How Rewriting Affects the Changes in Target Society:

Shi Hu's Imitation and the Abolition of Classical Chinese

Wenjing Zhao

Zhengzhou Shengda University

Henan Normal University

Modern translation theory is shifting its focus from translation practice in the narrow sense to those ostensibly "original" writings that may often be instances of "rewritings", translation in the broad sense. Taking rewriting theory as its framework, this paper focuses on a rather common but largely under-researched phenomenon: the way in which creative writing in form but rewriting in essence facilitates the social reform in the target society. Rewriting theory has greatly extended the scope of translation studies both with respect to issues of form and content as well as contextual/social variables of ideology, poetics and patronage. Rewriting theory has also shed light on activities that "complement" translation as it were, criticism, imitation, biography, and historiography being relevant cases in point. However, these activities, and imitation in particular, have not attracted enough attention from the research area even today. For instance, it has been largely acknowledged that Shi Hu's essay "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature" (Shi Hu, 1917)—one of the most influential publications during the New Culture Movement— initiates and results in the abolition of classical Chinese in the early 1920s. A closer investigation would reveal that this essay was actually an imitation of Ezra Pound's "A Few Don'ts" (1913). However, no one further studies the phenomenon from the perspectives of translation studies: the connection between Hu's localized Chinese version of Pound's "Don'ts" and the consequent abolition of the classical Chinese. By textual and contextual analyses of the way in which Shi Hu's literary essay imitates and localizes the essay by Pound and initiates the new literary movement, this paper argues that imitation, translation in broad sense, plays a very significant role in making changes in the target society, especially when imitators are academically famous and influential, and hold an adequate discursive power.

Keywords: rewriting, translation in its broad sense, abolition of classical Chinese, Shi Hu

It has been acknowledged that Shi Hu's *Wenxue gailiang chuyi* (文学改良刍议; "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature"; also known as "The Eight Don'ts" as Hu called it) signalled the beginning of the literary revolution in the New Culture Movement. The essay popularised Shi Hu almost immediately after its publication and established his authority in the academic circles. Ever since then, the article has been frequently quoted and attracted attention from around the country. This article, actually, was an imitation of the essay then newly published by Ezra Pound, the leading figure of the imagist movement in the USA. However, very few scholars noticed the unoriginal feature and the function of this article. As will be justified below, most of Shi Hu's contributions to the New Culture Movement can best be summarised through the concept of rewriting. The focus of this study is on the sources and the acceptance of Hu's seminal essay "The Eight Don'ts", to assess the possible applicability of rewriting theory to examining Shi Hu's intercultural importation in the New Culture Movement.

As is known, rewriting theory was developed by André Lefevere, a Belgian-born scholar. With a background in comparative literature, and inspired by new developments within and outside translation studies, Lefevere established his concept of 'rewriting' (Lefevere, 1982/2000)—a concept that covers "the obvious form of translation, the less obvious forms of criticism…, commentary, historiography…, teaching, the collection of the works in anthologies, the production of plays" (Lefevere, 1982/2000, p. 235). Translating, according to Lefevere, is one of several types of practice that result in partial representations of reality. These forms of rewriting include editing, reviewing and anthologizing—with translation being a

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Wenjing Zhao, School of Foreign Language, Zhengzhou Shengda University, 1 Wenchanglu，Xinzheng, 450000, China. E-mail: wjzhao2002@aliyun. com

particularly effective form of rewriting that has been editing, instrumental throughout the ages in the circulation of novel ideas and new literary trends (Asimakulas, 2009, p. 241). To achieve a certain purpose, the translator or the rewriter manipulates the original in various ways and they are also constrained by the ideology and poetics of the target culture (Lefevere, 1985a/1992). All translations are rewritings, or renarrations as in Baker's term (Baker, 2006), in one way or another to the originals and their acceptance or rejection relies on the interaction of the control factors in the receiving context. Translational activity is therefore placed in a much larger social, cultural and historical context to cover various forms traditionally excluded from discussions of translation in literature. Lefevere's theory thus takes the study of translation to a new stage. Later on, translators and translation scholars such as Edwin Gentzler, Sherry Simon, Lawrence Venuti, … to name but a few, have all sought to expand the terminology of translation, as André Lefevere did in the early 1990s when he wrote about "refractions" and then "rewritings" (Bassnett, 2017, p. ix). Of all the developments achieved in modern translation studies, rewriting theory is one of the most important and influential (Gentzler, 2001, 2017; Hermans, 1999). If we accept that James Holmes is one of the first theorists to introduce socio-translation (Zhao, 2009, p. 146) into translation studies, it would be fair to acknowledge that Lefevere is among the first to concretise socio-translation studies by putting forward the notion of rewriting and the control factors (Zhang & Zhao, 2021, p. 112). However, even after so many years, the above-mentioned various forms—translation in broad sense—so far have not received sufficient attention from researchers. Fortunately, the recently-finished research project headed by Mona Baker,

