

2020

From Cultural Utilization to Cultural Understanding: Two Phases of the English-Speaking World's Reception of Traditional Chinese Plays

Lyu Shisheng
Nankai University

Yuan Fang
Nankai University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://css.researchcommons.org/journal>



Part of the [Social and Behavioral Sciences Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Shisheng, Lyu and Fang, Yuan (2020) "From Cultural Utilization to Cultural Understanding: Two Phases of the English-Speaking World's Reception of Traditional Chinese Plays," *Contemporary Social Sciences*: No. 4, Article 4.

Available at: <https://css.researchcommons.org/journal/vol2020/iss4/4>

This Research Article is brought to you for free and open access by Contemporary Social Sciences. It has been accepted for inclusion in Contemporary Social Sciences by an authorized editor of Contemporary Social Sciences.



From Cultural Utilization to Cultural Understanding: Two Phases of the English-Speaking World's Reception of Traditional Chinese Plays

Lyu Shisheng and Yuan Fang*

Nankai University

Abstract: The article analyzes the translations, performances and the reception of traditional Chinese plays in the English-speaking world from the mid-and-late eighteenth century to the early twentieth century. We found that the reception underwent two phases featuring self-centered and multicultural respectively. In the first phase, the English-speaking world acknowledged the moral values of traditional Chinese plays but it did not accept their aesthetic values while in the second phase, aesthetic values became the focus and were received through translations, studies and performances. The two phases differed significantly. The first phase was characterized by the initial contacts and exchanges between the plays and the English culture as well as obvious cultural misunderstandings. During the second phase, moral and aesthetic values were gradually accepted. Text translations, theatrical studies and performances were flourishing while cultural misunderstandings decreased remarkably. The two stages demonstrate the general result of the Chinese culture's historical process of "going global". The reception of Chinese culture by other cultures often started with cultural utilization, accompanied by obvious cultural misunderstandings. With the deepening of contacts and exchanges between the two cultures, however, the host culture began to gain a better understanding of the intrinsic values of Chinese culture and therefore cultural misunderstandings decreased. Cultural misunderstandings are an inevitable historical process that the Chinese culture would experience during its "going global". With continuing and expanded exposures, the intrinsic values of Chinese culture will continue to manifest themselves.

Keywords: traditional Chinese plays, drama translation, reception in the English-speaking world, culture understanding, culture misunderstanding

* Lyu Shisheng, College of Foreign Languages, Nankai University; Yuan Fang, College of Foreign Languages, Nankai University.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Lyu Shisheng, College of Foreign Languages, Nankai University, Tianjin. E-mail: nkprof@sina.com

The English-speaking world's reception of traditional Chinese plays ("TCPs") underwent two phases that embodied different features. The first phase was characterized by cultural utilization and the second phase by cultural understanding. During the first phase, the English-speaking world appreciated only the moral values of TCPs and did not recognize their aesthetic values. Cultural misunderstandings were also very obvious. In the second phase, however, TCPs were interpreted from a multicultural perspective and attention was paid to their aesthetic values. Through translations, adaptations, studies and performances, the English-speaking world expressed its understanding of TCPs.

