, does not dwell very long on the imperialist side of

matters, but she returns again and again to the reasons why Irish nationalists should involve themselves in it. Justification via deprecation from the imperialists is expected, but the fact that the colonized people reciprocate just as readily with contempt for minority civilian groups presents a problem. In order to alleviate the negativity of the Citizen's behavior, Shen allows him the benefit of the doubt. She writes,

> Partly due to their purity of Irish culture, partly due to their repulsion for the assistance from the marginalized Irish people, the nationalists' goal of reviving Irish culture is doomed to failure. The inevitable feeling of failure and disillusionment drives many of those nationalist Cyclops into the pub…[169]

She is suggesting that rather than actual malice towards women and other minority groups, the Citizen is merely disappointed by his own impotence and, as a result, is making drunken accusations to make himself feel better. The importance placed on the idea of national and racial unity in China may be the reason Shen is so intent on preserving the Citizen's status as a national "hero."

The critics *wanted* to emphasize the binary of imperialism versus nationalism. They allow the heinousness of the British Empire and its followers to speak for itself, often accentuating their crimes, such as when Shen claims that Haines's little book of phrases is intended to mock the quaint Irish mind. And although they express the negativity and futility of the nationalists' manipulations, they still do as much as possible to bury it, as in the example above.

There are two main methods of doing this, and Lü does them both. Firstly, by making excuses for the behavior of the Citizen and his followers by claiming that it as an effort to comfort and strengthen themselves. Secondly, after laying out the comparison between the Citizen and Deasy, he draws attention to the fact that Stephen rejects any such criticisms, correcting Deasy's crass remarks about Jews as they are voiced. Lü points out that when Mr.

Deasy says that “the Jew merchants are already at their work of destruction,” Stephen defends them by pointing out that every merchant “buys cheap and sells dear, Jew or genitile,” and when Mr. Deasy condemns the Jews as “sinned against the light,” Stephen opposes him by asking “Who has not?...”[170] Lü furthers his audience’s rapture with Stephen, including his reflections that behind the Protestants’ glorious, pious and immortal memory lie the “corpses of papishes” and “the black north” and the deep-rooted hatred to make “croppies lie down.”[171] Because they are wittingly or unwittingly adopting—like the translators—an anti-imperialist tone in their analysis, it is in the best interest of the critics to protect the image of the hero, in this instance the nationalist.

Shen engages this idea, as does Lü, by framing over-glorified Ireland as Gerty MacDowell, the girl on Sandymount Strand in the thirteenth episode. Gerty thinks of herself as “the most idealistic, most romantic, most sentimental, most attractive beautiful heroine.”[172] Here she is just like the Citizen, sitting at Barney Kiernan’s and praising the four beautiful green fields, the Irish economy and culture. Yet in the end, Bloom still realizes that it is a lame beauty, which led Lü to write that it “indicates Joyce’s awareness of the impotence of Irish culture under the British colonization, in spite of nationalists’ great effort to glorify their own history and culture.”[173]

Anthropologically, it is not at all surprising that the critics assume nationalists accept and use the same explanations as the imperialists have been forcing on them. As Deane notes, “External domination has been introjected to the point that a nation, so construed, may be said to have learned nothing from oppression but oppression itself.”[174] But in the end, the question becomes why? Why do they tease out this issue of falsified history? If it was only in order to

vilify the British for their empire building, then why do they also announce this significant degree of uniformity between the two versions of history?

Perhaps it is in an effort to dispel the habit of '*bi zhou zi zhen*', 'to cherish something of little value simply because it is one's own', idealizing and idolizing the motherland *because* it is the motherland and in spite of any flaws. This would certainly be a valid and interesting approach, because there is a tendency in China—as in most countries—to not approach issues of the nation just because it is easier to live with the failings, however invasive, than institute change and reform.

Strangers in the House on Eccles Street

Gerty is not the only character to be read allegorically by the Chinese critics. Rather than the traditional use of virtues or the first episode's use of political allegiance, each of three characters involved in the Bloom household at 11 Eccles Street on the day of June 16th, 1904 is read by the Chinese critics as an allegory for a specific culture, as with Gerty as the fabricated culture over-glorified by the Revivalists. The basic premise of this model is that Bloom's household has, like Ireland, been betrayed. The betrayal as written is the sexual affair between Bloom's wife Molly and her tour manager, Blazes Boylan. As parsed out by He Zhongsheng, the identities of each character are Boylan for British culture, Bloom for the impotent Irish culture of the present, and Molly for the future of Irish culture, although it is Shen Fuying that really delves into the character of Molly.

Between being persecuted as a Jew, being cuckolded, and being subservient to his wife, Bloom is a clear analogy of Ireland being in servitude to the British Empire, cuckolded by its

own people—jackals like Deasy and Mulligan, and the powerless pleasure-seekers like the Citizen. Bloom suffers from these blows, but as He Zhongsheng would have it, Bloom made his own bed by being too unfeeling towards Molly. He writes, "…Bloom clearly knows that his wife and her theater manager Boylan are having intercourse at his home, but does not dare interfere. Instead he holes himself up in a pub and painfully imagines his wife having an affair."[175] But his inaction does not just cause Bloom to suffer; according to He Zhongsheng, "This conclusion is of Bloom's own making…because of his coldness to Molly, his sexual impotence, and his unwillingness to act."[176] And as He Zhongsheng elaborates, every time Bloom sees Blazes on the street that day, he makes himself think about something else, trying to forget what is going to happen that afternoon. Unsurprisingly, He interprets Bloom's unwillingness to interfere with the affair that is making a fool of him as the Irish not being infuriated enough in their opposition to imperialism.[177]

By chance, because Boylan is the instigator of the "plundering" of the future of Irish culture from Ireland in the model He Zhongsheng established, he becomes an allegory for Britain. More importantly, what goes on between Molly and Boylan is not love in the remotest sense. Never does He Zhongsheng or Shen use the word. Instead, He uses the words 'commit adultery' or 'affair' to discuss it, such as when he writes that "the affair between Molly and Boylan is the destruction of the Bloom family," and therefore Ireland.[178] According to Shen, Boylan, with his strong sexual drive, lascivious flirtation with any female, and pleasure at commandeering that which is not his, is a strong analogy for the "aggressiveness and vitality" of British culture.[179]

Molly, as the future of Irish culture, is forced to sleep around because Bloom has avoided

full intercourse with her for the past eleven years, which is evidenced by He's statement from above that Bloom's coldness towards Molly forces her to seek other outlets for sexual gratification. Beyond that, He draws very strong bonds between Molly and Ireland when he writes, "…She [Molly] was betrayed by external and internal forces. Ireland was betrayed, and so was Bloom's home…"[180] But Shen takes this argument one step further. According to Shen, Molly and her countless illicit lovers—of which many Bloom is aware—"analogize the future cultural hybridity of Irish culture with other cultures."[181] Although it will be a hybrid culture, it will still have Irish roots; she is not averse to reviving her "native culture," as demonstrated by her willingness to rekindle the youthful relationship she once shared with Bloom, which comes across in the final page of the novel, because Blazes is a mere "sexual toy" and not at all a "lover." [182] Wen Jieruo points out that even Molly, the future, remembers a lover—Gardner—killed while away fighting for the English in South Africa and is infuriated over it.[183]

The most weighted parts of this argument are that the situation is of Bloom's making, that Molly is more than willing to restore her relations with Bloom, and that Blazes means nothing to Molly. The effect is such that British culture becomes a kind of disposable tool that Irish culture (Bloom) might learn from, and "traditional" Irish culture takes partial fall for their continued oppression, perpetuating the overarching theme of opposition to imperialism. The outsiders are satisfactorily impugned and the actions of the home population corrected: do not ignore your household duties.