> contains not only texts which have been overtly labelled as translations but also numerous commentaries, critical editions and original writings whose production is here understood to have involved a comparable process of interpreting, reformulating and adapting other texts, concepts or systems of thought for new audiences, often—but not exclusively—across some form of linguistic or cultural barrier. (Baker et al., 2021, p. 139)

And the project also "concerns the extent to which texts which cannot easily be categorized as translations may still rely extensively on the mediation of translators in order to construct and deliver their argument, even if the fact of translation is only rarely explicitly acknowledged" (Baker et al., 2021, pp. 139–140).

Therefore, this research will take one of the forms, imitation, as an example to illustrate how Shi Hu's imitation, translation in its broad sense, affects the changes in target society.

Taking the acceptance and canonisation of Shi Hu's seminal essay *Wenxue gailiang chuyi* (文学改良刍议; "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature") (Hu, 1917/1993a) as an example, this research attempts to demonstrate how applicable the theory is to explaining Chinese translation phenomena.

Shi Hu undoubtedly had luck on his side. The earlier repeated failures at reform taught him some useful lessons; the tempestuous transitional socio-historical period provided him with a turning point, a rare opportunity to capitalise on freedom of speech so that his "Tentative Proposals" could be publicised in order to address "vacuums in a literature" (Even-Zohar, 1978/2000, p. 121); the experience of studying abroad provided him with deep insight into Western thought and systems, and enabled him to broaden his outlook in terms of thinking of ways to eradicate feudal culture. Shi Hu understood that the emphasis in Western thought on democracy, science and individualism meant that it largely conflicted with the existing Chinese ethical system. To construct a new culture, the old culture had to be destroyed first. Shi Hu put it thus in 1918: "When advocating literary revolution, we cannot but start from destruction" (Hu, 1918/1993b, p. 40). Literature was regarded as the foundation of all cultures and their ideologies, and language as the paramount element of literature. So, Hu specifically targeted the literary language, which he saw as the carrier of traditional ethics and values. It was with this motivation that Shi Hu published his seminal essay 'Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature', to which Hu himself later referred as "The Eight-Don'ts" or Eight-Don'ts-ism (Hu, 1917/1993a). And it was principally this article that made him famous within academia and ultimately launched a literary revolution. Even his critics recognise this as one of his greatest achievements. In what follows, we focus on this article, a manifesto for the literary revolution, and discuss the context of its production and reception.

Brief Introduction to the Essay

The literary revolution in early-20th century China is commonly believed to have started with the publication of Shi Hu's essay "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature" in *New Youth* (Grieder, 1970; Song, 1996; Yi, 1987). The revolution "led over the next several years to the acceptance, in the schools, in newspapers and magazines, and by the writers of a new style of literature, of a language closer than the classical written language to the usages of common speech"

(Grieder, 1970, p. 76). Hu was always proud of the part he played as a sponsor and promoter of this movement, and he seems to be better remembered for this than for any other of his many endeavours.

Hu's "Eight Don'ts" in *New Youth* drew immediate attention from Duxiu Chen (1916/1996), the editor, who strongly recommended Hu's essay to the public.

In this essay, Hu expressed his view on traditional literature and classical Chinese (文言; *Wenyan*), criticising the former for paying too much attention to style but little or no attention to content, as for the latter, Hu compared it to Latin, the dead language. As a result, he argued, traditional writing carried very little real sense. To change this tradition, Hu proposed the eight principles. Given the centrality of the essay to the discussion in this study, I quote "the Eight Don'ts" in full from Kirk Denton's translation (1996).

 1. Writing should have substance.

 2. Do not imitate the ancients.

 3. Emphasise the technique of writing [follow literary grammar].

 4. Do not moan without an illness.

 5. Eliminate hackneyed and formal language.

 6. Do not use allusions.

 7. Do not use parallelism.

 8. Do not avoid vulgar diction.

(Hu, 1917/1996, pp. 123−124) [1]

Before we compare Hu's "Don'ts" with those of Ezra Pound, who significantly influenced Hu, it is necessary to outline the position of *wenyan* and *baihua*（白话）in order to set the essay in its linguistic context.