The English-speaking world's reception of TCPs began around the mid-eighteenth century through the performance of *The Orphan of Zhao*, first in France and then in London. The play is classified as being in the *zaju*^① genre of drama of the Yuan Dynasty. *The Orphan of Zhao* was also the first TCP to be translated into a Western language. Joseph Marie de Prémare, a missionary, translated the play into French. His version was later adapted by Voltaire, a French enlightenment thinker and playwright. In 1755, the play was performed on stage for the first time in the West and became highly successful. Under the influence of the successful show in France, Arthur Murphy, a British playwright and actor, translated the play into English under the title *The Orphan of China* which was performed in the Drury Lane Theater in London in April 1759. At that time, the theater season in London was drawing to an end and people were less inclined to go to the theater. After the play opened, however, it aroused the audience's enthusiasm so much that it was performed nine times consecutively. From then on, it was performed in London for ten consecutive years. Oliver Goldsmith, a critic at that time described London audience's favor toward the play in the *Journal of Review*, "The audience seemed to be extremely satisfied with the debut that night. They had reasons to feel that way... It seems to me that the strong emotions, the dazzling background and the fantastic director are the reasons for their satisfaction." (Yan, 2002) The successful performance of *The Orphan of China* in the UK marked the reception of TCPs by the English-speaking world. However, this *zaju* of the Yuan Dynasty was based on a French version of the play, which only selectively kept part of the theme of the original drama and hardly maintained the original artistic features and aesthetic values after the translation. Such a case was inextricably linked to the self-centered Western cultural position taken by the translator. During that time classical theatrical aesthetics prevailed in the UK and viewing this Chinese play from such a perspective, Westerners undoubtedly looked down on it. What they accepted from the play was limited only to its moral values, such as devotion to national interest, loyalty, trustworthiness and righteousness. What the English-speaking world accepted from the play at that time was its moral values while its aesthetic values were mostly overlooked. The acceptance of the latter actually took place in the early twentieth century, about 200 years later. But 200 years later, the English-speaking world's reception of TCPs happened in another

① *Zaju*: a form of Chinese drama or Chinese opera which provided entertainment through a synthesis of recitations of prose and poetry, dance, singing, and mime, with a certain emphasis on comedy.

place—a new English world on the other side of the ocean. It was marked by a show tour in the US conducted by the troupe of Mei Lanfang, a notable Peking Opera artist in modern Chinese theater. This tour was regarded as the second dissemination of TCPs to the Western world. The troupe’s success in making the tour was due to the further development of exchanges between Chinese and Western cultures so there had been some changes in the English-speaking world’s perceptions of TCPs. The artistic charm of TCPs started to thrive in the new English world, inspiring ordinary people, artists, and translators. Their cultural position thus changed from a single perspective to a multicultural perspective. We explored the following questions: During this historical process, how did the English-speaking world’s reception of TCPs take place? What were the features of the process? What were its effects on social and historical development? What can be learned from the process that can enhance the current Chinese culture in going global?

The First Phase

The version of the play *The Orphan of Zhao* that was introduced to the English-speaking world was actually an edited translation that could even be called an adaptation. It was obviously a creation resulting from the European-centered cultural perspective. *The Orphan of Zhao* is one of the numerous plays created in the form of *zaju* during the Yuan Dynasty, which was the first thriving period in the history of Chinese drama. During that period, Chinese drama was mainly represented by plays in the northern area and was called *yuanqu* (plays of the Yuan Dynasty) in the history of Chinese culture. The name came from the artistic features of such plays which were characterized by the combination of singing and spoken parts. Performers would both sing and speak during the performance. When the plot reaches a climax and the characters become emotional, the performers concerned would sing. However, such artistic features which were so popular in Chinese culture could not be accepted due to the classical theatrical aesthetics of the UK at that time. In the English version of the play, all the singing parts of the original text were deleted and only the spoken parts were kept. In this case, what the English readers or audiences saw was actually a disfigured Chinese play.

The direct reason for the play to be changed after its introduction into English culture was due to the fact that the French version, which the English translation was based on, already went far from the original Chinese text. The singing parts of the original, which represented its key artistic features in the history of Chinese drama, were completely removed. The reason for this was that the Western world held a self-centered cultural position at that time. Such a position was embodied by a comment in the source text (ST) by Du Halde, who was the editor of the French version. Du (1735) wrote, “Chinese plays do not follow the three unities. Nor do they observe other traditions of European plays. Therefore, they cannot match the achievements of the latter.” D’ Argens (1741), another critic, also expressed similar opinions, “In our comedies, Dear Yu Che Chan, we don’t observe any of those rules which formerly made the Greeks so perfect, and which for an age past, have made the French as perfect as the Greeks.”^① Undoubtedly, the criticism was based on classical theatrical

aesthetics then prevailing in Europe. Such a Europe-centered cultural position distorted the artistic quality of the *zaju* of the Yuan Dynasty. Even the remaining parts were intentionally selected out of a motivation for cultural utilization, which was a prominent feature of the first phase. This was due to the predicament of social and historical developments in Europe in the eighteenth century.