He Zhongsheng's theory of the text is reaffirmed and carried one step further by Shen when she writes, "Molly… finally draws the conclusion that it is Bloom she really loves and is

determined to give Bloom a chance to overcome his impotence and be united with her because she feels attracted again by his broad-visioned love, acceptance and consideration."[184] Thus only in doing right by Molly will Bloom be able to overcome his blind devotion to her, and only then will Molly have reason to expel the strangers from the house. This is essentially the same as He Zhongsheng's analysis, except that Shen literally extrapolates the connection out to extend into the future, beyond what is, to what might be. She begins to formulate her own solution to issues of imperialism; only if the Irish past can learn to live with and in the Irish future will there be no need for the presence of the British (i.e. colonizer).

A Jew and an Irishman Walk Into a Bar

Nearly every piece of literature that referenced nationalism at all pointed out that Joyce once referred to *Ulysses* as "…an epic of two races (Israelite-Irish)…,"[185] referring to the two main characters, a statement supportable by a myriad of quotations or possible close readings the critics might have drawn from the text, either when Deasy *or* the Citizen was haranguing Judaism. Yet the Chinese critics only scratch the surface of the issue, even with four of them separately commenting on it.

Two such supporting details are instances of highlighting Joyce's diction. One is He, who zeroes in on the Citizen's use of the word 'tribes' to describe the lost Irish people, referring to the millions who either died or emigrated during the Great Famine. Critic He explicitly states the implied comparison to Canaan before going on to give the specifics of eight centuries of oppression in Ireland, the lost tribes of Israel, and the Irish population problem in order to underscore the similarities between the two situations. The second is Yu, who picks out use of

the word ‘chief’ in the fifth episode to refer to Charles Stuart Parnell. According to Yu, ‘chief’ is an ancient Celtic form of address, and that this accent that Joyce gives the character is full of rich historical connotation and overflows with the state of mind specific to the Irish race.[186]

The third critic to add anything to Joyce’s remark on the bi-racial nature of the text is Li Huaiyu, who in the article “*Ulysses Readme*: A Key to Unlocking the Text” reads *Ulysses* as a mounting of the broken pieces of both races’ history onto the every day life of this one day.[187] This analysis is not markedly different from Joyce’s own statement of *Ulysses* being “an epic of two races,” with the exception of the word ‘*xiangqian*’. It is the word used here to mean ‘mount’, although in its original context it is specific to processes of jewelry making—‘mount’, ‘set’, ‘decorate’, jewel(v), or do niello work. There are several other words he might have used instead. In Chinese, you only ‘*xiangqian*’ a precious gemstone, and thus rather than the objective statement that it is “an epic of two races,” Li assigns a value to the two races in question: they are precious, and they are broken pieces that need to be put together, mounted around something whole.

The expression of Joyce’s own view not withstanding, the issue of the “Israelite-Irish” duality seems to have had little bearing on the critics’ reading of *Ulysses*. One of the more plausible explanations for this is the predominance of the idea of oneness in the Chinese concept of nationalism which would make an importance placed upon duplicate nationalities be politically problematic.

As Seamus Deane says in an essay on post-colonialism,

> Culture, when it is propagated as a canonical system, always asserts its “monogenealogy,” repressing its internal differences and hybrid origins, proclaiming itself xenophobically, ethnocentrically, in clamant and mystificatory ways as unitary.[188]

This kind of post-imperialist nationalism is the key pitfall of the patriotic characters on both sides of the divide. Deasy claims that "We are all Irish, all kings' sons."[189] However, this "we" includes only Scottish planters and the "fenians," and does not stretch beyond to include anything that Deasy himself does not respect, like Jewish people—Irish by birth though some of them might be. The Citizen is the same, abusing Bloom because he is by heritage Jewish in spite of the fact that he identifies more with being Irish. Deasy assumes that Ireland is untainted by a "polygenealogy," while the Citizen attempts to filter out the polluting bubbles of genetic diversity. They can accept the Scottish and even the English, because they share common origins—but the Jews are another matter all together.

Shen, who also quotes Joyce on the topic of the nationality dualism in *Ulysses*, chooses to weave the two nationalities together as Joyce did, "Israelite-Irish." As in many traditional readings of the text, Shen interprets Stephen's mother as a symbol of Ireland. She discusses the exchange in terms of Stephen's "quest" for a mother's love, which is a direct correlation to his search for a motherland. She says that, according to the second episode of *Ulysses*, an individual lacking both the persona and the relationship with mother/motherland is nothing but "a squashed, boneless snail."[190] Therefore, Shen concludes, the act of giving up mother and motherland is inherently a betrayal, and Stephen and Bloom in doing so must "leave" the country to become wanderers.[191]

With this final statement Shen winds the two nationalities together: the fact that Stephen and Bloom have two different motherlands is inconsequential. In a way, Shen is subjugating the need for specific ethnic identity to the importance of acknowledging the broader allegiance to a nation. Thus the fact of "two races," is less important than the similarity between the two:

the Jew and the Irishman, having both forsaken motherland, are forced to become wanderers through Dublin, and since wandering is often associated with exile, it is one of the harshest punishments for one of the worst crimes. This again hales back to the importance of a unified genealogy to colonized and post-colonial nations.

This pattern of forced "monogenealogy" even in the face of truth was and still is as true in China as it was and still is in Ireland. Post-colonial nations, having framed their unified national identities in reaction to imperialization, continue to think of themselves in those terms even after the invading power has departed. This sense of nationalism remains built on the idea of oneness. Anything different, as was demonstrated in the section on the fabrication of history, is either ignored or stigmatized. But as Shen Fuying argues and as I myself would argue, *Ulysses* is a drawing board for a new kind of nationalism. It is one that ignores the physical and historical "truths" for a more cerebral approach.

Forging the Conscience and a New Nationalism

At the end of *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Stephen says, "I go to encounter for the millionth time the reality of experience and to forge in the smithy of my soul the uncreated conscience of my race." Shen Fuying and Wen Jieruo understand *Ulysses* to be the result of that forging, especially since it was written after Joyce exiled himself from Ireland, as Stephen had done in order go forward with his plan.

