

New Terminology for New Concepts:

*Introduction of Western Economic Concepts in China through
Yan Fu's Translation of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations*

Kristina K. A. N. Braarvig



M.A. Thesis (60 Credits), East Asian Linguistics
EAL 4090

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental
Languages

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

SPRING 2012

New Terminology for New Concepts:

*Introduction of Western Economic Concepts in China through
Yan Fu's Translation of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations*

Kristina K. A. N. Braarvig



M.A. Thesis (60 Credits), East Asian Linguistics
EAL 4090

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental
Languages

UNIVERSITY OF OSLO

SPRING 2012

© Kristina K. A. N. Braarvig

2012

New Terminology for New Concepts; Introduction of Western Economic Concepts in China
through Yan Fu's Translation of Adam Smith's Wealth of Nations

Kristina K. A. N. Braarvig

<http://www.duo.uio.no/>

Trykk: Reprosentralen, Universitetet i Oslo

Abstract

The subject of this thesis is Yan Fu's translation *Yuanfu* 原富 (*The Origin of Wealth*) of Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*. Its purpose is to discover how Yan Fu introduced unfamiliar Western economic concepts into late Qing China. It is an attempt to show to what extent the Chinese language was able to absorb Western concepts and terminology, and how they were received in a society with a Confucian ideology in strong contradiction to essential economical Western concepts as those conceived in *Wealth of Nations*, such as 'free competition', 'material gain' and 'self-interest'. Moreover, we will observe the degree of faithfulness of Yan Fu's translation and which translation methods and terminology he utilized. By back-translating passages from the *Yuanfu* and comparing them with their equivalents in the *Wealth of Nations*, our findings indicate that Yan Fu's translation methods are vague and lack precision, though Yan Fu has managed to preserve faithfulness to a certain degree when applying his own definition. However, despite the fact that he constantly pursues *xin* 信 'faithfulness' in according with his own view, he refers to his translation as a "free translation", not in accordance with the general definition of faithfulness. His translation in the end has too many distortions for the readers to understand the essential concepts of Adam Smith's work. Additions, deletions and restructuring of the text, as well as his body of terminology and written style, all contribute to the incomprehensibility of *Yuanfu*. Regarding his written style, we find that the translation was not aimed at "school children", as he says, but to a small literary and bureaucratic elite of late Qing China. However, scholars in late Qing, as well as in modern times, have expressed that there are serious challenges in understanding the Classical Chinese employed. Regarding terminology, his approach in coining terms is discussed, and further why the Japanese terms ultimately defeated Yan Fu's. With the purpose of understanding the dynamics of Yan Fu's work on the *Wealth of Nations*, I have compared the original version of *Yuanfu*, not to my knowledge employed as a source for a study of *Yuanfu*, with a version published in 1981, most often referred to by scholars.

Acknowledgements

The completion of this work has enjoyed efforts of several prominent scholars. First of all, this thesis would not have been possible without my supervisor Prof. Halvor Eifring's thorough comments, guidance and accepting only my best effort.

I gratefully acknowledge Jin Li and Øystein Krogh Visted who has evaluated and commented my translation of *Yuanfu*. Prof. Rune Svarverud's remarks on the translations have also been most valuable. I want to thank professor in Economics, Olav Bjerkholt, for his articles on Adam Smith and *Wealth of Nations*.

Further, I would not have had the rare chance to base my work on the original edition of *Yuanfu* without, the highly appreciated, effort of librarian Liu Xinshun, Prof. Li Minghua and Dr. Pang Cuiming. Lastly, this thesis could not have been completed without the support and encouragement of my most beloved mother and father.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Yan Fu	2
Terminology	2
Translation Principles <i>xindaya</i> 信達雅	4
Written Style	5
Cross-cultural Translation	5
Earlier Research	6
Chinese Translation of a Japanese Translation of WN	7
Versions of YF employed	8
Versions of WN employed	9
Works of Reference	9
PART ONE:	
CHAPTER 1 YAN FU, <i>YUANFU</i> & <i>WEALTH OF NATIONS</i>	
1.1. Editions of <i>Yuanfu</i> and <i>Wealth of Nations</i>	11
1.2. The Title <i>Yuanfu</i> 原富	11
1.3. Abbreviations and Additions	13
1.4. Commentaries and Notes	15
1.5. “Why do I choose an old book by Smith?”	16
1.6. Yan Fu’s Influence	18
CHAPTER 2 TRANSLATION METHODS	
2.1 <i>Xindaya</i> 信達雅	20
2.2. Are <i>Xindaya</i> 信達雅 Complementary?	21
2.3. Definition of a “Faithful Translation”	22
2.4. Implementing <i>Xindaya</i> 信達雅	23
CHAPTER 3 WRITTEN STYLE	
3.1. Classical Style	24
3.2. “Expel the Barbarians”: Yan Fu’s Effort of 古已有之	26
3.3. Translating English	28

CHAPTER 4 TERMINOLOGY

4.1. “Days and Months of Consideration”	30
4.2. Japanese Realization	31
4.3. Yan Fu and Japanese Terminology	37
4.4. Japan Standing Between the West and China	39

PART TWO

I. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 1	42
II. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 2	49
III. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 10, Part 2	56
IV. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 8	62
V. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 6	66
VI. An analysis of Book 4, Introduction	72
VII. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 8	79

CONCLUSION

Terminology	87
Translation Principles <i>xindaya</i> 信達雅	88
Written Style	90
Additions and Deletions	92
Yuanfu Today	92

BIBLIOGRAPHY

APPENDICES

INTRODUCTION

In 1902 Yan Fu published his translation *Yuanfu* 原富 (YF) (1902) of Adam Smith's *The Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nation* (1776), better known as *Wealth of Nations* (WN).

To present the problems treated in this thesis, I will start with an example:

In his translation, Yan Fu used the term *yong* 庸 to translate 'wage'. *Yong* 庸 have different meanings, such as 'need', 'ordinary', 'appoint; employ' and 'merit'. In Classical Chinese, 'wage' was translated as *lu* 祿 (TLS), and in late Qing China, dictionaries list several common translations of 'wage', such as *gongqian* 工錢, *gongjia* 工價, *gongyin* 工銀, *laoyin* 勞銀, *xinjin* 辛金 and *xinfeng* 辛俸 (MCST). *Yong* 傭 usually has the meaning 'employee', but can also have the meaning 'wage'. Further *yong* 庸 and *yong* 傭 are listed as similar. The Japanese loanword *gongzi* 工資, which is used in modern Chinese, was also available in late Qing China. Our question, then, is why did Yan Fu use the term *yong* 庸 in rendering 'wage', when other translators employed established Japanese or Chinese terms available? To clarify my arguments, I will refer to this example several times below.

As we will see through this thesis, the terminological confusion in the period was considerable, and the transfer of Western concepts to China was not a simple linguistic process, neither in view of semantics, nor in the formal construction of new terms in Chinese. However, trying to understand an aspect of this transfer of concepts, I will analyse seven extracts of Yan Fu's translation YF of Adam Smith's WN. But, paradoxically, the fame of Yan Fu's translation does not reflect the later impact of the new words he coined. For example, the term *yong* 庸 did not become the term current in later and modern Chinese for 'wage'. One may say that Yan Fu's translated terms were not particularly successful, even though he is celebrated as a pioneer in introducing Western semantic systems and translation methods into China. In this perspective I will present seven passages from WN with important concepts and essential terminology and discuss Yan Fu's choices in creating new terms for new concepts in his translation YF, trying to understand his methods. Back-translating equivalent passages in YF will function as a framework, allowing for discussion of terminology and translation in detail. I have employed the original version from 1902, not to my knowledge employed so far as a source for a study of YF. YF is notoriously difficult, and

scholars of late Qing China and modern scholars have expressed that they have met, and still meet, considerable challenges when reading Yan Fu's translation with its somewhat obscure mixture of neologisms and archaisms – as they are perceived.

Yan Fu

Yan Fu (1853-1921) studied at the Fujian Arsenal Academy, and in 1877, he spent two years studying at the Navy Academy in Greenwich, England. England became his ideal model for modernization, and the insights he got during his stay, made him severely frustrated by China's stagnation in every area. He wanted to discover England's secret for wealth and power, and pass it on to the intellectuals of late Qing China. For a long time, though, he remained an outsider, and it has been said that his bitterness and resentment was profound. Furthermore, his addiction to opium may reflect his frustration over his own career, as well as China's difficult situation (Schwartz 1964:30-31). Even though he wanted to influence the political decisions made in the Chinese society, Yan Fu failed to pass the Imperial Exams several times. It was not until after the Sino-Japanese war (1894-95) that he gained recognition and became one of the leading intellectuals in China. He lived by traditional Confucian moralities, and as Benjamin Schwartz points out, his personal life did not stray far from Confucian behaviour (Schwartz 1964:5). However, he was impressed by Western theories and ideas, even though they contradicted the Confucian ideology. His effort of reconciling Western and Chinese thought is reflected in his translation of WN. All in all, though, he is perceived as the most influential translator of his generation, and a great contributor to the import of Western theories and ideas into late Qing China¹.

Terminology

Cross-cultural translation and exchange of terminology involve a complex encounter of two conceptual worlds. In transmitting conceptual schemes from WN to YF, Yan Fu encountered challenges and contradictions in language and ideology. The example of *yong* 庸, as quoted above, reflects Yan Fu's tendency not to rely on existing traditional terms or Japanese loanwords, and his constant pursuit of own and often seemingly peculiar translation methods

¹ For further reading of Yan Fu's life, see Schwartz 1964:22-42, Wright 2001:235-238

are conspicuous. Some of his coined terms (usually referred to as *yanyi* 嚴譯 ‘Yan-translations’) rendering theories in WN had connotations not approaching Adam Smith’s real intention of the individual concept translated, as we later will see in the back-translations, as we can easily glean from our reference example of Yan Fu’s usage of *yong* 庸. He was consistent in translating ‘wage’ with *yong* 庸, however, not necessarily a correct translation, when he attempts to render also Adam Smith’s reference to ‘those who live by wages’, namely the employees, in addition to its use to render ‘wage’.

As in the case of the Japanese term *gongzi* 工資 ‘wage’, the influx of Japanese loanwords into Chinese language in late Qing China, were mostly performed by way of traditional characters attached to new Western concepts, which also had an already existing semantic domain in Chinese language. The Japanese terminology, in contrast with Yan Fu’s terminologies, became established throughout late Qing and is still dominant in Chinese language. So why was Yan Fu’s terminology unable to gain momentum?

Yan Fu states: 西名東譯，失者固多，獨此無成，殆無以易 “*When Western terms are translated to the East, much is inevitably lost, but if we do not translate terms from the East, nothing can be easily done*” (Wang 2005:1). He was aware of the difficulties of introducing new terms for new concepts and Lydia Liu cuts even deeper: “...*the impossibility and yet the necessity of translation between West and East*” (Liu 1995:5). What were the reasons why Yan Fu did not employ already established terms in the Chinese language? Within the conceptual framework of late Qing discourse, Japanese terminology had an immense impact to the introduction of Western learning in China. Yan Fu struggled with his translation methodology, having difficulties in establishing a new body of terms that would fit the concepts of Western science and learning, as well as Chinese habits. Every technical term has its origin and is situated in a particular system of knowledge, and functions as a framework reflecting the particular concept. In her article on Chinese terminology, Viviane Alleton defines terminology as “in the general meaning of “study of vocabulary in specialized fields” (Alleton 2001:15). The specialized fields refer to a set of different concepts. In an attempt to portray the concepts of WN through his own, often ambiguous, terminologies, Yan Fu did not always manage to reflect the intended meaning of Adam Smith’s underlying concept. If the terminology as a set and context is not understood, then the individual concepts are also distorted and poorly represented in the receiving language. How did Yan Fu then reach out to his intended audience, the intellectuals of the society, if they were not able to read his

translation or understand the key terminology? Scholars of late Qing, as well as later and in modern times, all met, and still meet, great challenges in reading WN, they understood neither his language nor the terminology presented. Among my hypotheses is that Yan Fu's terminology to a great extent was a product of a private universe of personal thought consisting in his own translation methods and principles, and that this is one of the reasons why it did not gain general acceptance.

Translation Principles xindaya 信達雅

It will be discussed how Yan Fu tried to solve fundamental problems of translating and which principles and methods he pursued. He supports his translation with the principles *xin* 信 'faithfulness', *da* 達 'comprehension'², and *ya* 雅 'elegance'. However, to what degree was he really true to his own principles? In studying the translation of YF on the basis of our back-translation, and discussing his own definition of *xindaya* 信達雅, it becomes clear that these principles are indeed very vague.

Further, we will investigate Yan Fu's terminology and translation in the perspective of free translation versus faithful translation, and as well as in the perspective of *ad verbum* versus *ad sensum* translations. I have also tried to understand how the dual cultural frameworks have played their part when Yan Fu coined his terms, that is, in the meeting of Chinese traditionalism and modernism, and of Chinese conceptual systems with those of the Western civilizations. I will examine his translation of WN by discussing his principles, especially his most important principle of 信-faithfulness (Liu 2006:8) in regard to *ad verbum* and *ad sensum*, principles not only thematized in Western tradition, but also used in translation by Yan Fu's contemporary Liang Qichao. I will examine whether he has been 信-faithful to the arguments and main concepts of the original as a whole. Further, I will research why he ultimately had difficulties implementing these principles in economic material with analytic technical language.

² I will translate *da* 達 as 'comprehension' on the basis on how I have understood Yan Fu's definition of it. However, it is problematic, when it usually refers to something that is given to a receptor. The translation 'reaching', could also be suitable, however I have decided to translate it as 'comprehension' in accordance with later translations of *da* 達.

Written Style

As for his principles, we should also address why he uses his characteristic style of Classical Chinese writing (*wenyan* 文言), which hardly anyone could comprehend, even in his own environment, when Vernacular Chinese (*baihua* 白話) or simpler versions of Classical Chinese was a common style of writing at the time. Following our later discussions about Yan Fu's written style, it may seem that employing the archaic written style was his attempt to justify unfamiliar Western theories in a society heavily influenced by Confucian ideology, as well as reaching out to the elites that made the most important political and economical decisions in the Chinese society at the time, like the imperial bureaucracies of the then weakened Qing regime, hoping to create new growth in China on the basis of Chinese tradition, on their own premises, rather than being dominated by the Western imperial powers.