The eighteenth century witnessed the rise of enlightened thoughts in the Western world and enlightenment advocates urgently needed to bring in some external thoughts to change the historical course. On that occasion, they cast their eyes on a play titled *The Orphan of Zhao*, from China, for its rationality and moral values. The play was firstly translated into French and then into English which started the process of the English-speaking world's introduction to TCPs. In the early eighteenth century, European missionaries flocked to China. When they returned, they brought back various books on Chinese history, politics, economics, society, law, literature, and art, covering almost every aspect of Chinese culture. For enlightenment thinkers, their reception of these resources was tantamount to a drought-stricken area to a rain storm since they sought eagerly for any solutions from the outside to help the Western world step out of its social development dilemma. In this sense, the possibility for TCPs to appear on the Western stage in the eighteenth century was closely related to its social and historical development. The gleaming values reflected in these TCPs enlightened the bewildered Western society. Amid such special historical conditions, the important moral values of TCPs were manifested. With the declining of the enlightenment, however, the influence of Chinese values on Western thoughts went down accordingly, and the exchange between Chinese plays and Western cultures went into a long-term standstill.

This situation lasted until the turn of the twentieth century when inner conflicts of Western cultures were intensified, resulting in two irreconcilable interest groups. A world war was going to break out and the Western social order was about to break down. Such a situation caused the Western world to reflect on their cultures and also to cast its eyes again on China, a cultural other. Some intellectuals began to rethink traditional Chinese culture so that TCPs were once again introduced to the English-speaking world. Compared with the eighteenth century, a multicultural trend of thoughts emerged in the Western world which started to change attitudes towards Chinese culture, its understanding about TCPs, and its interpretation and translation of their moral and aesthetic values.

The Second Phase

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the US was the first country in the English-speaking world to receive TCPs for a reason different from the cultural utilization in the first phase. At

① It was originally written in French. The author D' Argens expressed his opinions on TCPs through correspondence between two Chinese men that he created. The quotation is cited from the English translation of *Chinese Letters* (anonymous translator): "In our comedies, Dear Yu Che Chan, we don't observe any of those rules which formerly made the Greeks so perfect, and which for an age past, have made the French as perfect as the Greeks. I own to these that I could heartily wish, that tho' we don't care to subject ourselves to the rules which the Europeans call the three unities, we should at least preserve a little more of the probable in our plays."

that time, numerous Chinese men went to the US as laborers for building their transcontinental railroads. They brought along with them TCPs. TCPs that the English-speaking world received in the eighteenth century were distorted texts translated by missionaries. Therefore, it was impossible for TCPs, which always featured stage performances, to show their artistic charm to the English audience. The TCPs introduced to US society in the twentieth century were in the form of stage art. This could be one of the main reasons for their reception. Originally, TCPs were only performed in the Chinese community, but gradually other local people developed an interest in this unique art form. The performances were so novel and wonderful that they impressed the American people and caused much confusion as well. No matter what, they stood for a fascinating artistic style. If we regard *The Orphan of China* on the stage of the Western world in the eighteenth century as a Chinese play, it actually only included elements of a Chinese story, mainly the moral values and the setting of the story. Stage performances of TCPs, however, had never been directly experienced by the English-speaking world before this period. American society's interest in TCPs paved the way for the tour by the Mei Lanfang troupe in 1930. This marked the second reception of TCPs by the English-speaking world. After being obscured for almost a century, TCPs aroused the interest of the Western world once again. The troupe's six-week tour across the US became a sensational cultural exchange event. Charlie Chaplin, the famous comic actor was in the audience. The performances of the Chinese community introduced TCP performances for Americans while those of the troupe impressed them with the highest level of Chinese opera art. Mei was thus acclaimed by the US media as the cultural ambassador of China. Then this commercial show, which was originally initiated by a privately-owned troupe, was raised to the level of "state visit" by the US theatrical circles (Yel, 2014).