Wen gets caught up in Joyce's idea that only by writing what is in your blood (e.g. national identity) do you arrive at internationalism, and *that* only out of a passionate sense of nationalism. She quotes him on the subject, and how he remarked that if he could get at the

heart of Dublin then he could get at the heart of any great metropolis, which returns to Patrick Kavanagh's idea that the parochial is the universal and is in keeping with the Joycean definition of 'nationalism' as delineated in the introduction of this work, in itself a new nationalism.[192]

In the abstract to her doctoral thesis, Shen offers constructing a new patriotism as the solution to Stephen's quandary of history being "a nightmare from which I am trying to awake."[193] She draws the connection between forging the conscience and this new patriotism by focusing on the fact that in both instances nothing new is actually being created, just recombined. Incidentally, or perhaps not, that is precisely what the language of the text does—creates a new language out of components that are not only not new, but are in fact predominately antique. However, Shen does not bring this up, although it would have been beneficial to her argument of hybridity. She defines the new nationalism when she writes, "It is extremely urgent to put emphasis on keeping to native culture and extracting the beneficial elements from foreign cultures to supplement native culture while repelling what is harmful in it."[194] What is "harmful," as she writes later, is the indiscriminate imposition of foreign cultures, such as British culture, onto the native one.

Shen's interpretation of *Ulysses* is, if anything, a more modern approach to the issue of imperialism. Like the others, it rejects the violent and physical subjugation of the people and culture of one nation by the people and culture of another. The difference is that in this instance Shen does not react to that violence of people and culture by discrediting or defaming the British. Quite the opposite, she suggests there are things that the Irish stand to learn from the British when she talks about "the beneficial elements from foreign cultures."[195]

The critics are in, and by and large the few that involve themselves with the topic of nationalism in *Ulysses* understand that aspect of it exactly as it is presented to them by the two 1994 translations. Probably due to the “united” mindset of the general Chinese populace, the predominant understanding of the nationalist sentiment is involved in debunking the authority of the imperial power while simultaneously trying to enhance the standing of the opposing nationalist forces.

Among the critics, Shen stands head and shoulders above the others, just in sheer volume and breadth of work on the topic of nationalism. Between the two separate works of her analysis addressed here, she covers the entire spectrum of topics as addressed by the other critics, the key difference being that Shen seems to always push her analysis beyond a mere surface examination, which to some extent Lü does as well.

The one likely explanation, which was mentioned in passing earlier, is the age gap between Shen, Lü and the others: unlike the others, they were not alive during the periods in which parts of China were under imperialism, namely from the late 1920s until after World War II. It is not only a matter of personal experience, either; being born after this era, neither Shen nor Lü finished their higher education until the late 2000s. This means that their education was already radically different from that of the others, many of whom were indoctrinated into literature under the influence of the Maoist Regime, which of course was an insular structure. Shen and Lü, on the other hand, were educated in a time when western thoughts and theories were embraced in China, rather than reviled. Also, because Shen and Lü have the advantage of coming after the others, the burden of surface level analysis does not fall to them and they are

able to build off the understanding pre-established in the Chinese academic sphere by the critics preceding them.

Perhaps the most important point of all is Wen's statement that, to her, nationalism is the key to unlocking *Ulysses*. According to Frederic Jameson, "the story of the private individual destiny is always an allegory of the embattled situation of the public third-world culture and society."[196] Even though Ireland is not a third-world country and would not have been considered as such even when *Ulysses* was written, yet its long-term oppression by outside forces instilled Irish culture and the mindset with third-world ways of thinking. And *Ulysses* is a story of the "private individual destiny," which for Stephen is to forge the conscience. Coming from a third-world country herself, Wen was probably heavily influenced by her own experience of subjugation, which led her to understand the novel in the way that she explicitly says she does. It also seems likely that Wen's voice here speaks for the rest of her peers, who indeed also read the novel as an allegory for, as Jameson says, "the embattled situation" of the nation.

CONCLUSION
Bloom in Beijing or Stephen in Shanghai: Monogenealogical Brotherhood and Hybrid Nationalism

"The most important thing, therefore, was to change their spirit, and since at that time I felt that literature was the best means to this end, I determined to promote a literary movement."[197]

According to postcolonial cultural theorists, the hybridity inherent in the cultures of both the oppressor and the oppressed in the post-colonial period (i.e. once the foreign forces have completely withdrawn) is the result of the native population being forced to mimic the "civilized" behavior of the controlling population. Generally speaking, the typical outcome of the hybridity is a people who resemble the oppressor in mannerism, but who are native by birth, which is one possible explanation as to why the nationalist and imperialist forces as represented in James Joyce's *Ulysses* share very similar characteristics and attitudes.

Yet despite the likeness between the nationalists and the imperialists, the groups are still repulsed by one another: the soldiers would not recognize the Citizen as being a subject of the English crown just as he would not identify himself as one, even though the entire time the novel was being written Ireland *was* part of the United Kingdom.

The first two Chinese translations of *Ulysses*, by Jin Ti and by Xiao Qian with Wen Jieruo, take this as their understanding of nationalist conflict in the text. The voices and words of the characters are divided neatly into the two groups with little to no grey area between the two.

Given that in 1994 all three of the translators were well up in age, it is safe to say that they had each experienced the brutality of imperialism for themselves. The cultural nationalism that emerged from invasion by first Europe and then Japan must have impressed the critical notion of unity to the nation onto their minds.

In the translations, this mentality is evident. Both the Jin and Xiao-Wen translations highlight the conflict between the British and the Irish, whereas the conflict between different "types" of Irish people is overlooked, in both what is being said and how it was said. The first chapter of this work focused on the attention to nationalism in the footnotes of the initial two translations. The result is that positive pro-nationalist *monogenealogical* references are annotated, thus drawing attention to them, whereas imperialist or separatist references are either unacknowledged or reflected on negatively. I concluded that the main reason for the translators' overall non-differentiation between types of nationalism and focus on anti-imperialism probably springs from the fact of their own cultural upbringing rather than any particular agenda.

This statement is also applicable to the conclusion of the second chapter, which laid out the translators' approach to differentiating between the voices of different "ethnicities." In the end, the voices of the Anglo-Irish and the Northern-Irish all blend into the voice of the "pure" Irish, which is only contrasted with the voices of English characters, the result being a focus on the dichotomy of the colonized and the colonizer. Even with the knowledge that at least the Xiao-Wen translation was partially operating on a stated pro-nationalist (i.e. pro-Republican) agenda, the conclusion is only fortified. Wen is very explicit in the fact that the reason for selecting nationalism as a point of entry to *Ulysses* is because it will create compatriotism with the Irish and their situation under imperialism.

Those early Chinese critics of *Ulysses* working from these translations that approach the text from the topic of nationalism also focus on the absolute refusal of one group to deal with the other. All of these early critics are also products of the Cultural Revolution. As a result,

sometimes the negative actions of the “Irish” characters—especially those of the Citizen—are partially justified in criticisms, whereas the negative actions of the “British” are consistently played up and exaggerated. The issue of any gradient between the two is only addressed by Shen Fuying, as is the issue of cultural hybridity. Ingrained as the idea of a monogenealogy was in Chinese culture for so long, it is little surprise that both the translators and the critics were not in tune with the subtleties of race in *Ulysses*.

But there *is* a grey middle space, even amongst the characters. These are represented by Deasy, who claims to be Irish despite his planter descent, but identifies with the English, separating himself from the nation of Ireland in the condescending way he speaks to Stephen about Catholics and fenians.