Wenyan is classical literary Chinese, as used by traditional scholars in their written work. Before the New Culture Movement, it was nearly the only official and literary language and the medium of education in the country. Compared with *baihua*, or "Mandarin vernacular" (Wickeri, 1995, p. 129), *wenyan* tended to be denser and more abstract, and often contained learned or technical vocabulary, resulting in a language that was extraordinarily difficult and unintelligible to all but the limited number of literati, and as such was removed

from the experience of the vast majority of the reading public. Hence, for Shi Hu, *wenyan* functioned like Latin in medieval Europe. Since it was the only language used in the royal civil service examination (until 1905), *wenyan* was a prerequisite for those who wanted to be promoted. *Baihua*, on the other hand, was a vernacular variety intelligible to the majority of common people.[2] It was also the language of fiction and drama. Both these genres were looked down upon by the literati as "lowbrow" entertainment and had never been classified as genuine literature. Although essentially variants of the same language, *wenyan* and *baihua* differ tremendously. Unless one gets a special training in *wenyan*, one cannot understand *wenyan* literature even if one recognises all the characters in which it is written. *Baihua*, on the other hand, is readily accessible to the vast majority of the Chinese population, for whom it is the natural language of hearth and home.

Even at the turn of the 20th century, the ability to use *wenyan* was still the major criterion in assessing whether a man was well-educated or not. By the time Hu claimed the need for change, this traditional Chinese literature had exhausted its resources and was facing an impasse. On the whole, the works of all three classical language schools then were ossified in form. In content, the writings adopted a sentimental pose and were incapable of mirroring the real lives, thoughts and feelings of Chinese people in the 20th century. The ideologies of the old culture also permeated these writings: for centuries there had been no change whatsoever in the literature. Thus, by the first decade of the 20th century, all genres of Chinese literature had become stereotyped and stagnant, "with very few exceptions" (Chow, 1964, p. 270). Traditional Chinese literature needed change; it needed a revolution.

Shi Hu's eight principles directly highlight the weaknesses of classical literary writing. In this article, for the first time in Chinese history, Shi Hu declared that *wenyan* was a dead language and its literature a dead literature.[3] He went on to state: "From today's perspective of historical evolution, we can say with complete certainty that vernacular literature is really the canonical and will be a useful tool for developing future literature" (Hu, 1917/1996, p. 138). This essay aimed, in opposition to the dominant poetics, to defend and justify the dignity and the claim to canonical status of modern vernacular

---

[1] Hu's "Eight Don'ts" appeared in different orders with some modification in his various essays. For example, the version here taken from Hu's essay "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature" is different from the version in his letter to Duxiu Chen published two months earlier. However, no substantial changes were made to the content.

[2] For a detailed discussion of the history of *wenyan* and *baihua*, see Wickeri (1995).

[3] In making this assertion, perhaps Shi Hu attempts to argue that a language is dead if it is not audible and is incomprehensible to the majority of the people (Chinese language is quite different from Western alphabetical language in that the word and its sound have no connection with each other). In fact, at this time *wenyan* was still in use by the literati, though it was to die out within a few years of the death sentence that Hu passed on it.

language and literature; to undermine *wenyan* literature's orthodox literary position; to call for abandoning classical Chinese; and to "affect the unity of the spoken and written languages" (Hu, 1917/1996, p. 138). In short, the essay tried to elevate *baihua* to the position of a national language, so that the well-educated would not feel ashamed to use it. Hu's contention is that a dead language cannot produce a living literature, and must therefore be abandoned. Mandarin vernacular, a living language, should instead be used not merely in genres of entertainment, but also in education and in canonical literature.

From our current perspective, it may be difficult to perceive the courage, insight, and originality of this essay. However, we should remember that it was written nearly a century ago, at a time when *wenyan* was dominant in education and in the composition of so-called "highbrow" literature. The article targeted the very core of Confucius ideologies, and tried to destroy the authority and hegemony of the *wenyan* tradition. The purpose of such destruction was to construct a living literature that could help change the social superstructure. China, Hu argued, needed such a revolution in order to displace the hegemony of the classical tradition and create a vernacular literature that would be intelligible to the less educated, respond to modern social problems, and help transform society (Hu, 1934/2001, p. 96).