Cross-cultural Translation

How, then, is Yan Fu's language applied and how do we establish correspondence between equivalents in YF and WN? How did the Chinese language absorb the Western concepts through Yan Fu's flow of terms? With exchange of ideas and theories from WN, one must take into consideration a wide range of aspects, such as socio-economic backgrounds, history and time-period. In late Qing, the relationship between Western powers and China was strained, and intellectuals were reluctant to accept learning from the West. Yan Fu wanted to influence the Chinese intellectuals within a traditional framework, which again is reflected in his archaic written style in YF. He faced contradictions in ideology and social structure in China at the time, and concepts in WN, such as 'self-interest', 'free-competition' and 'material gains', militated against the prevailing elitist Confucian ideology – being, though, in a period of great change. In general, and often, cross-cultural translation and exchange of knowledge creates intellectual development, and if we look back on the vast body of Western works translated in China in the late Qing, a dramatic change emerged in the awareness of new ideas and theories from the West. But to which extent Yan Fu *really* contributed to this transfer of knowledge by importing Western concepts into Chinese language and culture through his translation of WN, is definitely doubtful.

Adam Smith's WN has been enormously influential since it was published, and even into the present. After the breakdown of Marxism in the late seventies and eighties in China, ideologies as set forth by Adam Smith have also flourished in China and created an unprecedented economical growth. It is therefore important to analyse and understand how these ideologies reached China, and how, as they were first introduced, met with the Chinese traditions at the time, during the beginning of the modernization in the late Qing dynasty – at the time when Chinese isolation fully broke down and China had to become a member of the global society.

We have to review the problems presented above throughout our back-translation of YF in discussion on terminology and content.

Earlier Research

Earlier research upon the problems presented has been addressed by several scholars, both in Western and Chinese academia. Paul B. Trescott (2007) discusses how Western economic disciplines was developed in China between 1850 and 1950 and evaluates how several late Qing China intellectuals, among them Yan Fu, transmitted and interpreted Western economics. Lydia H. Liu (1995) addresses problems with cross-cultural translation, and how one establishes meaning between equivalent terminologies by studying interactions between China, Japan and the West, “translingual practice” as she calls it. Benjamin Schwartz (1964) devotes his book to discuss Yan Fu's search for wealth and power for China through his different translations of Western works. Douglas R. Reynolds (1993) discusses Sino-Japanese relations and the importance of the Xinzheng revolution leading an intellectual revolution in late Qing China. Federico Masini (1993) discusses the formation of the modern Chinese lexicon between 1840 and 1898. Michael Lackner (2001 and 2004), co-editor of two essential books in this context, has gathered several articles upon lexical innovations in the 19th and early 20th century China, the emergence of new terms for new concepts and China's encounter with Western science and knowledge. Pi Houfeng (2000) discusses Yan Fu's translation of WN in general, and its diffusion and influence in modern China. Hu Peizhao (2002) discusses YF in comparison with later translations, and the importance of YF also in modern times. These materials serve as a good basis for my research on the topic, but it seems that none of

them have delved with any depth in close reading or translation of the original YF, which I have set out to do with several examples from YF.

Chinese Translation of a Japanese Translation of WN

A prevailing perception among Western scholars is that there exists a Japanese translation of WN translated into Chinese. We originally wanted to compare Yan Fu's version of WN with this Chinese translation of the Japanese translation of WN. The translation is referred to in *Jingjixue: The History of the Introduction of Western Economic Ideas into China, 1850-1950* (Trescott 2007:316 note 8). The work is also mentioned in *China, 1898-1912; The Xinzheng Revolution and Japan* (Reynolds 1993:111). Here Douglas R. Reynolds further presents Kojo Teikichi (1866-1949), a professor of Chinese studies, as the translator, with time of publishing as early as 1896 and with Nanyang Gongxue as publisher. Further, according to Reynolds, the translation is allegedly to be found in Liang Qichao's *Shiwubao* 時務報 ('The Times'), reproduced in Tan Ruqian's compilation 中国译日本书 (348 no.550.218).

In research of Japanese terminologies in the Chinese language, this would have been a solid comparison, however, it seems that it does not exist. In light of the wholesale Chinese translations of Japanese translations of scientific Western works in late Qing China, it would be reasonable to believe that this could exist. But, the references have led me to dead ends. Furthermore, a translation of WN could never have fit into a newspaper or an article, the *Shiwubao* 時務報 ('The Times'). Scholars may be referring to a short introduction or an abbreviated version of the Japanese translation in Chinese. In the introduction to the first Chinese edition of WN, Yan Fu's mentor Wu Lurun begins with:

嚴子既譯亞丹氏所箸計學書，名之曰原富。俾汝綸序之。亞丹氏是書，歐美傳習已久。吾國未之前聞。嚴子之譯，不可以譯也蓋國無時而不需財。

Yen Fu has just translated an economics book by Adam Smith, with the Chinese title of The Origin of Wealth, and asked whether I can provide a preface. This book is widely known in Europe and America, but our country is still not aware of it. Yen Fu's translation is,

*therefore, indispensable*³ (Lai 2000:34).

A similar notion, is asserted by Hu Peizhao:

...我國歷史上斯密大著的第一個譯本 (Hu 2002:65).

“...[Yuanfu] is the first translation of Smith’s work in Chinese history”.

With this in mind, we can conclude that this translation ultimately does not exist.

Versions of YF employed

In search of the original Chinese translation of WN, I have contacted several of the authors of books and articles employed, both Chinese and Western scholars. However, they have all suggested a version from 1981, published by *Shangwu Yingshuguan Chuban*

商務印書館出版. In the end, I have received a PDF of the original that seems not to have been used as a main source before⁴. This original is located in the library of Xiamen University, and I have had the rare chance to base this thesis on this particular version⁵.

The version from 1981 has different punctuations than the original, most likely in order to simplify the understanding of the sentences. Furthermore, this version is written in simplified characters, not traditional characters as in the original. In the transcription of the Chinese text, I have compared the passages with the version from 1981, and as we later can see in part two, there are several deviations in characters, and this thesis only presents a small part of YF.

Therefore, in further discussion and research of Yan Fu’s translation of WN, it may be wise not to blindly trust the version from 1981, but rather support oneself with the original.

³ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

⁴ By help from my supervisor Halvor Eifring, and by effort of professor Li Minghua and Dr. Pang Cuiming.

⁵ I will present a facsimile of every passage I translate, along with the foreword of Yan Fu and the preface of Wu Rulun, as appendices.

Versions of WN employed

I have used two versions of the original English WN; one version including an introduction and notes by Kathryn Sutherland, published in 2008 by Oxford University Press, and forgottenbooks.org's version published in 1957⁶, with an introduction of Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman.

Works of Reference

I have employed several works of reference. Among dictionaries, we have employed *Hanyu Dazidian* 漢語大字典 (1997), the fourth edition of *Guhanyu Changyongzi Zidian* 古漢語常用字字典 (2005), *Huaying Yinyunzidian Jicheng* 華英音韻字典集成 (*Commercial Press English and Chinese Pronouncing Dictionary*) (1903), *Hanyuwailaici Cidian* 漢語外來詞詞典 (1985), *Xinciyu Dacidian* 新詞語大詞典 (1978-2002) (2011), *Hanyu Dacidian* 漢語大詞典 (2001), *Tongyici Cilin* 同義詞詞林 (1985) and *Zhongwen Dacidian* 中文大辭典 (1973). Regarding dictionaries online and databases, we have consulted *handian* 漢典 <http://zdic.net/>, *Thesaurus Linguae Sericae* (An Historical and Comparative Encyclopaedia of Chinese Conceptual Schemes) (TLS) and *Modern Chinese Scientific Terminologies (MCST)*⁷. Even though TLS explores the conceptual schemes of pre-Buddhist Chinese, and therefore focuses on a different time era, due to Yan Fu's independent use of terminologies, TLS, combined with other dictionaries, can give an indication of nuances in the meaning of Yan Fu's terminologies as well as diversity in our own understanding of his terminologies.

This thesis is divided into two parts. The first part will discuss Yan Fu's relations to WN, reception of WN in China, and since this thesis first and foremost will have focus on Chinese language, I will spend a great deal on discussing Yan Fu's written style, terminology and translation methods, which have been highly debated in intellectual circles, at that time and in

⁶ Available on books.google.com.

⁷ MCST is indeed valuable in research of scientific terminology in Chinese language. However, it informs only of which book the particular terminology is found, and not in which chapter or which page number. This could be valuable for further discussing of the terminology referred to.

modern time. I have included my own discussions about the language and content of the Chinese translation and Yan Fu's approach, as well as from certain intellectuals and the literati during the 19th and 20th century. Cheng-chung Lai has translated Yan Fu's foreword and Wu Rulun's preface (Lai 2000:27-36), and I will include parts of these translations in the discussions, in addition presenting the equivalent Chinese passage from YF. Cheng-chung Lai has a different translation approach than I have employed in my translation of YF. As we compare the translations to the Chinese equivalent, he has not translated word by word, however, somewhat more freely and allowing additions to his translation, following a similar approach like Yan Fu. Despite his free translation, Cheng-chung Lai has captured Yan Fu's main essence, and will serve as an understanding of the preface and the foreword.

Part Two, will focus on my back-translations of YF, with discussions and comparison on essential terminology and content.

PART ONE

以史為鑒，可知興替

With history as a mirror, one can understand the rise and fall of a country

Emperor Taizong of Tang dynasty

CHAPTER 1:

YAN FU, *YUANFU* & *WEALTH OF NATIONS*

1.1 Editions of *Yuanfu* and *Wealth of Nations*:

Yan Fu's translation *Yuanfu* 原富 ('The Origin of Wealth') (YF) of *An Inquiry Into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, in modern times mostly referred to as *Wealth of Nations* (WN), was published in 1902. As based on the evidence of Yan Fu's own remarks of the translation process, he worked on the translations from October 1896, until January 31, 1901 (Pi 2000:309).

Numerous editions of Adam Smith's WN have appeared since March 9, 1776, with five already during Adam Smith's own lifetime⁸. Yan Fu employed the third version of WN published in 1784, which was later annotated by Professor Thorold Rogers (1823-1900), as source text for his translation. The original version⁹ of YF can be found at Xiamen University library, a thread binding dated 1902, which is quite tattered and without a front and back cover (Hu 2002:63). In the original YF we find a translator's preface of Yan Fu and an introduction by his mentor Wu Lurun.

1.2 The Title *Yuanfu* 原富:

Concerning the title *Yuanfu* 原富, Yan Fu explains in his foreword:

⁸ In 1776, 1778, 1784, 1786 and 1789.

⁹ Which we have based our work on.

然則何不徑稱計學，而名原富，曰從斯密氏之所自名也。且其書體例，亦與後人所撰計學，稍有不同，達用多於明體一也。匡謬急於講學。二也，其中所論如部丙之篇二篇三，部戊之篇五。皆旁羅之言。於計學所涉者寡尤不得以科學家言例之。云原富者。所以察究財利之性情。貧富之因果。著國財所由出云爾故原富。計學之書，而非講計學者之正法也。

Then, why do I use not jixue but Yuanfu (Origins of Wealth) as the Chinese title for WN? Well, the title used by Smith in fact emphasizes the nature and causes of national wealth; it thus seems appropriate that I use Origins of Wealth for the Chinese edition¹⁰. Moreover, the contents and style of WN also differ from what is now called 'economics' in two ways: first, WN is more a practice-oriented book than an economic-theory-oriented book; second, Smith put more emphasis on the correction of the 'economic errors' of his time than on the discipline of economics itself¹¹. For instance, chapters 2-3 of book III and chapter 5 of Book V are digressions on practical questions only indirectly related to economics, and we cannot consider these parts as a scientific discourse. As the title of WN indicates, the book was intended as an inquiry into the nature of profits and finance, the causes of wealth and poverty, and the sources of national revenue. That is why I maintain that WN is a book of jixue ('learning of calculation') rather than a book on scientific (orthodox) economics¹² (Lai 2000:27).

In 1902, WN was still referred to as *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, and by using *yuan* 原, Yan Fu preserves the term 'causes'¹³ and by using *fu* 富, he preserves 'wealth'¹⁴. However, *yuan* 原 most likely refers to 'origin', hence we translate *Yuanfu* 原富 as 'The Origin of Wealth'. As for the later Chinese translations of WN, they all appear under the title *Guofulun* 國富論¹⁵ ('Theory of National Wealth'), which is closer to the modern English, more common title *Wealth of Nations*. Regarding the English title in general, it attracted Yan Fu's attention; he wanted China to be powerful and wealthy and the

¹⁰ This sentence is probably added by the translator.

¹¹ This sentence is probably added by the translator.

¹² Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

¹³ 原因 in modern Chinese.

¹⁴ 財富 in modern Chinese.

¹⁵ When discussing WN in general in modern Chinese, the title *guofulun* 國富論 is used.

title may have played a role in his choosing of this particular economic classic (Lai 2000:xxiii).

1.3 Abbreviations and Additions

Yan Fu's translation has 816 pages, whereas in Classical Chinese works each page counts for two pages, hence altogether it has 1632 pages. According to Cheng-chung Li's calculations, Yan Fu translated only about 50-60% of WN (Lai 2000:18-19)¹⁶.

In the following passage from Yan Fu's foreword, he first discusses his method, secondly claims he did not add anything, but lists up what he has omitted. However, he refers to the addition of a certain chronicle table.

是譯與天演論不同下筆之頃。雖於金節文理，不能不融會貫通為之。然於辭義之間。無所偵到坳益獨於首部篇十一釋租之後。原書旁論四百年以來銀市騰跌。文多繁贅而無闕宏旨。則概括要義譯之其他如部丁篇三，首段之末，專言荷京版克以與今制不同。而所言多當時瑣節。則刪置之。又部甲後，有斯密及羅哲斯所附一千二百二年至一千八百二十九年之倫敦麥價表亦從刪削。又此譯所附中西編年。及地名人物義諸表。則張菊生比部鄭稚辛孝廉。於編訂之餘。列為數種。以便學者考訂者也。

My translation of this book is different from my translation of Evolution and Ethics¹⁷. In translating WN, I abridged the original text after I fully understood Smith's arguments. I added nothing to the text but some passages are omitted. In Chapter II of Book I ("Of the Rent of Land") there are some digressions on the fluctuation of silver prices over a period of four centuries¹⁸; this passage is full of details, and so I provide only some of its main points. From Book IV Chapter 3 some details on the banks in 1202 and 1829 (completed by Rogers) have been deleted. I have added a chronicle table to compare major events in China and in

¹⁶ Where he takes into account the many translators notes and Yan Fu's Classical Chinese style (which will be discussed further). See further p18 Table 1 "A Comparison of *The Wealth of Nations* and Yen Fu's translation", for a comparison of the number of pages for each chapter.

¹⁷ T.H. Huxley *Evolution and Ethics* (1891), Yan Fu's Chinese edition 天演論 (1898).