The tension of national identity is present throughout the entire text, up until the end of the seventeenth episode, when Molly’s voice takes over for Stephen and Bloom, and ethnicity is not something that concerns her at all—she will couple with anyone who has something to contribute to her wellbeing. Shen Fuying’s analysis of Molly as an allegory of the future Irish culture (i.e. post-colonial) is especially appropriate because it pairs well with her construction of Joyce’s “new nationalism” as one that nurture’s the “native” culture while simultaneously welcoming adaptations of beneficial aspects of foreign cultures.

Despite the fact that Shen’s idea of *Ulysses* being a vehicle for Joycean nationalism is the one divergent voice in the understanding of nationalism in the novel by Chinese critics, in actuality it might be the most relevant argument for anyone to have made. The new nationalism, as she defines it, varies only slightly from the cultural structure of post-colonial societies according to post-colonial scholars. The difference is this: that rather than rejecting the

hybridity of both cultures as problematic, Shen embraces it as Joyce's escape plan to the nightmare of history.

Shen and her interpretation of *Ulysses* are a sign of a new generation of scholars in China—one that has not been subjected to the cruelty of imperialism or colonization. Even though she was born during the Cultural Revolution, her tertiary education did not come until after the Revolution had ended and China was re-opened to the outside world. Even just the ten years between the early criticisms that emerged as soon as the translations hit the market and Shen writing her doctoral thesis in the late 2000s produced a significant and important difference in Chinese readings of the theme of nationalism in *Ulysses*.

Translator Wen Jieruo was perhaps the earliest Chinese scholar to read Joyce's work as having, at the heart of it, nationalist sentiment. When she was working on the translation with her husband Xiao Qian, she wanted the Irish nationalist spirit to resonate with the Chinese reader. She said that that was why she chose to highlight the nationalists in her own critical work on the subject. But thirteen years after the Xiao-Wen translation was published, Chinese scholars are already not even remarking on this resonance. Shen Fuying and her student, Lü Liying (2010) are both distant from the compatriotism inspired by *Ulysses*.

The factors that influenced the translators to identify—and want the reader to identify—with the Irish Diaspora were more than likely feelings of resentment towards the institution of imperialism for the brutality and hybridity it instituted in China during their lifetimes. As a result, they picked out Ireland as a "third-world" country, and read *Ulysses* as a narrative of the nation.[198] These same feelings also probably helped the critics to connect to the text in the same narrow-minded way, seeing only the smaller picture of a powerful nation

usurping from a powerless nation.

Aloof from this, Shen gently discredits previous notions of the "nationalism" Joyce has on offer in the novel: no undue resentment, and certainly none of the "Xenophobic cycloptic prejudice against 'the other'" that previously prevented or stigmatized learning from the colonizer, which is to say it destabilizes the power so long credited to the concept of monogealogy in cultural nationalism.

This proof is important for two reasons. First, the disinclination to associate her own country's history[199] from her reading of *Ulysses* despite the similar grievances of the two nations is indicative of new levels of objectivity in approaching literary analysis, especially since previous critics such as Wen showed that they were susceptible to this resonance. The second is that Shen is also one of the first—if not *the* first—Chinese scholars of Joyce to define Joycean nationalism. None of the other Chinese scholars that spent any length of time on the theme of nationalism even distinguished between *types* of nationalism, but Shen defined it in terms not far from the definition of it in the introduction to this project, as a kind of love for one's nation *without separating* it from the collective of all nations, which means that *Ulysses* is finally getting the depth of analysis in China appropriate to a novel of its merit.

Literary merit is not the only reason that this depth is important: as demonstrated in the introduction, Joyce's post-modern, deconstructionist style especially as represented in *Ulysses* had a visible impact on modern Chinese writing, and that was before the Chinese audience understood much about the work at all. Now, however, with the introduction of Shen's "new nationalism" (i.e. Joycean nationalism), comes the idea that something "new" can be constructed out of "old" components, like the language of *Ulysses*. Her work on the novel

finally highlights the most important and most revolutionary aspect of Joyce: the “message” of the novel can be extracted from *how* the novel is constructed rather than *what* it says.

Endnotes

[1] Gabaldon, Diana. *Dragonfly in Amber*. New York: Bantam Dell, 1992, 907.
[2] Charles Edward Stuart.
[3] In point of fact, Prince Charlie was fighting for the English throne, which at the time ruled over Scotland, England, Wales and Ireland. (His family was Scottish.) He garnered support from the Irish because he was Catholic and as monarch would have been more equitable towards the Irish. There are very few references to the Jacobite insurrections of the eighteenth century in *Ulysses*, but it is interesting to consider the most overt of them: at 2.200 Garret Deasy is described as possessing a Stuart coin collection. He keeps the coins displayed neatly in a little glass case, ostensibly because they are precious items. In actual fact, Deasy the Ulsterite is keeping the royal (Catholic) Stuarts boxed up on his mantle piece, quaint and outdated, exactly where they belong in his esteem: something to marvel at for its quixotic-ness. It is as if Deasy is saying to the Republic, 'This is what I think of your king.'
[4] "Nationalism." Def. 1. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Encyclopedia Britannica. Web. 30 Nov. 2011.
[5] Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. New York: Routledge, 1995, 10.
[6] In his Graveside Panegyric for Jeremiah O'Donovan Rossa, Pearse said, "Life springs from death; and from the graves of patriot men and women spring living nations." (Pearse, Pádraig H. "Patrick H. Pearse's Oration Over The Grave Of O'Donovan Rossa," 1 August 1915. http://www.easter1916.net, 11 April 2012.)
[7] To avoid confusion, the character referred to as 'the citizen' in the text of *Ulysses* will be addressed as 'the Citizen' in this work.
[8] Nolan, 91.
[9] Nolan, 28.
[10] Lloyd, David. Nationalism and Minor Literature: James Clarence Mangan and the Emergence of Irish Cultural Nationalism. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987, 168.
[11] Consider the masturbation scene on the beach in the thirteenth episode, the brothel scene of the fifteenth episode, and the scene in the eighteenth episode leading up to the end where Molly orgasms.
Germany was the first country to publish a translation of *Ulysses*, in 1927. This date falls before its publication in both Britain and the United States. *Ulysses* wouldn't win its supreme court case until 1933- a case raised because of the non-family friendly nature of the text.
[12] *Roses and Thorns: The Second Blooming of the Hundred Flowers in Chinese Fiction, 1979-1980*. Ed. Perry Link. Berkely: University of California Press, 1984, 7.
[13] The original gives the word 'prose' in English.
[14] "这部书恐怕非但是今年，也许是这个时期里的一部独一著作，他书后最后 100 页，那真是纯料的'Prose'，像牛酪一样润滑，像教堂里石坛一样光澄，非但大写字母没有，连可厌的符号一齐灭迹，也不分章句篇节，像一大匹白罗披泻，一大卷瀑布倒挂，丝毫不露痕迹，真大手笔！" (《康桥西野暮色》, 1922)
[15] Zhou was a leftwing writer.
[16]《英美意识流小说述评》, 1964.
[17] Qian, Zhongshu (钱钟书). *Guan Zhui Bian* （管锥编）. Beijing: Shulin Press, 1990, 394-5.
[18]《外国现代作品选》1981, # 2

[19] “不管你喜欢也罢，不喜欢也罢，它总是本世纪人类在文学创作上的一宗奇迹。” [Joyce, James. *Ulysses*（《尤利西斯》）. Trans. Xiao Qian (萧乾) and Wen Jieruo (文洁若). Nanjing: Yilin Press (译林出版社), 1994, 4.]