The tour was originally planned because of the general interest of many American people and not for any specific cultural reasons. However, as American interest and fondness for TCPs grew, academia's interest was on the rise as well. Comparative studies of TCPs and Western plays were conducted and enthusiasm for translations and adaptations grew. During this time, Western people started to develop some objective understanding of the artistic value of TCPs, an understanding that was totally different from the understanding in the first phase. This means that the position from which the English-speaking world received TCPs has slowly undergone some changes from self-centered to multicultural.

Changes in Cultural Positions in TCP Studies

The gist of multiculturalism is that: any civilization is a product of history; it is a specific form of a specific tradition, in a specific region, and under specific conditions for survival; it has its intrinsic motivation and specific value system. No civilization can claim that it is superior to other civilizations. Nor can it have any reason to regard itself the dominant civilization and thus despise and deny or even replace other civilizations (Wang, 2000). "Cultural diversity is as necessary for humankind as biodiversity is for nature. In this sense, it is the common heritage of humanity and should be recognized and affirmed for the benefit of present and future generations" (UNESCO,

2001).

Multiculturalism began at the turn of the twentieth century when the ideological system of capitalism witnessed intensified internal conflicts and a disavowal of Western's self-centered thinking. Although a multicultural ideological system had not taken shape completely across the world at that time, the exchange between traditional Chinese culture and Western culture played a catalyzing role in its formation. This is also another embodiment of the moral and artistic values of TCPs.

At the turn of the twentieth century, there appeared many monographs on TCPs in the English-speaking world, but most of them were limited to entry-level introductions to TCPs, such as stage forms, backgrounds, props, costumes, make-up, trades, characters, and performance procedures. Such introductory books were mostly attached to the translations of TCPs, and even their titles were similar, using mostly *The Chinese Drama*, *The Chinese Theater* and the like. In the 1920s, a monograph of in-depth studies on TCPs appeared. It was *The Chinese Theatre* written by A. E. Zucker. It elucidates the origin and development of TCPs, introducing from Adjutant Play (*Canjun Opera*) of the Tang Dynasty to Peking Opera of the Republic of China era (1912-1949). It also introduces Mei Lanfang, the artist who made great contributions to the development of TCPs. Zucker used one chapter to illustrate his comparative studies on Chinese and Western drama. The chapter fully reflects his cultural position on TCPs.

When *The Orphan of Zhao* started to draw the attention of the Western world, its artistic features, namely the combination of singing and spoken parts, were actually not accepted by the Western world, which considered this style to be a strange mix-up. In the eyes of Zucker who lived in the twentieth century, however, such a strange combination was nothing different from the dramas of the period when the Western world started to rise. He found that the ancient Greek dramas had not only spoken parts, but also singing. What is more, the forms of singing were more diversified, including chorus and solo. "...music was employed in the Greek theater not only by the chorus, but also by the actors in the midst of the spoken dialogue when a particularly emotional point was reached" (Zucker, 1925). For example, *Agamemnon*, the famous ancient Greek opera, is typical of this art form. Zucker (1925) further explained that ancient Greeks sang or chanted a great part of their plays to express their feelings while dialogues were mostly presented by spoken language. The book states his findings of the similarities between the ancient Greek dramas and TCPs. On the contrary, Westerners in the eighteenth century focused on the differences between TCPs and Western dramas. The variance between seeking for similarities or differences is essentially the difference in cultural positions behind such a focus.

Western drama is generally divided into two distinguished genres—tragedy and comedy. For TCPs, there are always disputes over whether they should be divided in such a way. Zucker did not offer his opinions in this regard in his book, but his intention can easily be identified from his exploration of the similarities in Chinese and Western drama style classifications by analyzing the conceptual source of tragedy and comedy.