¹⁸ The translator has not taken *sui* 雖... *ran* 然 'even though...so...' into consideration, hence his translation of this passage do not clearly correlate with the Chinese.

*the West, hoping that it will help readers to understand the historical background*¹⁹ (Lai 2000:32).

It is interesting to see that he points out that he did not add anything to the text, but in the next sentence mentions the addition of a table of comparison. This supports his definition of a faithful translation, where there is room for additions and abbreviations.

Yan Fu did translate each chapter of WN, but as we can see later in the back-translations, these translations are often fairly free, and some of his translations may count rather as rewriting and even reinterpretations, if not outright wrong translations. But the rewriting does not always appear in a condensed form, and it appears in quite a few instances, as I have mentioned, that he also added sentences²⁰. In some of the passages I have chosen, Yan Fu's passage is longer than the original. But, if we compare the length of the first chapter with later Chinese translations of WN we can see that Yan Fu's version is significantly shorter: Yan Fu: 2522 characters, Guo and Wang (1931): 4704 character, Chou and Chang (1964 and 1964): 5280 characters, Xie and Li (2000): 5360 characters, and Yang (2001): 5130 characters. A vast difference, though, which we have to take into account, is that Yan Fu used Classical Chinese (*wenyan* 文言), which has shorter words and more condensed sentences, whereas the other translators have used Vernacular Chinese (*baihua* 白話). Comparing the length in pages of Classical Chinese text with an English text or later translations written in Vernacular Chinese is indeed dubious, mostly because of the short and condensed style of Classical Chinese, where one character may express several words in English. It is obvious that Yan Fu has deleted several sentences or sections, however, I will argue that one cannot base the length on number of pages, but rather on work as a whole, taking into consideration whether the semantic contents of the work is retained in the translation.

Because of the many deletions and additions, it is challenging to compare YF with the original. But in order to convey the main concepts, it seems that for Yan Fu, additions and deletions were inevitable. He informs us in a note: 文多繁贅，而無關宏旨 “*The text has numerous unnecessary, and insignificant (topics)*”, thus indicating he deleted passages that were not necessary for the situation in China at the time. However, he continues:

¹⁹ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

²⁰ See sentences added or omitted under my analysis of each passage.

概括要義譯之“*it is in general a free translation*”²¹ (Hu 2002:64). Following his statement, Yan Fu’s definition of a 信-faithful translation was a free translation, which in translation tradition is its absolute opposite in translation theory.

1.4 Commentaries and Notes

Regarding additions, he added for each Book several comments, all together 310 notes (Lai 2000:23)²², mainly concerning new information to support the text, comments on Smith’s text and European examples to show the shortcomings of China. Yan Fu points out in his preface of YF:

今錄其善者附譯之，以為後案不佞間亦雜取他家之說。參合己見，以相發明溫故知新。取與好學深思者。備揚權討論之資云爾。

I have taken some relevant notes [from the version I used for translation]²³ and translated them in this Chinese edition; I have also taken notes from other editions and commented on them with my own observations. I hope these can be used for further discussions among my readers²⁴ (Lai 2000:32).

Further he explains enthusiastically why:

故不佞每見斯密之言。於時事有關合者，或於己意有所根觸，輒為案論。丁甯反覆不自覺其言之長，而辭之激也。

That is why when I felt that Smith’s arguments were related to our current situation, or when his texts stimulated my sentiments, I have written down my comments as translator’s notes. Sometimes they contain strong arguments²⁵, but I could not stop myself from writing these long and pointed notes²⁶ (Lai 2000:32).

²¹ Note in *Book 4, chapter 2* ”論沮抑外貨不使銷之政”.

²² See p23 Table 2.

²³ Which was the edition annotated by Thorold Rogers.

²⁴ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

²⁵ This sentence is probably added by the translator.

²⁶ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

From his own notes, we can also see that he expressed his own personal ideas and feelings regarding the text:

*When I read the text, in some places it is so moving that I cannot keep from crying. Alas! How touching Smith's sentences are!*²⁷ (Lai 2000:22)

Further, Cheng-chung Lai observes interestingly about Yan Fu's comments:

"Looking over his 310 notes, one obtains an impression that the method he used to write translator's notes are the following²⁸ ... his knowledge of economic theory was limited to the basic "supply and demand" paradigm" (Lai 2000:22).

1.5 "Why do I choose an old book by Smith?"

Why did Yan Fu translate a book published 126 years earlier and what were his motives? Why WN, and not a later economic classic prevailing at his time, such as Karl Marx's *Das Kapital* (1867-1894) or Alfred Marshall's *Principles of Economics* (1890)? Yan Fu had in fact earlier tried to translate several economic works, such as parts of a French book with the translated title *Guojixue Jiabu* 國計學甲部, though, only half of the book was translated, with approximately 3000 characters²⁹ (Pi 2000:312).

In his preface to the first Chinese edition, Yan Fu forwards several arguments to present his intention:

計學以近代為精密，乃不佞獨有取於是書。而以為先事者，蓋溫故知新之義，一也。其中所指斥當軸之迷謬。多吾國言財政者之所同然，所謂從其後而鞭之而也。其書於歐亞二洲，始通之情勢英法諸國，舊日所用之典章，多所纂引，足資考鏡，三也。標一公理，則必有事實為之證喻，不若他書，勃率理窟淨精微，不便淺學，四也。

Since modern economics is much more precise and more deeply analytical why do I choose an old book by Smith? First, because we need to know what happened before, and reading

²⁷ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai. Since the Chinese edition is copiously interlaced with commentaries, and the translator does not inform of in which chapter or book he has found this particular note, it has been difficult to find the Chinese equivalent for this sentence.

²⁸ See further (Lai 2000:22) for which methods he used to write translator's notes.

²⁹ See further (Pi 2000:312) for other attempts of translating other economical works.

*history is helpful for understanding our contemporary situation*³⁰. Second, what blame Smith attributed to the administrators of his time in this book (WN) correspond quite well to the mistakes committed by our economic decision-makers. WN is, therefore, a “mirror book” to reflect our errors. Third, as this book was written when Europe and Asia started to have contacts, it contains much information concerning British and French laws and institutions, which can be useful to us. Fourth, Smith’s style is easily accessible, for he offers evidence for every principle which he advocates; some other political economy books, while clear in style and full of theoretical reasoning, are elegant but not easy for beginners³¹ (Lai 2000:29).

His motives are obvious; in order to learn from England’s experience, a powerful nation, he translates a book that can function as a “mirror” for China’s “unfortunate” economy. He further adds:

斯密計學之例所以無可致疑者，亦以與之冥同則利，與之舛馳則害故耳...
欲違其災舍窮理盡性之學，其道無由，而學矣非循西人格物科學之律令，亦無益也。

*We should not doubt the principles contained in Smith’s book; we will benefit if we follow his principles, and will be damaged if we do not...I do hope that Western science can be of help to the destiny of our unfortunate country*³² (Lai 2000:30,33).

His concern lies in discovering the secret of success, particularly the Western model for achieving power and wealth³³. He was especially impressed by England’s achievements, increasing its wealth, even though their national debt also increased (Schwartz 1964:118).

However, Liang Qichao did not agree that theories of WN could be beneficiary for the Chinese society:

The ideas of Adam Smith were a good prescription for Europe at that time, but are by no means good for modern China...mercantilism hindered the economic growth of Europe after the XVIth century, but if we transplant it into China today, then it is only a way to save the Chinese economy. A big country like China has all necessary industrial materials and abundant labour. Foreign products invaded china simply because they had the advantage of

³⁰ We cannot argue with Yan on this one, since this argument support our own motive for translating parts of YF.

³¹ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

³² Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

³³ Also his motive when translating Spencer, Huxley, Mill and Montesquieu. For further reading of Yan Fu’s desire for wealth and power, see Benjamin Schwartz *In Search of Wealth and Power; Yen Fu and the West* 1964.

*advanced machinery. If we can have Western technology and tariff production, then we can compete with foreign products...A man requires at least ten years of protection so that he can be brought up as an adult. Similarly, the industry and commerce of a nation also need protection and subsidies*³⁴ (Lai 2000:24-25).

Through his translation of WN, Yan Fu introduced to China economic ideas of ‘laissez-faire’, ‘self-interest’ and ‘free trade’, an anti-mercantilist economic policy, which contradicted China’s prevailing ideology among intellectuals at the time. Liang Qichao was a mercantilist and protectionist, and like most Chinese intellectuals, he resented the free trade forced upon China by Western countries. Hence, Yan Fu’s translation was not warmly received in the conservative intellectual sphere. Guo Dali, one of the translators of WN published in 1931, argues:

他這個以“原富”為名的譯本，在 1902 年出版以後卻不曾引起任何值得重視的反響。這當然不僅是由於譯文過於艱深典雅，有多所刪節，主要是由於清末當時的現實社會經濟文化等條件，和他的要求相距太遠了 (Guo; Wang 1931:1).

His [Yan Fu] translation of WN called Yuanfu, published in 1902 has since not led to any repercussion. Of course not only because of the abstruse written language or the many deletions, [however] the more important [reason] is that the conditions of economy in the end of Qing dynasty was far [too different] from the ideas advocated by Yan Fu through [Yuanfu].

1.6 Yan Fu’s Influence:

Even though intellectuals rejected his ideas at that time, and YF was by later generations regarded as a translation with several shortcomings, we still should not underestimate his influence on Chinese culture.

In 1936, Guo Zhanbo points out in *Jinwushinian Zhongguo Sixiangshi* 近五十年中國思想史 (‘China’s Intellectual History in the past 50 years’):

³⁴ Quoted from Hou Chia-Chu *History of Chinese Economic Thought* (1982:406), Taipei. Unfortunately, I have not been able to get hold of this book. Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

嚴氏在近五十年中國思想史的價值，在其西洋思想之介紹，而不在本身之思想 (Hu 2002:65).

Yan Fu has been valuable in the last 50 years of China's intellectual history, in transmission of Western ideas, and not only for his own ideas.

Despite Yan Fu's contradictions in language and ideology, his participation in the modernization of China is after all respected³⁵.

Ko-wu Huang describes Yan Fu as a contributor to especially intellectual development in general in China: *Yan Fu was an important figure, not because of any political or professional activity... but because of his influence in the intellectual development of China* (Huang 2003:25).

So even though his terminology and impact on the modern Chinese technical language seems to be fairly small, he is described as an important person, and in this way venerated as a traditional figure rather than quoted for technical purposes. The Chinese seem to acknowledge that Yan Fu exercised considerable influence on intellectuals in late Qing China, and also later generations, such as Liang Qichao, Hu Shi, Cai Yuanpei, Lu Xun, and Mao Zedong (Schwartz 1964:3). Mao Zedong referred to Yan Fu as a great contributor and as one of the fathers of a modernizing China (Temmerman; Knops 2004:158).

³⁵ Especially his translation of *Evolution and Ethics* 天演論 (1895), had great influence. Research papers presented at the conference *Yan Fu and the Modernization of China* in Fuzhou in 1998, shows that Yan Fu's introduction of Western knowledge and his influence on the Chinese society, at least on an epistemological level, indeed has been underestimated (Chan 2003:15).

CHAPTER 2:

TRANSLATION METHODS

2.1. *Xindaya* 信達雅

Yan Fu is well-known for his translation principles, *xindaya* 信達雅³⁶, ‘faithfulness’, ‘comprehension’ and ‘elegance’³⁷ which are first introduced in his translation of *Evolution and Ethics* by Thomas H. Huxley, *Tiyanlun* 天演論:

一，譯事三難：信，達，雅...此在譯者將全文神理，融會於心，則下筆抒詞，自善互備。

至原文詞理本深，難於共喻，則當前後引襯，以顯其意。凡此經營，皆以為達，為達即所以為信也 (Yan 1898:6).

First of all, in translation business [we have] three difficulties (principles): namely faithfulness, comprehension and elegance... As a translator I will fuse and gather the extraordinary principles of the whole text in my mind, I will begin to write and explain the words, and if [my explanation and rendering] is good, it will cover the meaning. [This will be the case] until the principles of the terms in the original text are profound and difficult to share, then its (the term's) meaning will appear from the context. Every construction like this, they all will be used on account of 達 (comprehension), and on account of 達 (comprehension) will be used on account of 信 (faithfulness).

His three principles have been debated through history, and many scholars discuss whether his principles are still relevant to today's translation practice, or to what degree he has contributed to the development of later translation theories. (Liu 2006:9). In his article, Shen used a quantitative method to research discussions on 信達雅, and by going through over a hundred articles between 1920 and 1990, he states that 58% supported the principles, 27% agreed, but had some reservations and 24% were against (Shen 2000:vii). Whether in favour or not, the mere existence of a large number of articles discussing these principles attests to

³⁶ I will treat 信-faithfulness, 達-comprehension and 雅-elegance as individual terms when discussing his translation methods.

³⁷ In his book *Yanfu ji Majianzhong de Fanyiguan* 嚴復及馬建忠的翻譯觀 (1975) (*The views of Yan Fu and Ma Jianzhong on translation*), Gan Kechao argues that Yan Fu's compilation of these principles was inspired by the British theoretician of translation, Alexander Fraser Tytler and his work *Essay on the Principles of Translation* (1790).

their importance.

2.2. *Are xindaya 信達雅 Complementary?*

Let us participate in the discussion. Is it possible to translate a text with all these three principles? In one way, 信-faithfulness, 達-comprehension and 雅-elegance sacrifice each other and there has to be a disagreement in the comprehension of the definitions and the relationship between his principles. In Yan's own remark of 達-comprehension, according to his preface in *Tianyanlun* 天演論, he states that in order to translate a text, one had to make changes to the sentence structure because of the discrepancy between the English language and the Chinese language. Furthermore, in order to maintain 信-faithfulness, he focuses on the understanding of the basic meaning of the text, and then one was allowed to rewrite, naturally not by sacrificing the original meaning of the text, but by extracting the meaning from context.

...皆以為達，為達即所以為信也 ...*they all will be used on account of 達, and on account of 達 will be used on account of 信.* With this he says that to have 達-comprehension is to have 信-faithfulness. However, additions and deletions could be necessary in order to convey the meaning, and to achieve 達-comprehension. Lawrence Wang-chi Wong explains Yan Fu's pursue of 信-faithfulness:

...the xin, faithfulness to the original, in Yan Fu's mind, does not seem to refer to faithfulness to the original with regard to the external elements such as word order or sentence structure. It is faithfulness in meaning that matters. If changes to the external elements can help to reveal the meaning more effectively, then the translator should go ahead with such changes (Wang 2004:244).

Regarding 雅-elegance, Yan achieves it through pre-Han syntax and expression. Yan states in his preface of *Tianyanlun* 天演論:

故信達而外，求其爾雅，此不僅期以行遠已耳。實則精理微言，用漢以前字法、句法，則為達易；用近世利俗文字，則求達難 (Yan 1898:7).