[20] “同样值得深思的是，这部如今已确立为二十世纪最重要的英语文学著作的小说……”[Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. (《尤利西斯》). Trans. Jin Ti (金隄). Beijing: The People’s Literature Publishing House (人民文学出版社), 1994 (volume 1)/1996 (volume 2), 1064.]

[21] “God Kinch, if you and I could only work together we might do something for the island. Hellenise it.” [Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. New York : Random House, 1986, 1.157-9] From here on, all quotes from the text of *Ulysses* will be cited in the above format, giving first the episode number, followed by the line numbers, as is standard practice.

Interestingly enough, Robert Hand in *Exiles* is similarly satirized for the opposite idea. He says, “These cigars Europeanize me. If Ireland is to become a new Ireland she must first become European. And that is what you are here for, Richard. Some day we shall have to choose between England and Europe. I am descendant of the dark foreigners: that is why I like to be here. I may be childish. But where else in Dublin can I get a bandit cigar like this or a cup of black coffee? The man who drinks black coffee is going to conquer Ireland.” [Joyce, James. *Exiles*. London: Penguin Books, 1973, 51.]

[22] Co-translated with Wen Jie Ruo.

[23]林纾.

[24] Feng, Qi (冯奇). *A Critical Biography of Lin Shu and His Selected Works* (《林纾评传作品选》). Beijing : Chinese Literature and History Press (中国文史出版社), 1998, 185.

[25] Gao, Wanlong. “Lin Shu’s Choice and Response in Translation from a Cultural Perspective.” *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 13, 2010, 34.

[26] Lin, Shu (林纾). “*Preface to* Oliver Twist.” *Modern Chinese Literary Thought: Writings on Literature, 1893-1945.* Ed. Kirk A. Denton. Trans. Yenna Wu. Stanford: Standford University Press, 1996, 83.

[27]Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: The Viking Press, 1967, 238-253.

[28] Krishnamurti, J. *Freedom from the Known*. Ed. Mary Lutyens. New York: HarperOne, 1969, 51.

[29] This particular perception of the effects of globalism has roots in Wyndham Lewis’ *Time and Western Man*.

[30] Kavanagh, Patrick. “The Parish and the Universe.” *Patrick Kavanagh Collected Prose*. London: Gibbon and Kee, 1967, 282.

[31] “Then?

He kissed the plump mellow yellow smellow melons of her rump, on each plump melonous hemisphere, in their mellow yellow furrow, with obscure prolonged provocative melonsmellonous osculation.” (17.2240-3)

[32] “and then I asked him with my eyes to ask again yes and then he asked me would I yes to say yes my mountain flower and first I put my arms around him yes and drew him down to me so he could feel my breasts all perfume yes and his heart was going like mad and yes I said yes I will Yes.” (18.1605-9)

[33] See Yeats’ work “Cathleen Ní Houlihan” for more on this.

[34] Deane, Seamus. “Imperialism/Nationalism.” *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995, 366.

[35] However, it would be a mistake to assume that nationalism is traditionalism, even though

the convention is to equate anti-nationalism with modernity.

[36] The fact that Joyce chose to build the novel on *The Odyssey* presents another facet of his novel's anti-nationalist surface. If he needed a known myth to build up from, why not use the Irish epic, *Táin Bó Cúailnge*?

[37] For example, *Ulysses in Taipei* by Ye Weilian (《尤利西斯在台北》叶维廉) in 1960, *Armed Christ* by Lu Yin (《配枪的基督》Lu Yin) in 1960, *Ulysses in the New World* by Cong Su（《尤利西斯在新大陆》丛苏），and *The Drunkard* by Liu Yichang (《酒徒》刘以昌) in 1963.

[38] Lázaro, Alberto. "The History of the First Catalan *Ulysses* by J. F. Vidal Jové." *Papers on Joyce* 14, 2008, 51.

[39] "prestigiar el indiscutible valor cultural de la lengua catalana" [Saladrigas, Robert. "La llegada de *Ulysses* a Catalunya." *La Vanguardia* 4.16.1981, 3.]

[40] Iribarren, Teresa. "The Reception of James Joyce in Catalonia." *The Reception of James Joyce in Europe* vol. 2. Ed. Geert Lemout and Wim Van Miedo. London: Thoernmes Continuum, 2004, 453.

[41] The word 'tragicomic' has roots in the Latin 'tragicocomoedia', which became 'tragicommedia' in Middle French, but it was Joyce who is credited with introducing it into English.

[42] Xiao, Bing Tang. "The Mirror of History and History as Spectacle: Reflections on Xiao Ye and Su Tong." *Chinese Mordern: The Heroic and the Quotidian*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000, 243.

[43] McCann, Colum. *Let the Great World Spin*. New York: Random House, 2009, 32.

[44] 1.400-6

[45] Sean-Bhean bhocht

[46] The four green fields refer to the four early provinces of Ireland: Ulster, Munster, Leinster, and Connacht.

[47] Jin 1994, 19.

[48] The younger personification of Ireland is often called Róisín Dubh, or Dark Rosaleen. Here Jin draws from the mythology of Yeats' play "Cathleen Ní Houlihan," in which the poor old woman comes knocking at the door of a family with a young son. As soon as he agrees to go to war to protect her four green fields and to toss the strangers (the English) from her house, she becomes in his eyes a beautiful young woman.

[49] Any translations from the Chinese not annotated are my own.

[50] Xiao-Wen, 71.

[51] Around 6000.

[52] 12.1240-1

[53] 15.1516-8

[54] The cell system of terrorism created paramilitaries, and works like this: each independent cell has ten or fewer members, tightly knit. They have very little contact with the larger organization; they have one task or specific role in the greater scheme. This reduces the risk of being discovered or captured, and if they *are* captured, then the damage does not infiltrate further into the system because the cell group knows nothing specific about the activities of other members of the larger institution. It is at least purported to be a plan of Irish origin, initially used by a republican group such as the IRA or the IRB.

[55] Xiao-Wen, 1207.

[56] In note number 220 on page 361, it is explained that to his dying day, Moses was unable to enter the land of Canaan even though God had promised him it would be the land of his people [the Jews]. Note 370 on page 814 and note 126 on page 1479 both also point out specific examples of Joyce equating Ireland to Israel.