Tragedy and comedy actually referred to two kinds of music in the ancient Greek culture. Tragedy meant a “goat song” or a song sung in a ceremony for worshipping Dionysus, the god of winemaking or at the sacrifice of a goat. No matter what it actually referred to, the word was a musical term. Comedy (*comus*) was a song sung for procreation in a ceremony for worshipping the god of winemaking. Zucker found that from the perspective of the origin of drama, ancient Greek drama was classified by musical forms and so were TCPs. “Now let us look for a moment at the Chinese classification of styles of drama. We generally hear of the divisions of *kuan-ch’ü*, *pi-huang* and *pang-tzu*” (Zucker, 1925). Therefore, the Chinese and Western drama adopted the same way in terms of the origin of drama style classifications. As for the Western genres of tragedy and comedy or Chinese divisions of civil and fighting plays, they were both the results of historical evolvement.

During the two centuries before Zucker, TCPs seemed to be a “strange combination” to Westerners who regarded them as a primitive and naive form of entertainment if compared with Western drama. In such a context, Zucker’s findings of the similarities between TCPs and Western drama actually represented his recognition of TCPs. If it can be said that the visit made by the troupe of Mei Lanfang reflected the US public’s interest in TCPs, then Zucker’s recognition was to some extent a reflection of the attention from academia, and marked the understanding of TCPs having expanded to a wider social level in the English-speaking world.

The two forms of art are both embodiments of their respective cultures. According to multiculturalism, they both have their relative value and one is never superior to the other. It is hard to say if Zucker’s opinions on the artistic value of TCPs were generally accepted in the English-speaking world, yet it at least showed that there already appeared an inclination to evaluate TCPs on the basis of multiculturalism. The 1930 show tour made by the Mei Lanfang troupe can be regarded as a preliminary reflection of such an inclination. Had the American society not had a new point of view about TCPs, the tour would not have been possible. After all, this was a show tour made by a privately-owned troupe for commercial purpose. The consideration of profit for the survival of the troupe was definitely more important than international cultural exchange at that time.

Another aspect of the English-speaking world’s attitudes about TCPs lay in the music. Zucker made a comparison between the music of TCPs and that of dramas in the UK’s Elizabethan period and found that the noisy and clattering music of the TCPs was quite like that of the plays in an Elizabethan theater. “Most foreigners in Peking are kept away from the theater by the fearful noise made in these ‘fighting plays’, as they are called, but if these same people could attend an Elizabethan theater they would possibly find that the great delight of the audience was the ‘noise’ (music), the clatter and scuffle of the battles, the drums, the squibs, and the cannon” (Zucker, 1925). Such noisy music that the modern foreign audience dislikes most not only existed in TCPs, but also in Elizabethan theaters. It seems that for each feature of the TCPs’ that could hardly be accepted by Western audiences, Zucker was always able to find similar cases in Western drama. He did so to demonstrate that the “inelegance” of TCPs was not unique to China but was something similar or a common issue in Chinese and Western drama. In his book, he did not make a value judgment but

only expressed certain understandings about such common issues. A rational inference from that is TCPs and Western drama have the same aesthetic values and high artistic levels and that neither is superior to the other.

Zucker not only analyzed the artistic values of TCPs from a multicultural perspective, but also made a comparison between Chinese and Westerners' habits in appreciation. This is another indication of his efforts to seek similarities between Chinese and Western plays. He found that there were many similarities between Chinese and Westerners' habits in appreciation as well. Such a finding was something that even contemporary drama researchers are also curious about. The audience of TCPs, especially those living in the north often call the appreciation of a theatrical performance *t'ing-hsi*, which means to hear a play; in the Elizabethan period, the appeal was more to the ear than to the eye (Zucker, 1925). For those two types of audiences, the similarity was to resort to listening. Zucker also pointed out that resorting to listening was also due to the simpler platform stage of the two kinds of drama, compared with the picture stage in our modern theater.