Besides faithfulness (xin) and comprehension (da), it also has to be correct [and elegant] in

meaning, this is not only because you want [the text] to have prolonged value. In fact if the elegant and precise formulations are expressed through words and grammar with pre-Han language, it is easy to attain comprehension (da); by utilizing common [and vulgar] characters of modern times, it is difficult to attain comprehension (da).

According to his statement, 雅-elegance is not obstructing 信-faithfulness and 達-comprehension. As mentioned, one might argue that the three principles contradict each other, but Yan Fu treated them as complementary. According to Yan Fu, by using pre-Han syntax and expressions, we attain 雅-elegance, and therefore one can also achieve 達-comprehension. With Yan Fu's statement ...to have da 達 is to have xin 信, we can see that he treated the three principles as complementary.

So how closely is YF rendered and is it indeed faithful according to his own principles? According to some scholars it is³⁹. However, most critics agree that his constant pursuing of 信-faithfulness was in fact a failed project: "...a cursory comparison of the originals and his translations clearly shows that Yan adopted a far too liberal manner of translation" (Lackner; Vittinghoff 2004:243).

2.3. Definition of a "Faithful Translation"

Before discussing his principles in regard to the translations in Part Two, we should first address what is really a 信-faithful translation and how Yan Fu defines it. According to his comment, as we have seen, in order to understand and convey the basic meaning of the text, one may restructure the text by deleting or adding information. He also states in the note mentioned above: 概括要義譯之 "it is in general a free translation".

Faithfulness has been defined in many ways in history. While Joy Sisley argues that: "...[T]he notion of faithful translation as an objective fact has been abandoned in translation studies" (Sisley 1999:204), we can observe that in Ciceronian/Horatian tradition they included only two translation methods; namely faithful and free translation. Further, a faithful translation

³⁸ With *common; vulgar* language he is referring to *baihua* 白話 (Vernacular Chinese).

³⁹ See for example Trescott 2007:35.

was defined as either a "word-for-word"⁴⁰ or sense-for-sense⁴¹ translation (Baker 1998:87-89). By reproducing arguments and sentences, an *ad sensum* translation, Yan Fu does not to a great degree take into account individual words, and reproduces word order and syntax, as in an *ad verbum* translation. However, as we will see in several of the passages in Part Two, he neither addresses the principle of *ad verbum* nor of *ad sensum*. In light of this, we will discuss 信-faithfulness in the translations on the basis of either *ad verbum* or *ad sensum*, but we will primarily discuss 信-faithfulness on the basis of the text as a whole, according to his own comments, where arguments are preserved and whether he has been 信-faithful to the main concept of the original passage.

Yan Fu states in his preface of both *Tianyanlun* 天演論 and YF that he is true to his principles, but as we can see later in the back-translations, it is clear that several sentences and arguments are not taken into consideration, or sentences are added or manipulated, where neither 信-faithfulness nor 達-comprehension are practiced by Yan Fu.

2.4 *Implementing xindaya* 信達雅

Is it possible to implement Yan Fu's principles in translation of economic material? I would argue that his principles, especially *ya* 雅-elegance, may be justified and applicable in translation of fictional material with descriptive language, but not to that degree in a translation of theoretical economic material with mostly a precise, technical analytical language. It is difficult to compress complicated economic theories into the short and *ya* 雅-elegant sentences of Classical Chinese, and to attain the aims of this particular principle in this context may seem an impossible task. As we can see from his preface and the passages, his language is highly descriptive, and not as analytical as in the English version, and it may seem he has been restricted by his own principles and written style, so that the more precise language of the English WN, as well as many analytical aspects, have been lost in the translation. If one were to employ his principles in translation, one should rather apply them after the text is translated, functioning merely as an evaluation.

⁴⁰ Translating individual words, *ad verbum*.

⁴¹ Translating individual sentences, *ad sensum*.

CHAPTER 3:

WRITTEN STYLE

3.1 *Classical Style*

In the preface of *Tianyanlun* 天演论, Yan Fu praises the written language of earlier classics:

漢之士爭以撰著相高，其尤者，《太史公書》，繼《春秋》而作，人治以著；揚子《太玄》，擬《易》為之，天行以闡。是皆所為一干而枝葉扶疏也。及唐中葉，而韓退之氏出，源本《詩》《書》，一變而為集錄之體，宋以來宗之，是故漢氏多撰著之編，唐宋多集錄之文，其大略也。 (Yan 1898:3).

The scholars of the Han dynasty competed with each other in reaching excellence in the writings, in particular shiji 史記, which was based on the work chunqiu 春秋 ("Spring and Autumn Annals"), and people were governed by these written works: Yangzi's taixuan 太玄, imitating yi 易 ("Book of Changes"), and the world was explained through these. These books were all considered as beautiful leaves and branches of the same tree. Upon the middle period of Tang dynasty, and when the school of thought of the returning Han Yu, the original "詩"⁴² and "書"⁴³, was compiled into one body, and was venerated since Song dynasty and onward. Because these works were mainly produced during the Han Dynasty (漢), and compiled during the Tang Dynasty (唐) and Song Dynasty (宋), this is only a short overview.

YF is written in Classical Chinese and several scholars and translators have criticized Yan Fu's characteristic style of written language. For instance, his contemporary Liang Qichao points out:

太務淵雅，刻意模仿先秦文體，非多讀古書之人，一翻殆難索解。歐、美、日本諸國文體之變化，常與其文明程度成正比例……況此等學理邃蹟之書，非以流暢銳達之筆行之，安能使學童受其益乎？著譯之業，將以播文明思想於國民也，非為藏山不朽之名譽也 (Niu; Sun 1990:266-8).

⁴² Referring to "詩經" (*The Book of Songs*).

⁴³ Referring to "書經" (*The Book of History*).

[Yan Fu's] writing is too difficult and elegant, painstakingly [attempting] to imitate pre-Qin style. [Unless] the reader has read many classical books, the translations are not intelligible. The written language in Europe, America and Japan has changed, often in proportion with the level of [change] in [the country's] civilization.... Moreover, such as these books have profound learning, [if they are] not [translated] in easy, smooth and comprehensible writing, how can they be advantageous for school children? Translations shall be used as spreading ideas of civilization to the people, not something to hide away in mountains in order to earn immortal reputation [for the translators].

Yan Fu responds by stating:

不佞之所以事者，學理邃曠之書也，非以餉學童而望其受益也，吾譯正以待中國多讀古書之人 (Wang 2005:1).

What my humble self has translated are books of profound learning, not to entertain school children and [so that they] can benefit from [my translations], my translations are expected to be read by people in China who have read a lot of classical books.

Furthermore, Guo and Wang, the translators of the later translation of WN (1931), wrote in their preface:

三十年前出版的嚴幾道先生的改名為原富的那個譯本，雖則因為文字過於深奧，刪節過於其分，已經不易從此窺知原著的真面目 (Guo; Wang 1936:1).

The translated version known as Yuanfu (The Origin of Wealth) translated by Yan Fu and published thirty years ago, because the written language [of this version] is too abstruse and deletions are too many, it is not easy to know the essence of the original work.

Most will agree that when translating scientific texts, the meaning is to enlighten and instruct especially the young people of the society. The translated text should be read by as many as possible, and in this way common, smooth and comprehensible language would be advantageous. In the preface his translation *Lunziyou* 論自由 of J.S. Mill's 'On Liberty' in 1903, Yan Fu claimed:

*Readers find my translations hard to follow. They do not realize that the original versions are much more difficult than my translations. The difficulty lies in the logic and argument, and has nothing to do with the languages that I used*⁴⁴ (Lai 2000:21).

He was aware that his language was difficult for the readers. This quote further reflects Yan Fu's difficulties in translating Western scientific works, not particularly the language that was used, but rather the logic and arguments of the texts. Yan Fu was first and foremost a linguist, not a scientist or an economist and he had no formal training in economics, which fact may have impeded his attempt of conveying the Western sets of concepts and their contexts into a Chinese form.

In the preface of YF, Yan Fu points out:

凡此皆大彰著者也，獨其擇焉而精。語焉而詳事必有徵理無臆設，而文章之妙，喻均智頑。

He [Adam Smith] used a practical style of analysis, and his rhetoric was so skilful that readers of various levels of intelligence can understand it (Lai 2000:28)⁴⁵.

It can seem strange that, in admiration of Adam Smith's available approach of rhetoric, Yan Fu himself did not pursue this. Readers with "various levels of intelligence", even Liang Qichao, were not able to read his translation, and only a small scholarly elite could comprehend his language.

3.2 "Expel the Barbarians": Yan Fu's Effort of 古已有之

Why did Yan Fu use such a difficult written style? First of all, Yan Fu was well versed in classical reading and this was his written style as we can see in all of his other translations⁴⁶. In order to reduce the opposition to Western learning, which was the attitude of Chinese intellectuals at that time, by using terms from Classical Chinese to translate Western concepts, he gave the impression that these Western concepts could have as likely had their origin in

⁴⁴ Unfortunately, I have not been able to get hold of the preface of Yan Fu's translation of *On Liberty*, hence I cannot present the Chinese equivalent. Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

⁴⁵ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

⁴⁶ Such as Thomas Huxley's *Evolution and Ethics* and John Stuart Mill's *On Liberty*.

China or that these particular concepts had *guyiyouzhi* 古已有之 “long existed” in China (Lackner; Vittinghoff 2004:256). With principles of Chinese culture as foundation, reinforced with Western techniques, he wanted to pursue and attain wealth and power (Trescott 2007:12). Yan Fu was in constant search for the “true secret of Western wealth and power” (Schwartz 1964:21), however, Lu Xun argued that Yan Fu’s focus on wealth and power was a misinterpretation of the Western civilization. Lu Xun seized on egalitarianism and individualism, inspired by the French revolution (Liu 1995:85). But Chinese intellectuals in general had reservations about new knowledge from the West, being implemented in the concerns of the state or the people. Reflected in assertions of several conservatives, intellectuals advocated a policy of “expelling the barbarian”, and they would not accept to learn from the barbarians (Lackner; Vittinghoff 2004:249). Besides, several scholars in late Qing were of the opinion that Western civilization ultimately originated “from the East”, with the “East” being China. (Schwartz 1964:50). In order to reduce the opposition towards Western learning, by concealing the Western concepts behind established Classical Chinese terminologies, Yan Fu hoped to reach out to the intellectuals.

Regarding the proverb *guyiyouzhi* 古已有之, Yan Fu mentions in the preface of YF:

謂計學創於斯密，此阿好者之言也。夫財賦不為專學，其散見於各家之著述者無論已。中國自三古以還，若大學若周官，若管子，孟子，若史記之平準書，貨殖列傳。漢書之食貨志，桓寬之鹽鐵論，降至唐之杜佑，宋之王安石。雖未立本幹循條發葉，不得謂於理財之義無所發明。

It is flattery to consider Smith the founding father of economics. Discussions on finance and tax are widespread in many books in China and the West and do not originate in Western political economy. In Chinese economic history, one can easily find famous administrators in different dynasties who wrote treatises about market supply and demand, about eminent entrepreneurs, on particular economic events, on the monopoly of iron and salt, and so forth. Although there was no such systematic development of economic discourse as in the West, one cannot deny that there are some insightful observations in the history of Chinese economic activities⁴⁷ (Lai 2000:28).

⁴⁷ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

From this we can see that he assumes that several economic subjects have existed in China long before, in the Classical period even, most likely to reduce the unfamiliarity of the Western economic concepts discussed in WN and to induce interest around WN among traditional intellectuals, and to please their nationalistic sentiments. In a doctoral thesis on Yan Fu, Li Qiang argues that he combined Western theories and ideas with different elements from the Chinese tradition, such as Confucian ideals of civilisation and harmony (Li 1993:318-23).

But, Yan Fu himself disagreed with many intellectuals, and rejected that the West had borrowed its civilization from China (Schwartz 1964:50).

Furthermore, Classical Chinese was used for all official written business by the government⁴⁸, and he used Classical Chinese in order to reach out to those who made the decisions in the Chinese society. The translation was ultimately, and deliberately aimed at the scholars, and it may seem that Yan Fu's translation never was meant to be intelligible to common people or the "school children", following his quote.

3.3 Translating English

Yan Fu was one of few scholars in late Qing China with knowledge of the English language, and as I will discuss further, he persisted in translating directly from the original. Who was supposed to proofread and verify his knowledge in English, when few scholars at that time had any knowledge in the English language? According to David Wright, Yan Fu did not always understand the English terminologies; "*Occasionally, he may have altered the text because he genuinely did not understand the reference*" (Wright 2001:240).

Yan Fu has been regarded as perhaps the most qualified translator at the time, and his English knowledge has been addressed as "excellent" (Wang 2004:243). After his studies at the Greenwich Naval College in England, he got a rare insight into English language and culture. However, his stay lasted only two years, and by reading YF closely, one may doubt his knowledge and understanding of the English language and its terminologies. Further, upon his return to China, he was not able to fill positions in the imperial social system, mostly because he had failed to pass the imperial examination. As a result, he expressed repentance

⁴⁸ As Latin was used in the middle ages of Europe.

of having learned English in a poem, and blamed his background in England as the reason for being degraded as a barbarian (Wang 2004:251).

In his suggestion of a translation academy in 1894, Ma Jianzhong (1844-1900) gave severe criticism against the translators:

*Those who know a Western language do not know Chinese and those who know Chinese do not know any foreign language. There is little wonder that the translations are so unsatisfactory and messy, inviting criticism and scorn*⁴⁹ (Wang 2004:243).

Translators at that time were badly paid and of low importance in the society. Therefore translation assignments failed to attract talented people and consequently translatory work was not appreciated as high-level activity (Wang 2004:250).

⁴⁹ Originally from Ma Jianzhong, *Nishe fanyi shuyuanyi* 擬設翻譯書院議 (A proposal for the establishment of a translation academy) in: Li Nanqiu (1996), *Zhongguo kexue fanyi shiliao* 中國科學翻譯史料 (Historical materials of CHinese scientific translation) Hefei: Zhongguo kexue jishu daxue chubanshe, pp.313-7; 314-6. Translation: Lawrence Wang-chi Wong.

CHAPTER 4:

TERMINOLOGY

4.1. “*Days and months of consideration*”

Yan Fu was very meticulous in his translating and coining of terminologies, which is reflected in his quote from the preface of *Tianyanlun* 天演論:

一名之立，旬月踟躕 (Yan 1898:7)

“*To formulate one single term took weeks and months of consideration*”.