As explained earlier, "The Eight Don'ts" has been widely regarded as the manifesto of literary revolution, and was instrumental in establishing Hu's canonical status. However, the very production of this article results from applying Western models to the Chinese context. Hu's eight principles bear obvious traces of "A Few Don'ts" (Pound, 1913).

The Influence of Pound's "A Few Don'ts"

In terms of structure and content, Hu's "Eight Don'ts", bears obvious vestiges of the essay "A Few Don'ts by an Imagiste" by the American imagist Ezra Pound. Hu's time in the United States[4] coincided with a new poetic movement (1912−1918) launched by some poets who "sought to eliminate the wordy circumlocutions" and "to strip poetry of rhetoric" (Gage, 1981, p. 34). These poets called themselves 'imagists' because they aimed "to search for the 'exact word,' which is the image" (Gage, 1981, p. 39). Pound was one of the pioneers of this group. A sensitive student of Western culture and literature, Hu could not avoid being influenced by this movement. Although Shi Hu does not acknowledge any debt to the American imagists,[5] his Eight Don'ts is an application of Imagists' ideas to Chinese contexts— and this thread represents a very significant aspect of his work in general.

It should be noticed that Shi Hu often fails to acknowledge his sources. When recorded for his oral autobiography in 1958, Hu disclosed that a review of his essay *Lun xunguxue* (论训诂学; "On Critical Interpretation of Ancient Texts") in his diary (Hu, 1919/1986) on December 26, 1916 reminded him of some point worth mentioning. His essay was in fact an abridged translation of Professor John Postgate's essay "Textual Criticism", which appeared in the 11th edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*. The difference, according to Hu, is that he (Hu) used Chinese illustrations to replace the examples from Shelley's poems in the original (Hu, 1989, p. 229). Hu went on to explain that had he not disclosed this, no one would ever have known it since there was no indication of the source in his article—it contained, in other words, some unmarked translation.

How many of Hu's works were written according to this strategy we cannot say for sure. But this acknowledgement highlights one important practice in Hu's writing. His "Eight Don'ts" similarly exemplifies the way in which Hu adapted foreign works to suit his agenda.

Pound's essay was published in the first volume of *Poetry* in 1913, four years before Hu's. At that time Shi Hu was studying in the United States. According to Huang (1997), "between 1912 and 1917, Hu read *Poetry* magazine", and "kept a clipping of Lowell's[6] 'Imagist Credo' from *the New York Times* (although he noted in his diary that her [Lowell's] principles resembled his instead of the reverse)" (p. 130). As with his article "On Exegetics" mentioned in his diary (Hu, 1919/1986), Shi Hu localised the original to fit the needs of the target audience. This explains why there are both similarities and differences between Hu's "Don'ts" and those of Ezra Pound. Here is an abridged version of Pound's "A Few Don'ts" (Pound, 1913, pp. 201−206):

---

[4] Shi Hu studied in the United States from September 1910 to June 1917, first at Cornell University as a graduate and then at Columbia University for his Ph.D. At that time Imagism was an important new movement in English-language poetry.

[5] In his "Preface" to *The Experimental Collection* (Hu, 1919/1993c, pp. 369−383), regarding the accusation of possible plagiarism of the new literary currency from abroad, Hu denied it: "My advocate of the literary revolution is based on the current Chinese literary situation. It has nothing to do with the new literary tendency in Europe or the United States" (Hu, 1919/1993c, p. 377, the author's translation). At that time, the Imagist theory was severely criticised and accused of being decadent, and did not even have an established position in its own birthplace. This might be the reason why Shi Hu does not want to acknowledge the influence of this school. Even in 1916 when the Imagists' theory was under discussion in the States, Hu merely acknowledged in his diary that the advocates of this school have some similarities with his (see Chen, 1989), which indicates that the relationship between his Don'ts and Pound's is "parallel to each other" rather than "one being influenced by another". However, Hu's own denial proves almost nothing.

[6] Emily Lowell was another key member in the imagist group.

A comparison between Pound's and Hu's versions immediately reveals the similarities in both style and content. The structures obviously mirror each other. Pound's "Use no superfluous word, no adjective which does not reveal something" paralleled Hu's "Don't write about nothing". Both stress the need to avoid empty rhetoric or meaningless language. Hu exhorts his readers: "[d]o not imitate the writings of the ancients; what you write should reflect your own personality", and Pound demands: "Don't allow 'influence' to mean merely that you mop up the particular decorative vocabulary of some one or two poets whom you happen to admire" (Pound, 1913, p. 201).