[57] 15.4932-3
[58] 15.4941-2
[59] For another example of a poem that attempts to ease his feelings of guilt at inaction, see "Easter 1916."
[60] Jin 1996, 827.
[61] He "set the poem to music and praised it as the best lyric in the world." (Ellman, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965, 69.)
[62] Xiao-Wen, 1259.
[63] Xiao-Wen, 1259.
[64] In *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, in response to a friend saying, "A man's country comes first. Ireland first.," Stephen says, "Do you know what Ireland is?... Ireland is the old sow that eats her farrow." (Joyce 1967, 206).
[65] 9.36-7
[66] Jin 1994, 276.
[67] Xiao-Wen, 500.
[68] Rather than transliterating the title to imitate the sound of the original title, Xiao and Wen instead called the play, "Gap-Toothed Cathleen."
[69] 4.73
[70] An Gorta Mór, or the Great Hunger.
[71] Joyce 1967, 206.
[72] Xiao-Wen, 175.
[73] 2.268-272
[74] Joyce, James. *Stephen Hero*. Binghamton: New directions, 1944, 59.
[75] Jin 1994, 50.
[76] Jin 1994, 94.
[77] Xiao-Wen, 105.
[78] 11.1284-94
[79] 12.1211-14
[80] Jin 1994, 494.
[81] Xiao-Wen, 814.
[82] The O'Neill family, a Northern family, were kings of Ulster and high kings of Ireland between the 5th and 17th centuries of Ireland. It was an O'Neill (Hugh) that was defeated by the English in the Siege of Kinsale in 1601, which was the deciding battle in the English conquest of the island.
[83] 12.1280-5
[84] The other being Stephen's Green.
[85] Jin 1994, 520.
[86] Xiao-Wen, 840.
[87] Tacitus, quoted in "Irish Language Notes," *United Irishman* (1896). [Fairhall, James. "Afterword: Language and History." *James Joyce and the Question of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993, 248.]
[88] Eye dialects, regional dialects, substandard dialects, etc.
[89] 12.148
[90] 12.265
[91] 12.523
[92] At the very beginning of *Ulysses*, Haines speaks several sentences of Irish to the old milk woman, but what words he speaks the reader is not privy to.
[93] Jin 1994, 453.
[94] Jin 1994, 458.

[95] Xiao-Wen, 712.
[96] Xiao-Wen, 717.
[97] Xiao-Wen, 728.
[98] 8.894
[99] 11.287
[100] 11.1160
[101] 18.1185
[102] Jin 1994, 262.
[103] 12.491
[104] Jin 1994, 466.
[105] Xiao-Wen, 726.
[106] 12.323
[107] 18.935
[108] 8.558
[109] 9.560-6
[110] Xiao-Wen, 468-9.
[111] 13.1053
[112] 1.427
[113] Bliss, A. J. "Note Re the Royal Irish Academy Committee for the Study of Anglo-Irish Language and Literature." *Journal of the Cork Historical and Archeological Society* LXXIII.218, 1968, 182.
[114] 12.387
[115] 12.441
[116] 12.124
[117] 12.1627-8
[118] 12.1040
[119] 15.3895
[120] Once when Joyce was asked if he had done a lot of work on *Ulysses* in the course of the day, he replied that he had. When asked how many pages he had written, his response was the he had written two sentences. It took him seven years to write the novel. With this piece of biographical information in mind, it is easy to understand that every single word of the text was carefully considered, and that if a protestant speaker says even word out of line (i.e. 'the') then it means something.
[121] 12.1180. 'Sassenach' is a Gaelic (Scottish *and* Irish) word for 'outlander', and has historically been most commonly assigned to the English so that over time it has accrued a derogatory connotation. The Citizen accusing the English of speaking in a patois is another irony, because at least the patois of the English is a recognized language rather than being the mottled Hiberno-English patois on his lips.
[122] 15.4493
[123] 15.4392
[124] 15.4720-1
[125] Jin 1996, 819.
[126] Xiao-Wen, 1183.
[127] Haines does not escape such brutal categorization either, even if his speech is educated. He is a raving Englishman who shoots at panthers in his sleep, and is so enamored of the Irish that he tries to collect Stephen's little turns of phrase as genius. He has even stupidly gone the length of learning Irish, in an Ireland where even 'Mother Ireland' (the milk lady) *does not* recognize the language as Irish, instead asking if it is French. He also blames history for the actions of the British Empire. For the English prostitute, Zoe, see *Ulysses* 15.1308-47.

[128] 12.1237-8

[129] O'Neill, Patrick. "Other Words, Other Worlds." *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003, 89-91.

[130] "了解乔伊斯的爱国之心，才能读懂《尤利西斯》。乔伊斯博大精深，可以从各个角度去研究。我之所以选这个题目，是与我们的民族有关，我们和爱尔兰民族一样，曾受到外来民族的欺压，读《尤利西斯》会产生这种共鸣。" ("Joyce—Ulysses' Gaze" (《乔伊斯——<尤利西斯>的凝视》). *Moving Against the Wind* (《逆风而行》), 26 April 2005. http://www.5ilog.com, 15 March 2012.)

This is a portion of an interview with Wen Jieruo, co-translator of *Ulysses*.

[131] Joyce 1967, 252-3.

[132] Shen, Fuying (申富英). *Nation, Culture and Gender: A Postcolonial Study of* Ulysses. (《民族、文化与性别——后殖民主义视角下的<尤利西斯>研究》). Thesis. Jinan: Shandong University, 2007, 56.

[133] Shen 2007, 26

[134] Shen 2007, 25.

[135] "亨利八世将爱尔兰琴图案入英国王室纹章以示统治爱尔兰一样。" [Yu, Hongying (于洪英). "The Theme of National Liberation in *Ulysses*" (《<尤利西斯>的民族解放主题》). *Foreign Literature Review* (《外国文学评论》)4, 1997, 69.]

[136] 1.307

[137] Lü, Liying (吕立营). *History in James Joyce's* Ulysses (《<尤利西斯>中的历史》). Thesis. Jinan: Shandong University, 2010, 9.

[138] 1.449

[139] Lü, 29-30. Shen 2007, 25. Also, *Ulysses* 1.405.

[140] Shen 2007, 48.

[141] Lü, 29-30.

[142] Shen 2007, iv.

[143] "……点出斯蒂芬的家被篡夺这一事实。" [Yu, 71.] For "usurper," see *Ulysses* 1.747.

[144] Wen, Jieruo (文洁若). "Forging a Conscience in the Unhappy National Spirit" (《在不幸的民族灵魂中铸造良心》). *Dushu* (《读书》) 4, 1995, 86.

[145] Yu, 69. Also, in *Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*, Stephen *does* leave Ireland, driven out not only by the many Haineses but also by the many Buck Mulligans surrounding him.

[146] Lü, 19.

[147] Lü, 19.

[148] Shen, Fuying (申富英). "The View of History in *Ulysses*" (《论<尤利西斯>中的历史观》. *Foreign Literary Research* (《外国文学研究》) 3, 2011, 28.

[149] Shen 2007, iii.

[150] "由于英国殖民民者的残暴统治和野蛮掠夺……文化上死气沉沉。"[Yu, 72.]

[151] ".....英国人海恩斯并没有就殖民者给爱尔兰带来的灾难而道歉，而是给殖民者所犯下的罪恶找到了一个最狡诈的借口。"[Shen 2011, 27.]

[152] 2.386

[153] Shen 2007, 71.

[154] Lü, 14.

[155] "公民莫名其妙地把一切社会问题都归罪于'外来人'，谩骂他们的语言粗俗不堪……"[Yu, 72.]

[156] Lü, 12.