His demands on himself in coining terminology was a constant pursue of a man of *belles-lettres* (*ya* 雅-elegance), coining terminologies of harmony in the sense of rhythm and perfection, and the demand of conveying the linguistic sense of the source concept through 信-faithfulness and 達-comprehension.

Not many of Yan Fu’s terminologies are included in modern Chinese language, however, a few have been used for a long period of time and have influenced the modern Chinese language. One example would be *tianyan* 天演 for ‘evolution’⁵⁰ used in his translation of *Evolution and Ethics* by Huxley. However, the phonetically transcribed term *luoji* 邏輯 rendering the Western word ‘logic’⁵¹ seems to have been the most vital term among those created by Yan Fu, being still the standard term for ‘logic’ in modern Chinese. The term first appears in his translation of Stuart Mill’s *A System of Logic* and it was Yan Fu above all who shaped the unfamiliar image of logic in China in the early twentieth century⁵².

Several of the terms coined by Yan Fu were impossible to understand and unfamiliar for readers at that time. For instance his translation *banke* 版克⁵³ of ‘bank’ in YF – and without presenting further explanation on the terminology for the readers, it was impossible to

⁵⁰ According to listing in 華英音韻字典集成 from 1903, the standard term for evolution was 展開. In modern Chinese, however, 天演 is not used as much as the Japanese loanword 進化, the standard terminology in modern Chinese for *evolution*.

⁵¹ According to listing in 華英音韻字典集成 from 1903, the standard terms for *logic* were 思之理, 理論之學 and 理學. 邏輯 is used as standard term for *logic* in modern Chinese, more frequently than the Japanese loanword 倫理學.

⁵² For further reading of Yan Fu and logic, see Lackner; Vittinghoff 2004:478-498.

⁵³ See database MCST.

understand its meaning⁵⁴. In his article, Tommaso Pellin has calculated that one tenth of the terminologies of Yan Fu are phonetic loans, as he says: “...*is probably the least clear and most difficult to decipher*” (Pellin 2004:159). He further explains Yan Fu’s approach to these terminologies:

When translating Wealth of Nations, Yan Fu and his readers knew England’s wealth and power, which were even more fascinating if compared with the desperate situation of China. The West therefore had a great influence on Yan Fu and he preferred to import Western terms directly rather than use of Chinese or Japanese terms, to create an expressive terminology rather than an easily understandable one (Pellin 2004:159).

Tommaso Pellin further questions the low rate of occurrence of graphic loans⁵⁵ in YF, since a widespread of graphic loans, especially Japanese loanwords, began to establish in the Chinese language around the beginning of the 20th century. He further explains:

The reason probably lies in Yan Fu’s style: in fact, it has been reported that Yan Fu was in favour of the usage of native, archaic terms and strongly against the usage of barbarisms, among which the Japanese loans. Thus the few terms employed by Yan Fu must have been so embedded in Chinese lexicon that he could not do without them (Pellin 2004:159-160).

With this in mind, in my further discussion of terminologies in the beginning of the 20th century, I would argue it is inevitable not to discuss the important heritage of Japanese terminologies in the Chinese language. Hence, in this chapter I have dedicated a great segment discussing Japanese terminologies in the Chinese language.

4.2. Japanese Realization

Anyone with knowledge of basic semantics of Chinese language, are aware of the enormous body of Japanese loanwords in Chinese. Many of the scientific terminologies derive from Japanese translations of Western works, and after being introduced to China, they became

⁵⁴ We may then question why *luoji* 邏輯 became his most vital terminology.

⁵⁵ Tommaso Pellin explains graphic loans as following: “Graphic loans are loanwords that directly adopt the meaning and the graphic shape of the foreign word to be translated, regardless of the pronunciation in the foreign language. As far as Chinese is concerned, graphic loans are imported only from languages that share their orthography with Chinese. In the 19th century, the only language written with Chinese characters was Japanese” (Pellin 2004:154).

firmly established in the Chinese language⁵⁶. Concerning the characteristic of the Japan-made Chinese terms, the Japanese preferred to use 兩字詞 ‘two-character terms’, as we can see in our examples of Japanese loanwords. However, the scholars proficient in writing in Classical Chinese at that time preferred to translate with 單字 ‘single-character terms’. After the Vernacular Movement (1917-1919), two-character terms were perceived as more comprehensible and this is one of the reasons the Japanese terminologies ultimately were able to take root in the Chinese language. It also explains Yan Fu’s use of *yong* 庸 in translating ‘wage’, instead of the Japanese loanword *gongzi* 工資.

Under the Westernization Movement, in order to study the West and translate Western scientific works, Chinese intellectuals turned to a modernizing Japan. After 1840 and the ongoing years with Western domination, China’s relations with the West was complicated and controversial, but with Japan as a model for modernization, it could seem that Japan, in some degree, cleared the way for acceptance of Western ideas. By studying the Japanese language they would have access to Japanese translations, and in that way were able to indirectly study the West, especially Western scientific fields. Chinese translations of Japanese translations of Western work were common and the utility of Japanese translations and terminology was a shortcut to Western knowledge. Statistics of Japanese translations to Chinese reflects a sudden consciousness of Japanese learning (Reynolds 1993:115):

1850-1899: 86 translations from Japanese, 15.1% of total 576 translations⁵⁷

1902-1904: 321 translations from Japanese, 60.2% of total 533 translations

⁵⁶ For example: *fuwu* 服務 ‘service’, *zuzhi* 組織 ‘organize’, *jilü* 紀律 ‘discipline’, *zhengzhi* 政治 ‘politics’, *geming* 革命 ‘revolution’, *zhengfu* 政府 ‘government’, *fangzhen* 方針 ‘policy’, *zhengze* 政策 ‘policy’, *jiejue* 解決 ‘solve’, *lilun* 理論 ‘theory’, *zhexue* 哲學 ‘philosophy’, *yuanze* 原則 ‘principle’, *jingji* 經濟 ‘economy’, *kexue* 科學 ‘science’, *shangye* 商業 ‘commerce’, *jiankang* 健康 ‘health’, *shehuizhuyi* 社會主義 ‘socialism’, *zibenzhuyi* 資本主義 ‘capitalism’, *falu* 法律 ‘law’, *gonghe* 共和 ‘republic’, *meixue* 美學 ‘aesthetics’, *wenxue* 文學 ‘literature’, and *chouxiang* 抽象 ‘abstract’. However, if we rethink these concepts, it is inevitable to evoke questions about the history of these characters and terms. We need to keep in mind that the Western terminologies translated by the Japanese, originally was imported from China. Second, we ought to know that after these Chinese words was spread to Japan, the meaning of the characters went through different levels of transformation in order to make them available for translation of Western concepts.

⁵⁷ 368 translations from English, which constitute 65%.

Tan Ruqian points out:

*From 1895 to 1911, Japanese works constituted the overwhelming majority of foreign language works translated into Chinese... These introduced new ideas and other elements into China. Many Japanese terms were absorbed into modern Chinese, vastly enriching Chinese vocabulary and reshaping the Chinese language. These unmistakably laid the foundation for China's modernization movement, and opened the way for broad cultural interchange between China and Japan*⁵⁸ (Reynolds 1993:115).

In his book *Quanxuepian* 勸學篇 (*Exhortation to Learn*), Zhang Zhidong discussed the practical reasons for studying in Japan and not in Western countries⁵⁹ and his quote *shibangongbei* 事半功倍 “twice the results with half the effort” (Zhang 1898:91) reflects the translation patterns at that time⁶⁰. In order to learn Western theories that had helped Japan in their modernization and economic development, Chinese translators could employ Japanese translations, without learning any Western language. Because Japanese translators had translated several Western works, Chinese translators seldom translated directly from the source text. With this there was a great mass fever towards Japanese study⁶¹. Several translators, like Liang Qichao, shifted over a few years from essentially Sino-centric terminology to Japanese terminology⁶². The following quote, from his editorial *Lun Xueribenwenzhiyi* 論學日本文之意 (‘On the Value of Learning Japanese’) published in *Qingyibao* 清議報 in 1899, reflects his eager admiration for the Japanese language and terminologies:

哀時客既旅日本數月，肄日本之文，讀日本之書，疇昔所未見之籍，紛觸於目，疇昔所未窮之理，騰躍於腦，如幽室見日，枯腹得酒，沾沾自喜，而不敢自私，乃大聲疾呼，以告同志曰，我國人之有志新學者，盍亦學日本文哉。日本自維新三十年來，廣

⁵⁸ Translation: Douglas R. Reynolds .

⁵⁹ Zhang Zhidong further points out in his book 勸學篇 (*Exhortation to Learn*) (1898:90): “Study should be in Japan rather than in the West: 1: Japan’s closeness would save on our costs, allowing more persons to be sent. 2: Its proximity to China would facilitate the supervision of our students. 3: Japanese writing is similar to Chinese writing, making it easier to understand. 4: The number of Western books is enormous, not all of them essential to Western learning. The Japanese, who have sifted through these, have weeded out the important works.” Translation: Y.C. Wang (Wang 1966:53). Reproduced: Reynolds 1993:44.

⁶⁰ The quote has been used frequently in encouragement for Japanese studying and in arguments for learning from Japan. See Reynolds 1993:221 note 16.

⁶¹ A vast increase of Chinese students in Japan; in 1896: 13, in 1906: 15.283 (Reynolds 1993:48, Table.1).

⁶² Liang Qichao established the Datong Translation Bureau in 1897, where he advocated the idea of translating Western works from Japanese. (Reynolds 1993:112).

求知識於寰宇，其所譯所著有用之書，不下數千忠種，而尤詳於政治學’ 資生學 ‘智學’

羣學等，皆開民智，強國基之急務也。吾中國之治西學者，固微矣。其譯出各書，偏重於兵學藝學，而政治資生等本原之學，幾無一書矣…學英文者經五六年始成，其初學成也尚多窒礙，猶未必能讀其政治學資生學智學羣學等之書也。而學日本文者數月而大成，日本之學，已盡為我有矣，天下之事，孰有快

於此者。夫日本於最新最精之學，雖無不欠缺，然其大端固已粗具矣。中國人而得此，則其智慧固可以驟增，而人才固可以驟出，如久-

饜糟糠之人，享以鷄豚，亦已足果腹矣 (Huang 1975:154-55)⁶³.

Under grievous times I have resided in Japan⁶⁴ for several months, learning the Japanese language⁶⁵, reading Japanese books, books I have never seen in former times dazzle my eyes, theories I have never encountered in former times prancing my brain, it is like seeing the sun after being in a secret room, like getting wine for a withered stomach, I am pleased, and dare not to be selfish, so with a shout I say to my comrades, my fellow countrymen who have aspirations for new learning, why don't you also study Japanese. In the recent thirty years of Japan's reform⁶⁶, [they have] sought widely for knowledge from the whole world, translating useful books, not less than several thousand, and especially detailed in politics⁶⁷, economics, philosophy and sociology, all [subjects] urgently required to open the minds of the people, and [functions] as foundation for a powerful country. The Western learning in China makes me laugh. Translations that have come out, lay particular stress on military science and art, and almost no books about the principles of politics and economics.... Those who study English use five or six years, and by the time they complete their study, there are still many obstacles, they still may not be able to read [and comprehend] the books of politics,

⁶³ Originally from 論學日本文之意 (“On the Value of Learning Japanese”) in 清議報，第十冊，本館論說，頁三 1899 (The tenth publication of *The Report of the Donglin Movement in late Ming*, p3 1899).

⁶⁴ As for the terminology for *Japan* he uses the Japanese terminology 日本 (in Japanese *nihon*), opposed to the ancient term 東瀛, the disparaging term 倭 or the modern, exclusive Chinese used term 東洋. (See *Japan in the Chinese Dynastic Histories: Later Han Through Ming Dynasties* (1951:110, 173, 191) for origins and further meanings).

⁶⁵ He use the Japanese terminology 日本文 (in Japanese *nihongo*), for *Japanese language* and not the standard Chinese term at that time 東文.

⁶⁶ He uses the Japanese terminology 維新 (in Japanese *ishin*) for *reform* and not the standard Chinese term at that time 變法.

⁶⁷ He use the Japanese terminology 政治學 (in Japanese *seijigaku*).

economics, philosophy and sociology. By studying Japanese one will see great achievements after months, Japanese learning can be ours, all the subjects in the world, can in no time come here. Even though Japan may be lacking the newest and the finest of [Western] study, its main features are roughly there. If the Chinese achieve this, their wisdom can increase in no time, and people can suddenly come out [of their shell], it is like people [who has] been satiated with grain for a long time, can [finally] enjoy chicken and pork, and will have enough to satisfy their hunger.

Liang Qichao indeed encouraged a *shibangongbei* 事半功倍 mentality, and by studying the Japanese works of Western concepts, rather than original works on the same topics, the Chinese scholars would in a few months achieve great learning in Western academia, respectively politics, economics, philosophy and sociology. Further, he criticizes the Chinese translations of Western works being primitive, only concerning military, science and art.

As we can see, Liang Qichao was deeply impressed and inspired by Japan's reformation, and learning Japanese was ultimately a revelation. However, Liang Qichao was not alone in this posture. In 1898 his teacher Kang Youwei argues:

臣愚顛顛思之，以為日本與我同文也，其變法至今三十年，凡歐美政治，文學，武備新識之佳書，咸譯矣…譯日本之書，為我文字者十之八，其成事至少，其費日無多也 (Huang 1975:154).

I have been repeatedly been thinking about this, and I think Japan has the same script as us, but during the past thirty years of Japanese reforms and up to now, all the best and latest Western books on political affairs, literature and military has been translated [into Japanese]... Eighty percent of Japanese-translated books consist of Chinese characters [therefore by translating them into Chinese] will require little effort and not much time.

Similarly pointed out by Yang Shenxiu, also in 1898:

The Japanese reforms, which I have studied, have produced translations of all the best Western works. [Japanese] writing is the same as ours, although grammar is somewhat

reversed. After just several months of study it can be generally understood, allowing us to translate [Western works] by utilizing these⁶⁸ (Reynolds 1993:113).

As an example, *Fuguoce* 富國策 (‘Strategies for Enriching the Country’) published in 1881, the author Wang Fengzao rather used Japanese loanwords in his translation, because they were easily comprehended and clearer than Chinese translations of Western scientific terminology (Temmerman; Knops 2004:159).

In 1940, Saneto Keito asserts:

In China today, without the use of Japanese terms one simply cannot carry in a conversation having any depth (Reynolds 1993:126)⁶⁹.