However, if we examine the two pieces more closely, we find that because of their different agendas, beneath the seemingly parallel structures they stress slightly different aspects. Both seem to prefer directness to unnecessary rhetoric, by stating respectively "Don't write about nothing" (Hu, 1917/1996, pp. 39−123), and "Use no superfluous word, no adjective which does not reveal something" (Pound, 1913, p. 202). However, Hu rejects artifice, and assumes that writing should have meaningful content. By contrast, Pound does not reject artifice in itself. Instead, he is rejecting verbosity, stressing the need for economy and precision. By rejecting the imitation of others and calling for writing to reflect one's own personality, Shi Hu rejects traditional Chinese literary influences and calls for writers to use the language and expressions of their own time, in particular in Mandarin vernacular—*baihua*. Pound, on the other hand, does not reject traditional literary influence, but advises poets: "[b]e influenced by as many great artists as you can" (Pound, 1913, p. 202), and "Don't allow 'influence' to mean merely that you mop up the particular decorative vocabulary of some one or two poets whom you happen to admire" (Pound, 1913, p. 202). Here Pound encourages poets to describe the same daily phenomena in an expression that nobody has used before. We should note here that Pound's "Don'ts'" targets the rhetorical issues in English-language poetry, while Hu's highlights the prevailing problems in Chinese literary writings. Shi Hu rejects adherence to classical convention and encourages the use of the vernacular; Pound advocates using concrete objects rather than abstractions (*e.g. "Don't use such an expression as 'dim lands *of peace*'. It dulls the image. It mixes an abstraction with the concrete"). Most importantly, Shi Hu and Pound have almost opposite attitudes towards the Chinese literary tradition: Pound seems to view traditional Chinese poetry much more positively than Shi Hu does (Pound, 1918, pp. 4−57).

However, despite the differences between the two pieces, it is

clear that Shi Hu adapted Pound's "Don'ts" in drafting his own "Don'ts".[7] Hu recast both its framework and its spirit to fit the Chinese context; his essay can thus be regarded as a localised Chinese version of Pound's "Don'ts". It is rewriting, a less obvious form of translation according to Lefevere.

This might explain why soon after the publication of Hu's "Eight Don'ts" and *The Experimental Collection*, Hu was accused of "plagiarising" Western literature (Chow, 1964, p. 30).[8] However, to my knowledge, no research so far has focused on the nature of this influential essay as rewriting, other than to accuse Hu of plagiarism. In fact, Hu's rewriting is far from mere adaptation. He took some ideas and developed his own views. Shi Hu's Don'ts, although discussing style and the use of expressions, basically call for a revolution in the literary system, aiming at the development of Chinese literature as a whole on the basis of criticising the traditional way of writing—paying too much attention to style and no attention to content. Pound's, however, are confined to the discussion of the rhetoric and rhymes of poetry, and of how to establish images—stressing writing style. This seems to be the intrinsic difference resulting from the different agendas of the two pioneers. The nature of Shi Hu's rewritings is to utilise and adapt foreign ideas to serve Chinese reform. Hu targets the whole Chinese feudal system and its mouthpieces, the literati while Pound just aims at how to create images in poetry.

This strongly indicates that in rewriting and introducing, Shi Hu was no innocent bystander. He had obviously chosen his narratives carefully in an effort to create an outlook favourable to his argument. In other words, the inaccurate account was the result of intentional localisation in order to fulfil his agenda. There is no misinterpretation as such here, or at least it should be called intentional misinterpretation—manipulation.

The Impact on Chinese Language, Literature and Translation

By the mid-1920s, publications in classical Chinese were rare (Denton, 1996, p. 116). Indeed, Shi Hu's own works also reflected the progress of his revolutionary ideas. When his "Tentative Proposals" was published in January 1917, although the essay called for abandoning *wenyan* and using *baihua*, it was

---

[7] It is interesting to note here that Pound is said to have acquired the idea of the image from his rewritings of the Chinese "Cathay", and that in turn his principles were rewritten by a Chinese scholar in ways which would influence Chinese literary reform.