He also determined that the way that TCP performers interacted with their audiences was not much different from British audiences in the Elizabethan period. "In China applause is expressed by shouting the word '*hao*', good, and disapproval by no more violent method generally than by a sarcastic intonation of the same word! In the Elizabethan period, audiences expressed their disapproval of bad performances by hissing, and by even more violent methods, such as throwing apples, eggs, or stones at the actors (Zucker, 1925). Such a statement by Zucker was from his true feelings. As for Chinese habits in the appreciation of their plays, Westerners often think that Chinese audiences failed to obey due etiquette and rules. Such an opinion is definitely based on their cultural position. What Zucker meant is that after the comparison, he found that the responses of Western audiences were often ruder.

His observation and analysis of TCPs proved that the reception of TCPs by the English-speaking world had entered a new stage which was significantly different from previous times. Apart from social and cultural trends at that time, as well as in-depth exchanges between TCPs and Western cultures, Zucker's cultural position was a more attributable factor, along with the aesthetic values and artistic charms of TCPs. His first-hand experience in Chinese theaters was surely the prerequisite for the generation of his multiculturalism. These conditions were not available to audience or readers in previous times, leading to historical limitations in their understanding of TCPs.

Zucker voiced something different about aesthetics of TCPs from his first-hand experience and unique cultural position. His findings are of important historical value. What is more, his findings about TCPs were not a solitary instance. Other researchers on TCPs also expressed similar opinions. This further indicated that the English-speaking world had undergone obvious changes in its attitude toward TCPs.

Changes in Cultural Positions in Text Translations

L. C. Arlington and H. M. Acton, who lived during the same period as Zucker, were also scholars

and translators of TCPs. In their translation titled *Famous Chinese Plays*, addition, deletion and adaptation could be found almost everywhere. They also included a number of paratexts to provide their comments and comparisons between the characters in the original and those in Western history and culture.^①

Arlington was an American who came to Beijing in 1879 to work for the Chinese government. After living in China for many years, he developed a profound understanding of TCPs and wrote *The Chinese Dramas, From the Earliest Time until Today*. It was published in 1930. Acton was a young British poet who came to Peking University in 1932 to teach English literature and poetry. *Famous Chinese Plays* was a collection of TCPs they translated in collaboration. In the translators' preface of the book, they stated that TCPs were like Western drama and that they were both rhythmic movements of the mind and artistic presentations of mankind in search of emotional resonance (Arlington & Acton, 1963). This statement affirmed the aesthetic value of TCPs. Considering the social and cultural contexts of the two hundred years after the eighteenth century, the aesthetic values of TCPs that were acknowledged by Arlington and Acton cannot be overemphasized. As for artistic features of TCPs which were often denounced by Westerners of the eighteenth century, the opinions of Arlington and Acton were also groundbreaking. They held that there was a clear-cut distinction among Western drama, singing, dancing, and other performance arts so that the corresponding artistic presentations may have some limits while TCPs incorporate a number of forms to supplement one another so that they give full play to the potentials of such artistic presentations, and this is actually real drama art (Arlington & Acton, 1963). *Zaju* of the Yuan Dynasty featuring a combination of singing and spoken parts was something too strange to be accepted by Western critics in the eighteenth century. To Arlington and Acton, however, it was such a combination that brought the artistic charm of TCPs into fullest play. The difference between these two kinds of opinions was fairly self-explanatory.

Additionally, deletion and adaptation can be easily identified in the translation of *Famous Chinese Plays*. Therefore, we have no intention to elaborate on that herein. What we focus on is analogy and comment, which were their unique strategies to express their multiculturalism.