Chen Yingnian similarly points out that the introduction of Japanese-coined terms⁷⁰ in China is a great intellectual debt⁷¹. Further he presents several prominent Chinese translators of Japanese works, among them, Zhang Binlin, Cai Yuanpei, Wang Guowei, Liang Qichao, Lu Xun, and Huang Yanpei⁷². With help of these outstanding scholars, China was introduced to important terminologies, e.g. ‘enlightenment thought’, 啓蒙思想 Ch. (*qimeng sixiang*) Jap. (*keimô shisô*); ‘people’s rights theories’, 自由民権理論 Ch. (*ziyou minquan lilun*) Jap. (*jiyû minken riron*); ‘materialist philosophy’, 唯物主義哲學 Ch. (*weiwu zhuyi zhexue*) Jap. (*yuibutsu shugi tetsugaku*); ‘socialist thought’⁷³, 社會主義思想 Ch. (*shehui zhuyi sixiang*) Jap. (*shakai shugi shisô*) and ‘scientific methodology’, 科學方法論 Ch. (*kexue fangfa lun*) Jap. (*kagaku hôhô ron*) (Chen 1982:269-281).

⁶⁸ Originally quoted in Li Jiequan “Ribei de Zhongguo yimin”(1898:283 note8). I have unfortunately not been able to get hold of the Chinese equivalent. Translation: Douglas R. Reynolds.

⁶⁹ Quoted from Saneto Keishu *Gendai Chuugoku bunka no Nipponka* “現代中国文化の日本か”(1939) p28. Reproduced in Tan Ruqian *Xiandai Hanyu de Riyu wailaici ji qi souji he bianren wenti* “現代漢語的日語外來詞及其搜集和辨認問題”(“Japanese Loanwords in Modern Chinese, and the Problems of their Collection and Identification”) (1977) p328. Translation: Douglas R. Reynolds.

⁷⁰ Or neologisms given new meaning.

⁷¹ For further reading and study of Japanese loanwords in modern Chinese, see Gao Mingkai and Liu Zhengtan compilation 現代漢語外來詞研究 (*Studies of Foreign Loan Words in Modern Chinese*) 1958. This work presents modern Chinese terminologies of Japanese origin, classified into three categories; first, old Japanese compounds utilizing Chinese characters, but unfamiliar in Classical Chinese (e.g. ‘service’ Ch. *fuwu* 服务, Jap. *fukumu* 服務). Second, Chinese classical compounds adapted by modern Japanese in order to translate Western concepts and terms (e.g. ‘economy’ Ch. *jingji* 经济, Jap. *keizai* 經濟). Lastly, neologisms for new compounds using Chinese characters, coined by Japanese in order to translate Western terms (e.g. ‘government’ Ch. *zhengfu* 政府, Jap. *seifu* 政府)

⁷² All of them great intellectuals who has influenced Chinese culture, history and language. However, most translators of Japanese works are unknown (Reynolds 1993:123).

⁷³ Early socialist thought.

4.3. Yan Fu and Japanese Terminology

Yan Fu did not agree with the usage of Japanese translations, and he “disliked the influx of Japanese terms” (Lackner; Amelung; Kurtz 2001:245). In order to deeply understand Western ideology, economy and science, one should read the original work. He believed that many of the Japanese terminologies used to translate Western concepts were not accurate, and borrowing of Japanese terminologies should be avoided – a translator should rather persist in his own translations (Hu 2002:65). Consequently, Yan Fu coined quite a number of terms himself, which are commonly called *Yanyi* 嚴譯 (‘Yan-translations’)⁷⁴. For example, he opposes the Japanese translation Jap. (*keizai*) Ch. (*jingji*) 經濟 of ‘economy’ and rather uses his own term, *jixue* 計學⁷⁵. He does not use the Japanese translation Jap. (*shakai*) Ch. (*shehui*) 社會, and persists in rendering the Western word ‘society’ by translating it with a single-character term *qun* 群, and in translating ‘sociology’ Jap. (*shakaigaku*) Ch. (*shehuixue*) 社會學 he uses the characters *qunxue* 群學. In addition, the Japanese translation of ‘capital’, Jap. (*shihon*) Ch. (*ziben*) 資本, Yan Fu translates it with *mucai* 母財; the Japanese translation of ‘evolution’ Jap. (*shinka*) Ch. (*jinhua*) 進化, Yan Fu translates it with *tianyan* 絜; the Japanese translation of ‘philosophy’ Jap. (*tetsugaku*) Ch. (*zhexue*) 哲學, Yan Fu translates it with *lixue* 理學⁷⁶; and the Japanese translation of ‘metaphysics’ Jap. (*keijijôgaku*) Ch. (*xingershangxue*) 形而上學, Yan Fu appoints it with *xuanxue* 玄學⁷⁷.

In discussion on Yan Fu’s terminologies, Benjamin Schwartz points out:

What [Yan Fu] tries to do, he informs us, is to grasp the essential meaning of the whole sentences or passages containing whole thought and then to communicate their meaning in

⁷⁴ In translating *A System of Logic*, Yan Fu adopted a particular system to coin terminologies. He employed and adapted terminologies from classical works in order to translate Western concepts. As an example, he adapted two terms from the *Yijing* 易经 (‘Book of Changes’), namely *neizhou* 內籀 and *waizhou* 外籀 to cover the meaning of ‘induction’ and ‘deduction’ (which was two basic methods in the art of logic). These two terms have since been abandoned, and in modern Chinese the expressions *guina* 归纳 and *yanyi* 演绎 are common.

⁷⁵ The Japanese terminologies shown here, are standard in modern Chinese. The examples of Yan Fu’s terminologies is found in the different works he translated.

⁷⁶ 理學 is used in modern Chinese, however, with different meanings, *natural science; physics*.

⁷⁷ 玄學 is used in modern Chinese as *metaphysics*, however, is slightly different than 形而上學, which is used as *metaphysics* in philosophy.

idiomatic Chinese. In actuality, the creation of new terms required infinite pains. In his own words, he sometimes 'pondered for a month over one term'⁷⁸.

Further, he adds:

"On the whole, he does not employ many of the neologisms which had been created by the Japanese during the previous decades... [H]owever, most of his own neologisms were to perish in the struggle for existence with the Japanese creations... [T]he line of least resistance was toward the wholesale adoption of the new Japanese vocabulary (Schwartz 1964:95-96).

However, Yan Fu was not all alone in taking this position. Scholars have later agreed that among the vast amount of Chinese translations from Japanese there were many of poor quality (Reynolds 1993:123). The unconditional borrowing of Japanese terms and translations were in several instances quite reckless and hasted. As mentioned, Liang Qichao, was an essential contributor for the flow of Japanese works into China before 1911, and he points out later in 1920:

戊戌政變，繼以庚子拳禍，清室衰微益暴露。青年學子相率求學海外，而日本以接境故，赴者尤衆。壬寅癸卯間，譯述之業特盛，定期出版之雜誌不下數十種。日本每一新書出，譯者動輒數家，新思想之輸入如火如荼矣。然皆所謂“梁啟超式”的輸入，無組織，無選擇，本末不具，派別不明，惟以多為貴，而社會亦歡迎之。蓋如久處災區之民，草根木皮，凍雀腐鼠，罔不甘之，朶頤大嚼，其能消化與否不問，能無召病與否更不問也，而亦實無衛生良品，足以為代 (Huang 1975:182).

Since the coup d'état in 1898 and until 1903, young students attended schools abroad, and brought back, especially from Japan, several dozen translations in special fields of publications. For each new publication of books in Japan, there were frequently several translations [into Chinese], with new ideas imported as fast as tea leaves take fire. However, all of them were introduced in a so-called "Liang Qichao style", disorganized, uncritical, unfinished, not clear, only concerned with quantity [not quality], yet Chinese society welcomed [the translations], in the same way as people in disaster areas eat grass roots and tree bark, frozen birds and dead rats, without doubting whether it may be chewed, without

⁷⁸ 一名之立，旬月踟躕 “to formulate one single term took weeks and months of consideration”.

asking if it can be digested, or even ask if it can make you sick. There were really no sufficient substitutes available.

His quote reflects the poor quality of many of the Chinese translations from Japanese in late Qing, and they were utilized because there were no substitutes available in Western material. Translators tried to imitate a "Liang Qichao style", though according to Liang Qichao, the translations were nothing but disorganized, uncritical and ambiguous. Liang Qichao's style of translation was, in contrast with Yan Fu's, performed in a very faithful manner. Content and language were coherent and consistent with the source text, and by following an *ad verbum* method, his approach was in accordance with the traditional understanding of faithfulness (Pollard 1998:111).

4.4. Japan Standing Between the West and China

On which level a terminology and concept condition and influence the mental sphere of society and the individual is ultimately difficult to calculate, however, an interesting question would be, if China had adopted Yan Fu's terminologies in order to understand Western thinking, rather than Japanese terminologies, would the Chinese understanding and reflection of the Western conceptual world, ideas and theories, be different, and could it have changed the Chinese history and culture? Lydia Liu also approaches the subject by pointing out: *It is possible that if Yan Fu had coined his neologisms before the 1860's and had been translated into Japanese, some of his creations might have survived and, through the Japanese mediation, found their way back into the modern Chinese lexicon* (Liu 1995:35).

Japanese terminologies have definitely shaped the Chinese language and concepts of institutional organs of the society. In the Western traditional literary relationship with China, there will always stand between us a Japanese. Because of this, it is interesting to read Yan Fu's translated works, without any direct Japanese influence.

But Yan Fu did not deny utilizing all Japanese loanwords. For example, he accepted *ziyou* 自由 as translation for the Western term *liberty/freedom*. In his translation of J.S. Mill's 'On Liberty', *Lunziyou* 論自由 ('On Liberty') published in 1903, he appoints 'freedom' the

Japanese translation *ziyou* 自由⁷⁹. It is difficult to know why exactly *ziyou* 自由 was approved by Yan Fu, the term, however, was firmly established in late Qing, and he may have not perceived it as a Japanese loanword.

It is evidently clear that in the modern Chinese language, the Japanese terminologies in the end defeated the *yanyi* 嚴譯, ‘Yan-translations’. Chinese was after all Yan Fu’s mother tongue, and his experience and observation of the original meaning of Chinese characters was meticulous and profound. I will argue that he, in some degree, was restricted by the Chinese character’s original semantic domain. Even though Japanese scholars at that time were proficient in Chinese, and the Japanese language was heavily influenced by Chinese thought, it was still a foreign language and therefore they could boldly reform the original meaning of the Chinese characters⁸⁰, in order to coin new words. Furthermore, because Japanese scholars did not have to consider Yan Fu’s translation methods and characteristic style, the degree of freedom was large.

As a conclusion, we can with certainty state that the sophisticated body of the Japanese terminology has had an immense impact on the Chinese language. Douglas R. Reynolds argues:

Prior efforts in China to translate Western concepts and terms into a Chinese idiom had proved an unmitigated failure, from the clumsy transliterations of Lin Zexue (1785-1850) and Wei Yuan (1794-1856) in the 1830’s and 1840’s, to the varied but uncoordinated coinages of Western missionary translators, on down to the more elegant but equally futile creations of Yan Fu at the turn of the century.

Douglas further adds, significantly:

Without Meiji Japan’s Kanji-based modern vocabulary, fully standardized and functionally coherent by the 1890’s, China’s every effort at reform would have foundered on terminological battles and bickering (Reynolds 1993:195).

⁷⁹ 自由 is the standard term for *liberty/freedom* in modern Chinese.

⁸⁰ Even to that degree that a Chinese character could be appointed the opposite meaning of the original meaning. For example, the Japanese-coined terminology 民主 for the Western concept *democracy* is standard in modern Chinese. Originally the Chinese meaning is 庶民之主宰 *domination of common people*.

PART TWO

溫故而知新

Gaining new knowledge by reviewing the old

Confucius

In Part Two, I will compare seven passages from Adam Smith's WN with the equivalent passages in Yan Fu's translation YF, by presenting a back-translation⁸¹. Each passage will first have an explanation on why I have chosen the particular passage. The choices are first and foremost based on the occurrence of essential key concepts in WN, and which terms are most interesting in sense of how they are translated in the Chinese version. The original *Wealth of Nations*, as well as the *Condensed Wealth of Nations*, provides the basis of understanding the main concepts. Subsequently I will compare sentences and discuss their content. Further I will discuss whether Yan Fu has preserved his principles *xindaya* 信達雅 in the particular passage, and especially 信-faithfulness and 達-comprehension. As we have learned from earlier discussions on *xindaya* 信達雅, they can be complementary, at least according to Yan Fu, and it is difficult to discuss them separately, especially 信-faithfulness and 達-comprehension. Further, I have tried to understand his definition of his principles, and, as mentioned, we will discuss them in the light of an *ad verbum* and *ad sensum* perspective, and the arguments in each extract, and the text as a whole. Lastly, I will discuss different key terms in the particular passage⁸².

Methodologically, it has been, in a few instances, tempting to read the original into the translation of Yan Fu. However, I have tried not to harm Yan Fu's first intention and understanding of WN. Occasionally the translations will suffer from seemingly poor English, but I will attempt to be true to Yan Fu's text, which in my definition of it in an *ad verbum/ad sensum* approach, and will try to mirror the Chinese text in English, rather than harmonize the language.

⁸¹ Back-translation is the translation of a target text (TT) translated from an original source text (ST), without any reference to the original. Generally used to test the accuracy of the translation (TT).

⁸² There are of course several topics, in content and language of the translations, that should be discussed further and viewed closer.

Moreover, some of the passages have been chosen from a quite long context, hence I take into consideration that Yan Fu may have included later fragments into the chosen passage, in order to contextualise.

I. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 1

This passage is the first sentence in WN, and describes the division of labour, a subject Adam Smith discusses in chapter 1, 2 and 3 of Book 1. The passage is often quoted by scholars, and explains the increase of productivity through specialization. The key term is ‘division of labour’.

Adam Smith (ST) page 4, paragraph 1:

Of the division of labour

The greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour, and the greater part of the skill, dexterity, and judgment with which it is anywhere directed, or applied, seem to have been the effects of the division of labour.

Yan Fu (TT) page 1, paragraph 1:

論分功之效

天下之常言曰：民生在勤。然則，力作者將斯人所定於天之分而無可逃者歟？雖然，均力作矣，其得效則此多而彼少。其致力則此益疾益巧而彼常拙常遲，其故果安在也？曰：其事首判於功之分不分。

Back-translation:

On the efficiency of division of labour

There is a common saying that people's livelihood depends on diligence. However, does this mean that those labourers have no way to escape these heavenly-ordained duties⁸³? Even though⁸⁴ it is all manual labour, when it comes to its effectiveness, some gets big effect and some small effect⁸⁵. What they invest effort upon may require either being quick and nimble or to the opposite, being tardy and clumsy. What really⁸⁶ are the reasons for this? It is said that it is judged first of all by whether the labour has been divided or not⁸⁷.