[8] Shi Hu's published diary (1919/1986, p. 80) reveals that early on, on July 24, 1916, Guangdi Mei (Hu's student colleague in the US) wrote Hu a letter discussing the issue of writing a poem in *baihua*, in which Mei criticised Shi Hu's suggestion of using *baihua* in poetry as plagiarising the literary "new tide" in Europe and the United States.

paradoxically written in *wenyan*, not in *baihua*, perhaps for the sake of his target readers, the literati. This indicates that *wenyan* at the time was still the proper language for the genre and a significant aspect of the identity of the author. However, a year later in April 1918, his essay "Jianshe de wenxue geming lun" (建设的文学革命论; "A Constructive Literary Revolution") appeared, completely in *baihua*. From that point onwards, Hu abandoned *wenyan* in his essays.

Within only five years, the vernacular language had come to occupy a dominant position throughout the nation. In such a large country as China, where classical Chinese had been used for more than two thousand years, this represented an unprecedented success—a great wonder. Supporters and opponents both had to concede that Shi Hu's works were instrumental in ensuring this achievement.

In other words, the earlier advocates still clung to feudalistic values, regarding them as essential, whereas the new ideas they introduced only complemented them. This, to Shi Hu, was a fatal mistake.

This ambivalent attitude to language and literary reform could not affect any fundamental change. For if *baihua* was to be used merely in cheap magazines, pamphlets and novels—the "lowbrow entertainment" area of Chinese writing—with the educated and literati refraining from using it in their own writing, how could it possibly be accepted by the whole of society? Who would like to learn or use a language despised even by its advocates? Hu displayed real insight in perceiving this inconsistency in proposals for language reform and insisting on pushing *baihua* onto a higher stage. Most reformers failed to see this. Even Duxiu Chen, who in his youth had founded a *baihua* newspaper in Anhui[9] for commoners alone, did not realise the significance of using *baihua* as a literary tool until he read Shi Hu's proposals. *Wenyan* had been used in his journal *New Youth* since its inception in 1915; it was only after Shi Hu and several other scholars joined the editorial team in January 1918 that *baihua* became the only language for the journal. Shi Hu understood that the key to reform was to convince the literati to change their own writing habits first. To do so, it was essential to gain strong support from various quarters, including scholars, prestigious journals, and educational institutions; in short, it was essential to secure patronage.

Institutional Settings and Patronage

Despite the nature of Hu's essay and the necessity of changes

as justified above, the popularity of the essay depends also on other factors. According to Lefevere, two control factors regulate the relationship between the literary system and other subsystems within the social system. One control factor comes from inside the literary system and is represented by the "professionals"; the other factor, which operates from outside the system, is called patronage (Lefevere, 1992, pp. 14−16). In the case of the Shi Hu phenomenon, the two factors in conjunction helped canonise Shi Hu and popularise his works. Outside the literary system, such powers of patronage as the highly respected journal *New Youth* and the educational institution Peking University greatly enhanced Shi Hu's academic authority and prestige; while inside the system, support from professional celebrities such as Duxiu Chen and Xuantong Qian played a decisive role in promoting Shi Hu and his works.

The first response came from Duxiu Chen. His unequivocally radical essay "Wenxue geming lun" ("On Literary Revolution") (1916/1996) drew the reading public's instant attention to Hu's essay "The Eight Don'ts". This was beyond Hu's expectations, being attacked and opposed by his fellow-students, seeing there was no response from the Chinese students in American universities to his suggestion for language reform, Hu modestly entitled his essay "Some Tentative Proposals for the Reform of Chinese Literature". It should be noted that in his previous letter to Duxiu Chen, he used the term "literary revolution". However, for formal publication as an essay, Hu carefully changed "revolution" to "reform" in order to make it less aggressive and more acceptable. Indeed, the article itself is not quite cogent. If we take a closer look at the eight Don'ts, we will find them overlapping and even contradictory. For example, "Do not avoid vulgar diction" and "Do not ignore grammar and syntax" contradict each other since sometimes the vernacular can be very colloquial and does not follow literary grammar. The four other points, "Do not imitate the writings of the ancients; Do not use clichés; Do not use allusions; Do not write in parallels" (Hu, 1917/1996, pp. 4−123) are also somewhat overlapping. [10] However, Duxiu Chen's immediate response (Chen, 1916/1996), which bravely attacked the existing literary tradition and showed his firm encouragement and strong support for Shi Hu's proposals, directed readers' attention to the originality and great insight of the article and obscured its weaknesses. Even Shi Hu himself was overwhelmed by such an enthusiastic response. In several of his articles, Shi Hu admitted that but for Duxiu Chen's firm support and uncompromising attitude, the literary revolution would have taken another one or two decades to start (Hu, 1989, 1934/2001).