The concept of analogy originated from the translation practice of Buddhist scriptures, but the strategy of analogy applied in *Famous Chinese Plays* was different. They did not use analogy to translate the concepts of the original with similar concepts in the target text but to compare main characters mentioned in the original with historical and cultural figures in the West. Such a strategy was to resort to the cultural experience of Western audiences or readers and to associate characters in the original with figures in the West to help the recipients develop an affinity to those characters and narrow the gaps between Chinese and Western cultures. In the history of drama translations, it is *Famous Chinese Plays* which first applied such a strategy to the translation of TCPs and offered

^① The book was first published in 1937. Then it was republished in 1963 by Russell & Russell in New York, printed by North China Daily News in Shanghai, and distributed by French Bookstore Peiping (China). The quotation was cited from the reprint.

such an effective way to bridge cultural gaps. This strategy totally changed the previous way of translating with notes and became a unique translation strategy that matched the two translators' multicultural position.

In the translation of a Peking Opera play titled *Beating the Drum and Cursing Ts'ao*, such a strategy was fully applied. Mi Heng, the leading character of the play, which depicts a famous story in the *Romance of the Three Kingdoms*, is so important that if the Western audience or readers had no historical or cultural background knowledge of this person, it would be very difficult for them to understand the conflict between him and Cao Cao as well as his embodiment of a deeper human nature. So, the two translators abandoned the traditional way of adding some notes about the cultural background for better understanding and instead compared Mi Heng to Apemantus in *Timon of Athens*, a famous play by William Shakespeare. Apemantus was a philosopher with profound thinking, yet he had a perverse character and was often sarcastic and tart. This image was well known in the English-speaking world. To compare Mi Heng to such a figure, the Western audiences or readers then had a historical or cultural basis for better understanding the personality of the main character of the play.

In the translation, the heroine Dou E of *The Golden Locket Plot*, a *pangtzu* of Hebei, was likened to Penelope in *Ulysses*. In the play, Penelope is Odysseus' wife who is known for her fidelity to Odysseus while he was absent, despite having many suitors. Her name has therefore been traditionally associated with marital fidelity in the Western cultures. Through such an analogy, Western audience's empathy toward Penelope was transferred unknowingly to Dou E. This kind of cultural empathy effectively aroused Western audiences or readers' cultural experience and became the psychological basis for cultural interpretation.

Similar applications can be widely seen in their translation works. For example, the daughter Yue Xiang in *The Day of Nine Watches* was compared to Iphigenia, wife of Agamemnon, a king of Mycenae in Greek mythology. In Western cultures, she was regarded as another famous female image for marital fidelity. In *A Double Handful of Snow*, Tang Qin, the heartbreaker, was compared to the mean Volpone in Ben Jonson's *The Fox* (Arlington and Acton, 1963).

The application of analogy in *Famous Chinese Plays* shows that the translators regarded the two different cultures represented by the two kinds of plays as equal and complementary, which was the basis for the analogies.

The multiculturalism underlying their analogy strategy can be distinguished only through analysis while their comments, attached to the translations, clearly expressed their multicultural perspective.

In the Peking Opera titled *The Shepherd's Pen*, the hero Zhu Chundeng returned home after being enrolled in the army for a battle. When he happened to meet his mother and wife, they could not recognize each other. The translators then added some analysis: Westerners may feel this illogical, but for Chinese people, it would be strange to run into the arms of someone who had left home for many years (Arlington & Acton, 1963). They pointed out the difference in the two lifestyles.

Thus, psychological expectations of behavioral patterns may differ, resulting from different living environments and cultural models. A behavioral pattern is only reasonable in its respective living environment or cultural model and has only its own value.

In the translation of *Jade Screen Mountain*, a Peking Opera, the translators again commented on Chinese cultural and behavior patterns. The multicultural perspective underlying this was typical. The play is an artistic expression of a value—loyalty—in Chinese culture. It draws its material from the novel *Water Margin*, telling the story of Shi Xiu killing his sister-in-law. Shi Xiu is a fictional character and when he discovers that the wife of Yang Xiong, his sworn brother, has a secret affair with a monk, he feels indignant and kills her. For such a behavior, the translators commented, “Our Western cultures cannot agree with the behaviors of Shi Xiu and Yang Xiong who managed to achieve such a purpose by any means. Especially their conceited manners after killing the woman, we cannot feel happy about that either. But what the Chinese follow is their standard of conduct” (Arlington & Acton, 1963). In this part, the translators pointed out that there existed different standards of values behind respective behavioral patterns. Although they did not agree with what the actors do, they did not offer their value judgment towards it and only adopted a third-party’s perspective to provide some description of the different features of such a behavioral pattern. Undoubtedly, describing cultural differences without value judgments is a concrete reflection of their multicultural position.