Discussion:

Adam Smith's main purpose in this passage is that efficiency is built upon dividing labour between people with different skills, which again creates a society with skill, dexterity and judgment as qualifications, which can be employed for the common good. Yan Fu's sentence "*there is a common saying that people's livelihood depends on diligence*" is a rather vague reproduction of "*skill, dexterity and judgment*"⁸⁸. Further, the sentence "*being quick and nimble or to the opposite, being tardy and clumsy*" seems to be a reproduction of Adam Smith's reference "*...anywhere directed, or applied...*". Yan Fu's sentence: "*However does this mean that those labourers have no way to escape these heavenly-ordained duties?*" cannot be found in the WN. Why is it included in the Chinese? Probably it is his way of including Chinese tradition of the relations between heaven and earth, where heaven is

⁸³ In order to take the question mark *yu* 歟 into consideration, an alternative translations of this sentence and the sentence after would be "It is what people says, that how diligent you are depends on people's livelihood. If so, is labour defining a person according to heavens divisions and is there nothing you are not being able to escape? [No, it is not], even though it is all manual labour...". According to 古漢語常用字字典, *yu* 歟 is used as a question particle in relations with an astonishing or unexpected event, and is rethorical. Ultimately it is difficult to translate this sentence, since there is no comparative sentence in the original.

⁸⁴ With Classical Chinese connotation I would translate *suiran* 雖然 as 'even though it is like that', however, in relations with *jun...yi* 均...矣, the sentence will make more sense if translated with modern Chinese connotation, 'even though...it is...'

⁸⁵ Translates also more elegantly, however, not as direct, as *...it is unevenly distributed*.

⁸⁶ The function of *guo* 果 in this sentence, according to TLS database, is that it can work as a denominal adverb and meaning 'certain'; 'indeed'; 'really' and 'true and not being doubted'.

⁸⁷ *Fen* 分 has the meaning *fenbie* 分別 'differentiate', though, in accordance with the original, it is likely Yan Fu used *fen* 分 to translate 'divide'.

⁸⁸ I will discuss the terms 'skill', 'judgment' and 'dexterity' under terminology.

sovereign. Moreover, by referring to *duties*, he expresses that work was a duty in China, and not volitional, as Adam Smith propagandized. Yan Fu questions whether diligence is enough to escape what heaven has decided us to be. It is a rhetorical question, and of the next sentence, he surprisingly opposes Chinese tradition with indirectly answering with *that is not the case*- they indeed have this possibility. Whether you are diligent or not, is decided by the individual. This indicates a criticism of the Chinese traditional faith in the relation between heaven and earth.

Even with a superficial reading of the back-translation, it becomes clear that Yan Fu very freely translates the English passage. He keeps some of the terms, but they become different in the Chinese language garb. First of all, the main idea of this passage in WN is that the effects of the **division** of labour are the greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour. This is not clear in the Chinese passage, not to say, non-existing. ‘Skill’, ‘judgment’ and ‘dexterity’ stand out as three important terms in WN, but are not clearly conveyed through terms in the Chinese version.

The sentence “*there is a common saying that people’s livelihood depends on diligence*”, conveys that everything is innate and naturally given, however, Adam Smith is preoccupied of the active role of each individual. Consequently the reader is given a wrong impression already in the first sentence in YF. However, if we take the alternative translation “*It is what people says, that how diligent you are depends on people’s livelihood. If so, is labour defining a person according to heavens divisions and is there nothing you are not being able to escape? [No, it is not], even though it is all manual labour...*” into consideration, it has to be viewed in a different way, namely that Yan Fu is simply asking whether the common saying is true or false, which he himself argues against⁸⁹, hence preserving Adam Smith’s message of the individual’s active role.

Following Yan’s translation principles, 信-faithfulness, 達-comprehension, and 雅-elegance, we could argue that *tianxia* 天下 is a way of conveying 雅-elegance.

We can see from the back-translation that Yan Fu has manipulated the text. I have discussed Yan Fu’s approach to 信-faithfulness, and in my understanding of it, in this passage, he has not been true to the text, neither in an *ad verbum* nor *ad sensum* translation nor to his own

⁸⁹ As I have mentioned, the first two sentences of this passage is complicated, and the original do not have similar sentences, hence I am unable to use any comparison to give reason for my translation.

definition of 信-faithfulness. He added sentences, and even though that was allowed in his definition of 信-faithfulness, the sentences does not convey the concepts of WN, and at the same time leaving out important terms, such as skill, dexterity and judgment⁹⁰.

Several Chinese translations of WN exist; 原富 *Yuanfu* ('The Origin of Wealth') translated by Yan Fu (1902), 國富論 *Guofulun* ('National Wealth Theory') by Guo Dali and Wang Yalan (1931), 國富論 *Guofulun* ('National Wealth Theory') by Chou Hsien-wen and Chang Han-yu (1964, 1968), 國富論 *Guofulun* ('National Wealth Theory') by Hsieh Tsong-lin and Li Hua-xia (2000) and Yang Jingnian's 國富論 *Guofulun* ('National Wealth Theory') (2001).

According to Lung Jan Chan, in discussing and comparing different Chinese translations of WN in his thesis, Yan Fu's translation of this passage is "qualified as a translation"⁹¹, however not qualified in comparison with the English WN nor other Chinese translations of WN because of Yan Fu's extensive manipulation of the material (Chan 2003:37).

He further presents a back-translation⁹² from the other four translations of the same passage we have translated⁹³:

Guo and Wang (1931: 5):

勞動生產力上最大的增進，以及運用勞動時所表現的更大的熟練，技巧和判斷力，似乎都是分工的結果。

Back-translation:

The greatest improvement in the productive power of labour, and the greater dexterity, skill and judgment when labour is used, seems to be the result of the division of labour.

Chou and Chang (1964/1968: 5):

⁹⁰ I will discuss this further under terminology, attempting to find nuances with the terminologies Yan has used with relatively close approach to either skill, dexterity or judgment.

⁹¹ It is difficult to know what the author of this master thesis really meant with the Chinese version being "qualified" as a translation.

⁹² Unfortunately he has not translated the headline.

⁹³ I will only present the other back-translations for this passage, since my focus is on Yan Fu's version. However, I want to present it for my first passage in order to see the contrasts between faithfulness of the different translations.

我以為勞動生產力的最大的改善及將勞動導向並應用於任何方面時，其熟練，技巧與判斷的大部分，都是分工的結果。

Back-translation:

I think the greatest improvement in the productive power of labour and the great part of its dexterity, skill and judgment when labour is directed and applied anywhere is the result of the division of labour.

Hsieh and Li (2000: 19):

勞動生產力上最為重大的進步，以及人們不管往何處引導在何處應用生產力，所展示的大部分技巧，熟練度與判斷力，似乎都是分工的結果。

Back-translation:

The greatest progress in the productive power of labour, and the greatest part of skills, dexterity and power of judgment with which it is anywhere directed or anywhere applied, seems to be the result of the division of labour.

Yang (2001: 7-8):

勞動生產力最大的改進，以及勞動力在任何地方運作或應用中所體現的技能，熟練和判斷的大部分，似乎都是勞動分工的結果。

Back-translation:

The greatest improvement in the productive power of labour, and the great part of skill, dexterity and judgment of labour, no matter where it operates or is applied, seems to be the result of the division of labour.

Comparing the later translations with Yan Fu's, we can see that Yan Fu highly manipulated the English version, neither adhering 信-faithfulness nor preserving important terms. This

also reflects the difficulty of translating WN into *Classical* Chinese, and not by means of the *Vernacular* Chinese, which all the later translators have employed.

Terminology:

A key concept in WN is the division of labour, to which Adam Smith devoted his first book. Yan Fu has chosen the term *fengong* 分功 to translate ‘division of labour’ in the heading. Adam Smith’s first mentioning and introduction of the concept and term ‘division of labour’ in the text is in the last sentence of this passage. However, we can see in the Chinese sentence, Yan Fu has not treated it as a term, but rather translates ‘division of labour’ with *gongzhifenbufen* 功之分不分, directly translated *labour in which is divided or not divided*. According to the MCST database, Yan Fu also uses *tonggongyishi* 通功易事 to translate ‘division of labour’⁹⁴, however, *fengong* 分功 seems to be used more as a general term for ‘division of labour’. Further, MCST refers to an edition from 1931, which may have had an alternative introduction where *tonggongyishi* 通功易事 is mentioned, and not directly used by Yan Fu in the text.

According to *Hanyudacidian* 漢語大辭典, the modern term for ‘division of labour’ is *fengong* 分工, and it may not be surprising that the other Chinese translators of WN used *fengong* 分工, where *gong* 工 was used as a standard term for ‘labour’ or ‘work’. However, according to *Hanyudazidian* 漢語大字典⁹⁵, *gong* 功 has been used as *shigong* 事功 ‘achievement’ or *gongzuo* 工作 ‘work’, seen in “小爾雅·廣詁“: e.g. 功, 事也 and in ”六書故·人九“: e.g.

功, 庸也, 若所謂康功, 田功, 土功, 凡力役之所施是也。功力既施, 厥有成績, 因謂之功。

Regarding *gong* 功 and *gong* 工, we have numerous examples of these two being interchangeable, as in *gongfu* 功夫/工夫 ‘time’. In this example *gong* 功 and *gong* 工 seems to only be used phonetically and there is no difference in meaning and without any particular

⁹⁴ I have not encountered this term in my reading of YF. MCST refers to a version of YF published in 1931 by Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan, but do not inform of which page. It may be a term mentioned in an additional preface or introduction.

⁹⁵ 漢語大字典 1995:154 pt. 2 *gong* 功.

nuance in characters, where either *gong* 功 or *gong* 工 is being used. In the example *gongdaozecheng* 工/功到自成 we can interpret the meaning from the character, e.g. 工 ‘productive labour’ **leads** to success, but also 功, which can mean ‘achievement’, is a **result** of success. *Gongjia* 功/工架 ‘actor’s motion’ is yet another example.

The four other translations all use the key terms from the English passage: ‘labour’ as *laodong* 勞動, ‘productive power’ as *shengchanli* 生產力, ‘skill’ as *jineng/jiqiao* 技能/技巧, ‘dexterity’ as *shulian* 熟練, ‘judgment’ as *panduan/li* 判斷/判斷力 and ‘division of labour’ as *fengong* 分工. At a first examination of this passage, Yan Fu has not directly translated these terms. We should, however, consider some of the terms whether they may have nuances belonging to semantic domains of the key terms. It is reasonable to argue that *lizuo* 力作 could be a translation of ‘labour’, especially because of the character *zuo* 作, referring to listing in *Guhanyu Changyongzi Zidian* 古漢語常用字字典, meaning *laozuo* 勞作 ‘manual work’. With modern connotations it translates as ‘masterpiece/best work’, and not as a general term for ‘labour’. *Zhili* 致力 have the meaning ‘devote oneself to’ or ‘apply’, and in that way it seem to be an attempt to translate ‘dexterity’, but ultimately, with a contextual comparison with the English version, it is a translation of ‘apply’ which Adam Smith use. Furthermore, Yan Fu uses *qiao* 巧, and referring to listing in *Guhanyu Changyongzi Zidian* 古漢語常用字字典, it has the meaning *jiqiao* 技巧 ‘dexterity’ as in the original, which term has also been employed in the later translations of WN. *Dexiao* 得效 could be a vague attempt of translating ‘productive power’. However, *dexiao* 得效 can mean ‘attain results’, and can be analyzed as, “in order to attain results you have to be skilled”, however yet another vague attempt to find the term ‘skill’. *Pan* 判 is used in the last sentence, meaning ‘judge’, however, as we can see from the English version, it is used in another way in the Chinese, namely that manual labour can be unevenly distributed, and that is judged by whether the labour has been divided or not. However, Adam Smith’s message was that the greater part of judgment, which is applied, seems to have effect on the division of labour. Yan Fu’s translation fails to convey this in a clear way, however it may be an attempt of translating the term. Even though Yan Fu has established certain equivalents, by these examples we can see that he is not clear.

Regarding the Chinese heading “*On the efficiency of division of labour*”, it is not rendering Adam Smith’s heading. This passage includes the effects of the division of labour, however chapter 1 in totality is not merely about the effects, but rather on the division of labour in general. Hence Yan Fu’s headline is semantically misleading.

II. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 2

Modern scholars often quote this passage when discussing self-interest in WN, referring to the ‘butcher, brewer, baker’ quote. Self-interest is an important concept in WN, and in this passage he describes the fundamental cause and effects of people acting in self-interest. The key term is ‘self-love’/‘self-interest’.

Adam Smith (ST) page 13, paragraph 2:

Of the principle which gives occasion to the division of labour

But man has almost constant occasion for the help of his brethren, and it is in vain for him to expect it from their benevolence only. He will be more likely to prevail if he can interest their self-love in his favour, and show them that it is for their own advantage to do for him what he requires of them. Whoever offers to another a bargain of any kind, proposes to do this. Give me that which I want, and you should have this, which you want, is the meaning of every such offer; and it is in this manner that we obtain from one another the far greater part of those good offices which we stand in need of. It is not from the benevolence of the butcher the brewer, or the baker we expect our dinner, but from their regard to their own interest. We address ourselves, not to their humanity, but to their self-love, and never talk to them of our own necessities, but of their advantages. Nobody but a beggar chooses to depend chiefly upon the benevolence of his fellow-citizens.

論分功交易相因為用

夫吾既常有求於群，而他人之惠養又不足恃，吾將何所恃以奉吾生乎？曰：恃天下之各恤其私而已矣。人，自營之蟲也，與自營之蟲謀其所奉我者，是非有以成乎其私，固不可也。市於屠，酤於肆，糴乎高廩者之家，以資吾一餐之養，非曰屠肆高廩者之仁有足恃也，恃是三者之各恤其私而已。人日中之市，而與蚩蚩⁹⁶者為易也，意皆曰與我彼，吾與若是。是之於若，方彼之於若為有贏也，則市之人皆歆之矣，此吾所以養吾生者也。今夫無所易而受人之惠養者，蓋有之矣，行匄⁹⁷是也。

Back-translation:

On the exchange⁹⁸ and division of labour and their mutual interaction for implementation

As I constantly am in demand of people, yet other people's benevolent nourishment is not to be dependent upon, upon what shall I depend to provide⁹⁹ for my life? The answer is¹⁰⁰ simply¹⁰¹ that everyone under heaven depends on their own self-interest. Man, is a self-seeking insect¹⁰² and to seek from the self-seeking insect what they may provide for us, definitely will not be done unless there is something that fulfils his self-interest. To buy from the butcher, to buy wine from the shop, and to buy grain from the house of the granary man, in order to nourish yourself¹⁰³, you can not say that it is sufficient to rely on the benevolence of the butcher, the shopkeeper or the granary man, you may only depend on the fact that each of these three sympathizes only with their own selfish interest. Man in his daily walk to the

⁹⁶ If we look at appendix 2, *chi* 蚩 is the first character, however, due to the quality of the pdf, the second is difficult to interpret. By taking context into consideration, we assume it is the same characters.