[157] Shen 2007, vii.

[158] Lü, 14.
[159] 2.386
[160] 2.390-4
[161] Upon whom Haines has already heaped blame: “Of course I'm a Britisher, Haines's voice said, and I feel as one. I don't want to see my country fall into the hands of German jews either.” (1.666-7)
[162] 2.347-8
[163] 2.442
[164] 12.1157-8
[165] Shen 2007, 49.
[166] 12.1197
[167] 12.1385-6
[168] Lü, 15.
[169] Shen 2007, 48.
[170] 2.350-73
[171] Lü, 29. (2.274-6)
[172] Shen 2007, 74.
[173] Lü, 40.
[174] Deane 1995, 361.
[175] “……而布卢姆明知妻子在家与剧院经理鲍伊岚交欢，却不敢去过问，只是龟缩在小酒店里痛苦地想象妻子与别人偷情的情景。” [He, Zhongsheng (何仲生). “Special Analysis on the Steam-of-Consciousness Novel *Ulysses*” (意识流小说专题辅导·《尤利西斯》分析). Ed. Zhongsheng He. *A History of Modern Euro-American Literature* (《欧美现代文学史》). Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2007.]
[176] “这种结局也是布卢姆自身所造成的……对莫莉的过分冷淡、生理功能的退化、明知奸情而不敢回家。” [He 2007.]
[177] He 2007.
[178]“莫莉与鲍伊岚的私通使得布卢姆的家庭遭到破坏。” [He 2007.]
[179] Shen 2007, ix.
[180] “……她被来自外部和内部的势力出卖。爱尔兰被出卖，布卢姆家也是如此.” [He 2007.]
[181] Shen 2007, 15.
[182] Shen 2007, x.
[183] Wen 1995, 90. Also, see *Ulysses* 18.867.
[184] Shen 2007, 107.
[185] James Joyce on *Ulysses*, 1920.
[186] Yu, 2.
[187] “…用乔伊斯自己的话，是写了犹太人和爱尔兰人两个民族的历史。在小说里，两个民族的历史碎片镶嵌到这一天的生活当中。” [Li, Huaiyu (李怀宇). “*Ulysses Readme*: A Key to Unlocking the Text” (《<尤利西斯自述>：一把打开天书的钥匙》). *Time Weekly* (《时代周报》) 3.10.2011. http://www.time-weekly.com, 3.10.2012.]
[188] Deane 1995, 356.
[189] 2.279-80
[190] 2.142
[191] Shen 2011, 30.
[192] From “Joyce—Ulysses’ Gaze.”
[193] Shen 2007, 7. Also, see *Ulysses* 2.377.

[194] Shen 2007, 16.
[195] Shen 2007, 46.
[196] Jameson, Frederic. “Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism.” *Social Text*, 15. Durham: Duke University Press, 1986, 69.
[197] Lu, Xun. “Preface to *Call to Arms*.” *Selected Stories of Lu Hsun*. Trans. Xianyi Yang. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1972, 2.
[198] Jameson, 65.
[199] In China, it was also Shen who initiated the dialogue on the fabrication of history.

Works Cited

Quatorzièmes Assises de la Traduction Littéraire. Ed. Jacqueline Carnaud. Arles: Actes Sud/Atlas, 1997.

Theories of Translation: An Anthology of Essays from Dryden to Derrida. Ed. Rainer Schulte and John Biguenet. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Translation and Creation. Ed. David Pollard. Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 1998.

Bliss, A. J. “Note Re the Royal Irish Academy Committee for the Study of Anglo-Irish Language and Literature.”*Journal of the Cork Historical and Archeological Society* LXXIII.218, 1968. 182-183.

Boison, Mogens. "Translating "Ulysses"" *James Joyce Quarterly* 4.3, 1967. 165-69.

Chow, Tse-tsung. “The Literary Revolution.” *The May Fourth Movement: Intellectual Revolution in Modern China*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1967. 269-288.

Deane, Seamus. “Introduction.” *Finnegan’s Wake*. London: Penguin Group, 2000. vii-xlix**.**

Deane, Seamus. “Imperialism/Nationalism.” *Critical Terms for Literary Study*. Ed. Frank Lentricchia and Thomas McLaughlin. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995. 354-68.

Djebar, Assia. “Writing in the Language of the Other.” *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers On Identity and Creativity.* Ed. Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 19-27.

Dorfman, Ariel. “The Wandering Bigamists of Language.” *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers On Identity and Creativity.* Ed. Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 29-37.

Ellman, Richard. *James Joyce*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1965.

Fairhall, James. “Afterword: Language and History.” *James Joyce and the Question of History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1993. 248-56.

Feng, Qi (冯奇). *A Critical Biography of Lin Shu and His Selected Works* (《林纾评传作品选》). Beijing : Chinese Literature and History Press (中国文史出版社), 1998.

Gabaldon, Diana. *Dragonfly in Amber*. New York: Bantam Dell, 1992.

Gao, Wanlong. “Lin Shu’s Choice and Response in Translation from a Cultural Perspective.” *The Journal of Specialised Translation* 13, 2010. 26-43.

Gladney, Dru C. “Ethnic Separatism in China: Threat or Smoke?” *The Wall Street Journal Interactive Edition*, 9 July 1996. http://www.innermongolia.org, 18 February 2012.

Goldman, Merle. “A New Relationship Between the Intellectuals and the State in the Post-Mao Period.” *An Intellectual History of Modern China*. Ed. Merle Goldman and Leo Ou-Fan Lee. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002. 499-538.

He, Zhongsheng (何仲生). “Special Analysis on the Steam-of-Consciousness Novel *Ulysses*” (意识流小说专题辅导·《尤利西斯》分析). Ed. He Zhongsheng. *A History of Modern Euro-American Literature* (《欧美现代文学史》). Shanghai: Fudan University Press, 2007.

Heath, Stephen. “Ambiviolences: Notes for reading Joyce.” *Post-structuralist Joyce*. Trans. Derek Attridge and Daniel Ferrer. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1984. 31-68.

Iribarren, Teresa. “The Reception of James Joyce in Catalonia.” *The Reception of James Jouce in Europe* vol.2. Ed. Geert Lemout and Wim Van Miedo. London: Thoernmes Continuum, 2004. 445-454.

Jameson, Frederic. “Third-World Literature in the Era of Multinational Capitalism.” *Social Text*, 15. Durham: Duke University Press, 1986. 65-88.

Jiang, Feng (江枫). “Is *Ulysses* a Divine Manuscript or Not?” (《*Ulysses* 是不是天书》). *China Reading Weekly* (《中华读书报》). Beijing: Communist Party of China, 1996 (期刊 1). 53-56.

Joyce, James. *A Portrait of the Artist as a Young Man*. New York: The Viking Press, 1967.

Joyce, James. *Exiles*. London: Penguin Books, 1973.

Joyce, James. *Stephen Hero*. Binghamton: New directions, 1944.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. New York : Random House, 1986.

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*. (《尤利西斯》). Trans. Jin Ti (金隄). Beijing: The People’s Literature Publishing House (人民文学出版社), 1994 (volume 1)/1996 (volume

2).