Throughout the process of the English-speaking world’s reception of TCPs, the reason why the reception changed in the twentieth century is that its position toward TCPs and Chinese culture had changed, developing from self-centralism to multiculturalism—a social and historical progress, and translation studies made by Zucker, Arlington et al. are specific reflections of that progress.

Conclusion

From the middle of the eighteenth century to the middle of the twentieth century, the reception of TCPs by the English-speaking world underwent two historical phases that were different from, yet quite related to, each other. In the first phase, the English-speaking world accepted moral values of TCPs out of its needs for cultural development and utilization but denied the artistic values of TCPs. The ideological basis for acceptance or denial was Europe’s self-cultural centralism at that time, leading to misunderstandings about Chinese culture. With the deepening of exchanges between TCPs and English culture, the intrinsic cultural values of TCPs were gradually acknowledged by the English-speaking world. Along with social and historical development, as well as the emergence of multiculturalism, the English-speaking world gradually recognized the reasonableness of the art form of TCPs for reflecting Chinese culture. Thus, it began to understand the artistic features of TCPs.

The two phases of the English-speaking world’s reception of TCPs reflect a general trend of cultural exchanges. One culture’s reception of another culture generally starts from utilization.

At this stage of the process cultural misunderstandings are unavoidable. Yet with the deepening of exchanges between the two cultures and the influence of multiculturalism, one culture's understanding of another culture will gradually emerge and further promote the development of multiculturalism. In this way, self-cultural centralism will turn to multiculturalism accordingly.

The basic tendency of the English-speaking world's reception of TCPs, which started from cultural utilization and developed into cultural understanding, has significant meanings for the current trend of the Chinese culture's going global. The Chinese culture will surely experience misunderstandings during its "going global" process. This is an unavoidable step due to cultural utilization and also closely linked to the distribution of power between Chinese and Western cultures. Cultural exchanges between China and the Western world will continue to expand. Although accompanied by cultural misunderstandings, the tendency will be toward an understanding of other cultures. Therefore, it is a rational choice to keep the inevitability of cultural misunderstandings in mind and promote the "going global" process of Chinese culture to make some changes in the current multicultural patterns derived from the distribution of power between Chinese and Western cultures.

REFERENCES

- Arlington, C. & H. Acton. (1963). *Famous Chinese plays*. New York: Russel & Russel. pp. XII-XIII, 262, 317, 389.
- D' Argens, M. (1741). *Chinese letters*. London: Peter Harington. pp. 161.
- Du Halde, J. (1735). *Description géographique, historique, chronologique, politique, et physique de l'Empire de la Chine et de K Tartarie Chionois*. Paris: P.G. le Mercier. pp. 342.
- UNESCO. (2001). *Universal declaration on cultural diversity*. UNESCO, the 31th session of General Conference. Paris.
- Wang Xi. (2000). The origin, practice and limitation of multiculturalism. *The Chinese Journal of American Studies*, (2): 45-80.
- Yan Jianqiang. (2002). *The use and transmission of Chinese culture in eighteenth century in Western Europe*. Hangzhou: China Academy of Art Press. pp. 146.
- Yel, C. (2014). China: A man in the guise of upright female. *Journal of the History of Ideas in East Asia*, (7): 3-52.
- Zucker, E. (1925). *The Chinese theater*. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. pp. 192-193, 197, 205, 210.

(Translator: Wen Yi; Editor: Gerald)

This paper has been translated and reprinted from *Language Education*, No. 1, 2019, pp. 14-19.