---

[9] Between February 15, 1904 and August 1, 1905, Chen established, edited, and wrote for *Anhui suhua bao* (*Anhui Vernacular Journal*), the first vernacular paper in Anhui province and one of the earliest in China. For more information (Feigon, 1983, pp. 61−62).

[10] In his "A Constructive Literary Revolution", published in 1918 in *New Youth*, Hu recast the eight points into four, which made his proposals more coherent.

Chen's firm attitude brought the value of Hu's proposals into full play. Chen at that time was an acknowledged youth leader and was highly esteemed. Chen's strong recommendation of the article certainly aroused readers' interest in it and made it more conspicuous. Otherwise, the article might have remained unnoticed.

The Shi Hu phenomenon, to some extent, reveals the significant role played by "the two control factors" (Lefevere, 1992). In the process of Hu's gradual recognition, we see the interaction between ideology, poetics and patronage. However, the process is not as straightforward as Lefevere suggests. There was no such explicit demarcation between the two factors from within and outside the literary system, or between poetics and ideology. Ideologies were in the dominant position most of the time. First, Hu's article "The Eight Don'ts", although calling for poetic change, answered the call of socio-political needs—to change the feudal ideologies and values expressed in *wenyan* literature. In fact, replacing *wenyan*, the super-stratum, with *baihua* would not have been so significant had it not initiated extensive importation of new thought into literature to replace the old ideas conveyed by *wenyan* literature and to remedy the inadequacy of traditional literature. Hu's article itself draws heavily on foreign literary movements and literary reformers. Secondly, support from professionals inside the literary system was also ideologically-motivated, *i.e.* authoritative professors wrote not only to confirm that what Hu suggested was original and feasible, but also to express their strong desire for change of traditional values (which has been explicitly demonstrated in the articles discussed above). Of course, the influential journals, educational institutions and even official government organs such as the State Education Department did act as strong sources of patronage in publicising and popularising Shi Hu and his proposals, and without them Shi Hu would not have become known while still a student in the United States, and his seminal essay might have been ignored as it had been by Chinese students in the United States.

Conclusion

Translation studies should cover the various practices of translation in broad sense. "…in the globalized world of Facebook, Twitter and Skype? …Today's world is vastly different, and so is the position and the role of Translation Studies" (Snell-Hornby, 2012, p. 371). Imitation is an effective way of introducing and translating foreign thoughts into the target society. The interaction between the sources of patronage formed an important virtuous circle. First, the strong support of professionals enabled Shi Hu to acquire reputation and prestige. Then, because of this, Hu was able to hold a position in both a

highly respected journal and China's most prestigious university. Hence Hu obtained discursive power, and his works became popular among intellectual communities and could be widely circulated. Moreover, his reputation with the reading public also played a major role in the influence exerted by his writings on institutions. As Hu recalled in "The Chinese Renaissance" (Hu, 1934/2001), since 1917, with support from one journal and one university, his proposals spread quickly all over the country and thus initiated a literary revolution. Behind the Shi Hu phenomenon, and the wonder of changing classical Chinese in a surprisingly short period of time, lay the functions of patronage and ideology.

References

Asimakoulas, D. (2009). "Rewriting". In M. Baker (Ed.), *Routledge encyclopaedia of translation studies* (2nd ed.). (pp. 241–246). London & New York: Routledge.

Baker, M., Buts, J., Jones, H., Zhao, W.-J., & Yang G.-S. (2021). Using corpora to trace the cross-cultural mediation of concepts through time: An interview with the coordinators of "the Genealogies of Knowledge Research Network". *Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 53*(1), 135–145.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict a narrative account*. London & New York: Routledge.

Bassnett, S. (2017). Foreword. In Edwin Gentzler (Ed.), *Translation and rewriting in the age of post-translation studies* (p. ix). London & New York: Routledge.

Chen, D.-X. (1916/1996). On literary revolution. (T. Wong, Trans.). In K. Denton (Ed.), *Modern Chinese literary thought: Writings on literature 1893–1945* (pp. 45–140). Stanford & California: Stanford University Press.