Joyce, James. *Ulysses*（《尤利西斯》）. Trans. Xiao Qian (萧乾) and Wen Jieruo (文洁若). Nanjing: Yilin Press (译林出版社), 1994.

“Joyce—Ulysses’ Gaze” (《乔伊斯——<尤利西斯>的凝视》). *Moving Against the Wind* (《逆风而行》), 4.26.2005. http://www.5ilog.com, 3.15.2012.

Kavanagh, Patrick. “The Parish and the Universe.” *Patrick Kavanagh Collected Prose*. London: Gibbon and Kee, 1967.

Kellogg, Robert. "The First International Academic Conference on James Joyce in China 5-9 July 1996." *James Joyce Quarterly* 33.4,1996. 506-17.

Krishnamurti, J. *Freedom from the Known*. Ed. Mary Lutyens. New York: HarperOne, 1969.

Lázaro, Alberto. “The History of the First Catalan *Ulysses* by J. F. Vidal Jové.” *Papers on Joyce* 14, 2008. 51-69.

Li, Huaiyu (李怀宇). “*Ulysses Readme*: A Key to Unlocking the Text” (《<尤利西斯自述>：一把打开天书的钥匙》). *Time Weekly* (《时代周报》) 3.10.2011. http://www.time-weekly.com, 3.10.2012.

Lin, Shu (林纾). “*Preface to* Oliver Twist.” *Modern Chinese Literary Thought: Writings on Literature, 1893-1945*. Ed. Kirk A. Denton. Trans. Yenna Wu. Stanford: Standford University Press, 1996.

Liu, Lydia H.. *Translingual Practice*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1995.

Liu, Junping (刘军平). “Comparative Analysis on Two Chinese Translations of *Ulysses*” (《<尤利西斯> 两种译本的比较研究》). *Translation Appreciation* (《译著赏析》). 1997. 35-37.

Lovell, Julia. “Translator’s Preface.” *A Dictionary of MaQiao*. New York: Columbia University Press, 2005. vii-xi.

Lloyd, David. *Nationalism and Minor Literature: James Clarence Mangan and the Emergence of Irish Cultural Nationalism*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1987.

Lu, Xun. “Preface to *Call to Arms*.” *Selected Stories of Lu Hsun*. Trans. Xianyi Yang. Beijing: Foreign Language Press, 1972. 1-3.

Lü, Liying (吕立营). *History in James Joyce's* Ulysses (《<尤利西斯>中的历史》). Thesis. Jinan: Shandong University, 2010.

MacCabe, Colin. *James Joyce and the Revolution of the World*. London: The Macmillan Press LTD, 1981.

McCann, Colum. *Let the Great World Spin*. New York: Random House, 2009.

Molloy, Sylvia. "Bilingualism, Writing, and the Feeling of Not Quite Being There." *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers On Identity and Creativity.* Ed. Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 69-77.

"Nationalism." Def. 1. Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Encyclopedia Britannica. Web. 30 Nov. 2011.

Nolan, Emer. *James Joyce and Nationalism*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

O'Neill, Patrick. "Other Words, Other Worlds." *Polyglot Joyce: Fictions of Translation*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003. 70-96.

Paz, Octavio. "Translation: Literature and Letters." *Traducción: Literatura y Literalidad*. Trans. Irende del Corral. Barcelona : Tusquets, 1971. 152-162.

Pearse, Pádraig H. "Patrick H. Pearse's Oration Over The Grave Of O'Donovan Rossa," 1 August 1915. http://www.easter1916.net, 11 April 2012.

Pellatt, Valerie. *Thinking Chinese Translation: A Course In Translation Method: Chinese to English.* London: Routledge, 2010.

Prescott, Joseph. "Stylistic Realism in Joyce's *Ulysses*." *A James Joyce Miscellany*. Ed. Marvin Magalener. Carbondale : Southern Illinois University Press, 1959. 15-66.

Qian, Zhongshu (钱钟书). *Guan Zhui Bian*（《管锥编》). Beijing: Shulin Press, 1990.

Quine, W. V.. "Translation and Meaning." *Word and Object*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1960. 26-79.

Roses and Thorns: The Second Blooming of the Hundred Flowers in Chinese Fiction, 1979-1980. Ed. Perry Link. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Saladrigas, Robert. "La llegada de *Ulysses* a Catalunya." *La Vanguardia* 4.16.1981. 3.

Shen, Fuying (申富英). *Nation, Culture and Gender: A Postcolonial Study of* Ulysses.

(《民族、文化与性别——后殖民主义视角下的<尤利西斯>研究》). Thesis. Jinan: Shandong University, 2007.

Shen, Fuying (申富英). “The View of History in *Ulysses*” (《论<尤利西斯>中的历史观》. *Foreign Literary Research* (《外国文学研究》) 3, 2011. 24-31.

Tawada, Yoko. “Writing in the Web of Words.” *Lives in Translation: Bilingual Writers On Identity and Creativity.* Ed. Isabelle de Courtivron. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2003. 147-155.

Voitkovska, Ludmilla S. "James Joyce and the Soviet Reader: Problems of Contact." *The Canadian Journal of Irish Studies* 16.2, 1990. 21-26.

Wales, Katie. *The Language of James Joyce*. New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1992.

Wang, Yougui (王友贵). “World Translation: A Close Reading of Two Chinese Translations of *Ulysses*” (《世界之译：细读<尤利西斯>的两个中译本》). *Comparative Literature in China* (《中国比较文学》).Shanghai : Shanghai University Press, 1998 (期刊 4). 67-78.

Wang, Zhenping and Ren, Dongsheng (王振平、 任东升). “The Skopos and Methods of Translation: Re-Evaluation of the Two Chinese Versions of Ulysses” (《目的与方法： 对<尤利西斯>两个中译本的再思考[J]语言文学研究》). *Foreign Languages Research* (《外语研究》). Ed. Yang Xiao Rong (杨晓荣). Nanjing: Nanjing University Press, 2006 (期刊 1). 52-56.

Wen, Jieruo (文洁若). “Forging a Conscience in the Unhappy National Spirit” (《在不幸的民族灵魂中铸造良心》). *Dushu* (《读书》) 4, 1995. 86-92.

Xiao, Bingtang. “The Mirror of History and History as Spectacle: Reflections on Xiao Ye and Su Tong.” *Chinese Mordern: The Heroic and the Quotidian*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2000. 225-244.

Yan, Fu (严复). “Introduction to Translation of Thomas Huxey’s *Evolution and Ethics*” (《天演论: 物竞天择, 适者生存》). Trans. Yan Fu (严复). Zhengzhou: Chinese Ancient Books Press, 1998.

Yu, Hongying (于洪英). “The Theme of National Liberation in *Ulysses*” (《<尤利西斯>的民族解放主题》). *Foreign Literature Review* (《外国文学评论》)4, 1997. 67-74.

Zhou, Yanxi and Liu, Xiangqing (周彦希、 刘祥清). “On Mr. Xiao and Ms. Wen’s Translation of *Ulysses* ” (《<尤利西斯>萧、文译本散论》). *Journal of Shaoyang University* （《邵阳学院学报》）. Shaoyang : Shaoyang University Press, 2008.