Chen, J.-G. (1989). *Hu Shi yanjiu ziliao*. Beijing: Beijing Publishing Group.

Chow, T.-S. (1964). *The may fourth movement*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

Denton, K. A. (1996). *Modern Chinese literary thought: Writings on literature 1893–1945*. Stanford & California: Stanford University Press.

Even-Zohar, I. (1978/2000). The position of translated literature within the literary polysystem. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 7–192). London and New York: Routledge.

Feigon, L. (1983). *Chen Duxiu*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Gage, J. T. (1981). *In the arresting eye: The rhetoric of imagism*. Baton & London: Louisiana State University Press.

Gentzler, E. (2001). *Contemporary translation theories*. London and New York: Routledge.

Gentzler, E. (2017). *Translation and rewriting in the age of post-translation studies*. London & New York: Routledge.

Grieder, J. B. (1970). *Hu Shi and the Chinese renaissance: Liberalism in the Chinese Revolution 1917−1937*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Hermans, T. (1999). *Translation in systems: Descriptive and system-oriented approaches explained*. Manchester: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hu, S. (1989). Dr. Hu Shi's personal reminiscences. (Tang D.-G., Ed. & Trans.). In Chen J.-G. (Ed.), *Hu Shi yanjiu ziliao* (pp.156−327). Beijing: Beijing Publishing Group.

Hu, S. (1917/1993a). Wenxue gailiang chuyi. In Jiang Y.-H. (Ed.), *Hu Shi xueshu wenji: Xin wenxue yundong* (pp. 19−29). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

Hu, S. (1917/1996). Some modest proposals for the reform of chinese literature. (K. A. Denton, Trans. and Ed.), *Modern Chinese literary thought: Writings on literature 1893−1945* (pp. 39−123). Stanford & California: Stanford University Press.

Hu, S. (1918/1993b). Constructive literary revolution. In Jiang Y.-H. (Ed.), *Hu Shi xueshu wenji: Xin wenxue yundong* (pp. 40−54). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

Hu, S. (1919/1986). *Hu Shi's diary abroad*. Taipei: Luan-Liou Publishing Co., Ltd.

Hu, S. (1919/1993c). Preface to the experimental collection. In Jiang Y.-H. (Ed.), *Hu Shi xueshu wenji: Xin wenxue yundong* (pp. 369−383). Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company.

Hu, S. (1934/2001). *The Chinese renaissance: The Haskell lectures 1933*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Huang, G.-Y. (1997). *Whitmanism, imagism, and modernism in China and America*. Selinsgrove: Susquehanna University Press / London: Associated University Presses.

Lefevere, A. (1985a). Why waste our time on rewrites? The trouble with interpretation and the role of rewriting in an alternative paradigm. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 243−251). London & New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (1985b). What is written must be rewritten. *Julius Caesar*: Shakespeare, Voltaire, Wieland, Buckingham. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *Second hand: Papers on the theory and historical study of literary translation* (pp. 88−105). Antwerp: ALW.

Lefevere, A. (1992). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame*. London & New York: Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (1982/2000). Mother courage's cucumber: Text, system and refraction in a theory of literature. In L. Venuti (Ed.), *The translation studies reader* (pp. 233−249). London and New York: Routledge.

Pound, E. (1913). A few don'ts by an imagiste. *Poetry, 1*(1), 201−206.

Pound, E. (1918). Chinese poetry. *Today*, *3* (14)*, 54−57.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2012). From the Fall of the wall to facebook: Translation studies in Europe twenty years later. *Perspectives, 3*, 365−373.

Song, J.-H. (1996). *Hu Shi and the transformation of Chinese culture*. Heilongjiang: Heilongjiang Education Press.

Venuti, L. (2000). *The Translation Studies Reader*. London and New York: Routledge.

Wickeri, J. (1995). The union version of the Bible & the new literature in China. *The Translator 2*, 129−152.

Yi, Z.-X. (1987). *On Hu Shi in the May Fourth Literary Revolution*. Hong Kong: Joint Publishing (H.K.).

Zhang, Y.-B., & Zhao, W.-J. (2021). Translation not only presenting reality but also reframing it—Interview with Professor Zhao Wenjing on rewriting and multiform translation. *Journal of North China University of Water Resources and Electric Power (Social Science Edition), 37*(6), 109−114.

Zhao, W.-J. (2009). Literary criticism and the creation of Ibsen's image in China. *Perspectives: Studies in Translatology, 3*, 137−149.