⁹⁷ In the edition from 1981, we find the character *gai* 丐, not *gai* 匄 as we can see in the original edition. However, both characters refers to 'beggar'.

⁹⁸ *Jiaoyi* 交易 is translated with exchange/barter according to Yan Fu's own remark to the terminology on page 10.

⁹⁹ *Feng* 奉 can mean 'give'; 'present' or 'to be offered'; 'to receive' or *gonggei* 共給 'provide'; 'maintain'.

¹⁰⁰ Instead of the usual Classical Chinese translation of 曰 "It is said...", I suggest "the answer is..." is more appropriate in this context.

¹⁰¹ *Eryi* 而已 is translated as 'simply'.

¹⁰² See discussion.

¹⁰³ Another possible translation, which is slightly more directly translated "...is to support yourself for dinner".

market¹⁰⁴, makes deals with the plain and honest folk, then his purpose is always that you give me this and I give you that, as for “this” to “that”. If yours “that” compared¹⁰⁵ to mine “this” we both will get profits¹⁰⁶, then all people in the market will be happy¹⁰⁷, and this is what I depend upon to nourish my life. Now as for those who do not have anything to exchange but receive from others benevolence and nourishment, there exist such people, who are the beggars.

Discussion:

The first two sentences of Adam Smith are preserved in Yan Fu’s short reference “...*that everyone under heaven depends on their own self-interest*”¹⁰⁸. The “invisible hand” theory of Adam Smith is well known and is explained by many of the main concepts of WN, in this case that of ‘self-interest’. By referring to *heaven* in this context, Yan Fu may have covered the concept “invisible hand”. He preserves the explanation of trading relations, “*I will give you this, then you will give me that*” and by this means, both parts will be beneficiaries. Moreover, he captures the descriptions of those who do not engage in these kinds of trades, adding that they are the beggars.

So as an *ad sensum* translation, he is fairly consistent in preserving the content of each sentence, thus adhering to the principle 信-faithfulness in a traditional framework. However, in the perspective of an *ad verbum* translation, it is obvious he is not faithful. Regarding 達-comprehension, he has clearly defined and explained the concept self-interest through the trading relations Adam Smith is describing, hence making it understandable for the readers. However, as we will later discuss, his referring to “*self-seeking insect*”, may have influenced the 達-comprehension of self-interest. 雅-elegance may have been preserved in his mentioning of *heaven* in “*under heaven all depends on..*” and “*...upon what shall I depend to provide for my life*” by compelling the reader to reflect.

¹⁰⁴ In this sentence we treat *zhi* 之 as the modern construction *dao...qu* 到...去 ‘go to’.

¹⁰⁵ *Fang* 方 can mean *jiaobi* 較比 ‘comparatively’ or *duibi* 對比 ‘contrast’

¹⁰⁶ These sentences introduce trading relations between *me and you*. Shortly explained, in this trading both will be beneficiaries, and in this mutual trade everyone will be pleased.

¹⁰⁷ *Xin* 歆 used as *xinxi* 欣喜 ‘joyful’ seen in “*国语·周语下*”, ex: *民~而德之, 则归心焉*.

¹⁰⁸ However, lacking in degree of faithfulness when referring to *heaven*

As mentioned, this passage reflects a very central topic in WN, namely self-interest. Adam Smith's idea is that if an individual pursues his own interest, he will indirectly and ultimately profit the whole society and be to the advantage of all the individuals of that society. The meaning of *Wealth of Nations* refers in the first instance to the wealth of those who a nation is composed of, namely the sum total of individuals. "*The wealth=economic welfare of a nation identified with its real output per capita, which is provided by "the annual labour of every nation"*" (Trescott 2007:29).

Adam Smith's philosophy of self-interest is in conflict with the Confucian ethic principles of the time – and before that, for that sake – where pursuing your own self-interest is against any of its moral principles¹⁰⁹. Benjamin Schwartz argues that:

Freedom of the individual is inevitably linked to a repudiation of a cardinal tenet of the orthodox Confucian ethic-the principle that the pursuit of self-interest, of li, is the ultimate source of evil (Schwartz 1964:60).

When you pursue your own self-interest it is at the expense of the society, not reinforcing society, and thus not of the constructive self-interest Adam Smith prescribes for the success of the balanced capitals society that he promotes:

When the Chinese pursues his own interest or the interest of his family, it must be at the expense of the state...the sort of cancerous consumer self-interest, which can only weaken the social organism as a whole (Schwartz 1964:71).

How was self-sacrifice embodied in Confucian filial piety going to be reconciled with the conflicting self-interest, so essential in WN? The acceptance of an authority, a father, may be transferred to other authorities, to a subordinate, and the Confucian discipline may as well be transferred, not only in view of others, but also to the individual. Regardless, Yan Fu was facing a contradiction between the "Western" self-interest and the Confucian aversion against individuals pursuing material gain – the prejudices and ethos was deep-rooted. The terminologies Yan Fu chooses can reflect his effort of toning the theory down, in order to reach out to the sceptics. However, Yan Fu's mentor, Wu Rulun, wrote in his introduction to YF, highly supporting the theories of self-interest:

¹⁰⁹ However, self-interest also collided with Christian and other forms of Western morality when WN was published in 1776.

然而不痛改諱言利之習，不力破重農抑商之故見，則財且遺棄於不知...
是何也，以利為諱，則無理財之學重農抑商。

Unless we make every effort to change our mental habit of shunning all talk of interest, unless we resolutely break our attitude of emphasizing agriculture and suppressing commerce, our wealth will remain undeveloped... If interest is taboo there can be no science of economics (Schwartz 1964:123)¹¹⁰¹¹¹.

As we will discuss further, Yan Fu's terminology does not clearly reflect the theories behind self-interest, however he is not afraid of confronting, accepting or even supporting the matter. In his preface of WN, he introduces and explains self-interest:

然而猶有以斯密氏此書，為純於功利之說者，以謂如計學家言。則人道計贏慮虧。將無往而不出於喻利。馴致其效，天理將亡此其為言厲矣。獨不知科學之事主於所明之誠安而已，其合於仁義與否。非所容心也。且其所言者計也，固將非計不，言抑非曰人道止於為計，乃已足也。從而尤之，此何異讀兵謀之書，而訾其伐國。觀鉉¹¹²砭之論，而怪其傷人乎。且吾聞斯密氏少曰之言矣。曰：

今夫群之所以成群。夫必皆善者機也，飲食男女。凡斯人之大欲，即群道之四維缺一不行。群道乃廢醴樂之所以與，生養之所以遂。始欲耕鑿。終於懋遷。出欲為人者寡出於自為者多。積私以為公。世之所以盛也，此其言。藉褒衣大袂者聞之不尤掩耳而疾走乎。則無怪斯密他日之悔其前論。戒學者以其意之已遷，而欲燬其講義也。

Smith proposed that the motivation for people to participate in a given group is not always goodwill. Any group must consist of four elements: food, wine, money, and sex. Few people's activities are intended for the good of the others – people are self-interested – but there is an invisible hand that coordinates these self-interests into public welfare. Civilizations are made from self-interested behaviour. This theory was abhorrent to moralists, which is why Smith regretted his “invisible hand” theory, and claimed that his ideas had changed; he also intended to burn some of his lecture

¹¹⁰ Worth mentioning, is Wu Rulun's use of the terminology *licai* 理財, and not Yan Fu's terminology *jixue* 計學 in translating 'economy'.

¹¹¹ Translation: Benjamin Schwartz.

¹¹² This character is difficult to interpret due to the quality of the pdf.

notes (Lai 2000:32)¹¹³¹¹⁴.

If we look back on Chinese economic history it becomes clear that Yan Fu's translation did not contribute much in spreading Adam Smith's self-interest or economic individualism in China. Earlier, in 1885, translator and missionary John Fryer introduced a translation of John Hills "Political Economy for Use in Schools and for Private Instruction" in China. Here we can see an effort of moderating the topics concerning self-interest, (Trescott 2007:319 note 5), which reflects awareness of the perceptions around self-interest in China in late 19th century.

Further, Jia Yi wrote in his essay *Eastern Miscellany* in 1916: "*Individualism is utterly alien to the Chinese mind. Inasmuch as the clan, local district, state, and society hold absolute dominance, there is no chance for the individual to emerge*" (Liu 1995:83)¹¹⁵.

Accordingly, Yan Fu had difficulties in convincing the Chinese readers of YF in acting with self-interest.

Terminology:

This is the first passage in WN introducing self-interest and Yan Fu uses *si 私*, which according to *Hanyingcidian* 漢英詞典, in modern Chinese is used as 'personal'; 'private/selfish/secret'; 'private/illicit'; 'illegal'. According to the database TLS, the definition of Classical Chinese meaning of *si 私* is "the standard word for selfishness in Classical Chinese". In modern Chinese, 'self-interest' in an economic context is *zishenliyi* 自身利益 while *zisi* 自私 is used in a moral context, meaning 'selfish'; 'self-centred'. Yan Fu does not emphasize that *si 私* here is used in an economic context; hence the term could very likely create misunderstanding of the idea, as it has a more negative nuance. In Yan Fu's translation, the concept behind the term 'self-interest' could have been taken out of its original context and ultimately being perceived as a negative feature in an economic

¹¹³ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

¹¹⁴ In dialouge with Olav Bjerkholt, a professor in Economics at the University of Oslo, he supports Yan Fu in that Adam Smith did in fact burn several of his notes. However, Bjerkholt has never heard of him regretting his invisible hand and self-interest theories. It may be an attempt of toning down the concepts.

¹¹⁵ Translation: Lydia Liu.

individual. It is crucial to understand the concept behind ‘self-interest’ in order to understand the whole picture of Adam Smith’s philosophy; hence the intellectuals in China may have misinterpreted an important part of WN. The sentence 人，自營之蟲也，與自營之蟲謀其所奉我者 is thought provoking – even though he supported the concept, we can see that Yan Fu connects *ren* 人 ‘man’ with *ziyingzhichong* 自營之蟲 ‘self-seeking insect’. It seems that he insinuates that a man with self-interest is nothing but an insect at the bottom of the food chain, accordingly with negative connotations. The Chinese intellectuals reading the text at that time could possibly get the impression of self-interest being a character flaw rather than an advantage for the society, which Adam Smith wants to propagandize. However, we can interpret the sentence in another way. Perhaps *chong* 蟲 contained the meaning ‘animal’, and by using *chong* 蟲, Yan Fu wanted to state that a human is like an animal, with survival instincts always preserving its own interest, stating merely a fact. If we read it in this way, the negative connotation will be gone. However, already in Ming dynasty, the Chinese language included the term *dongwu* 動物 meaning ‘animal’, the standard term in modern Chinese, so if he wanted to compare the human being with animals, this term was at his hand¹¹⁶. But then again it does not mean that *dongwu* 動物 was an integrated and standard term at the time. In relations with the term *si* 私, it is natural to think in negative terms when connecting *ren* 人 with *chong* 蟲. Even though it has negative connotations, Yan Fu refers later to the people trading in self-interest as “*the plain and honest folk*”, which again draws positive connotations.

Lydia Liu discusses whether the term ‘self’ has an equivalent in Chinese, upon the assumption that ‘self’ indeed has existed a long time in Chinese philosophical tradition, with the Confucian *ji* 己. She further dismisses the assumption, and it indeed is dubious, Chinese equivalents compared to the English word ‘self’ has been established only recently in modern dictionaries¹¹⁷ (Liu 1995:8).

¹¹⁶ Several terms for ‘animal’ are listed in 華英音韻字典集成 from 1903, such as *shengwu* 生物, *shengling* 生靈, *qinshou* 禽獸 and *zoushou* 走獸.

¹¹⁷ On recent treatment of individual in China, see for further discussion *The Rise of the Individual in Modern Chinese Society*, Rune Svarverud and Mette Halskov Hansen 2010.

As for the Confucian ‘righteousness’ *yi* 義 and ‘profit’ *li* 利, are they in an irreconcilable conflict of values? Or can they be viewed as complementary? In the realm of economics, and not necessarily as a general human morality, in Adam Smith’s opinion they are reconciled, who stressed that righteousness should not give way to self-interest (Schwartz 1964:124).

III. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 10, Part 2

In this passage, we can see explanations on the impediments for free competition¹¹⁸, monopoly, taxes and control. Adam Smith was a pioneer in encouraging free exchange and markets. The passage is taken from a rather complex context. Briefly explained, this chapter begins with elegant principles in how the market causes equal wage for equal work in the same locality (part one of chapter 10). Part two discusses differences “occasioned by the policy of Europe”. Key term is ‘free competition’.

Adam Smith (ST) page 112, paragraph 17:

Of Wages and Profit in the different Employments of Labour and Stock

It is to prevent this reduction of price, and consequently of wages and profit, by restraining that free competition which would most certainly occasion it, that all corporations¹¹⁹, and the greater part of corporation laws have been established. In order to erect a corporation, no other authority in ancient times was requisite, in many parts of Europe, but that of the town-corporate in which it was established. In England, indeed, a charter from the king was likewise necessary. But this prerogative of the crown seems to have been reserved rather from extorting money from the subject, than for the defence of the common liberty against such oppressive monopolies. Upon paying a fine to the king, the charter seems generally to have been readily granted; and when any particular class of artificers or traders thought proper to act as a corporation, without a charter, such adulterine guilds, as they were called, were not

¹¹⁸ Adam Smith uses the well-known metaphor *invisible hand* in order to explain free competition, however, in which passages I have read of YF, I have not found any direct attempt of translating *invisible hand*.

¹¹⁹ When Adam Smith is referring to the term ‘corporation’, it is a body which regulate and in accordance with this passage, limits participation in trades.

always disfranchised upon that account, but obliged to fine annually to the king, for permission to exercise their usurped privileges. The immediate inspection of all corporations, and of the bye-laws which they might think proper to enact for their own government, belonged to the town-corporate in which they were established; and whatever discipline was exercised over them, proceeded commonly, not from the king, but from that greater incorporation of which those subordinate ones were only parts or members.

Yan Fu (TT) page 17, paragraph 35:

論業異而庸贏不同之故

是故工聯之設，本旨無他，所以圉其業之物競。蓋物競既興，市價將跌，市價跌¹²⁰，則庸與贏自趨薄也。歐洲業聯之制，始皆城邑之民所自為，無關君上之事，獨英倫民設業聯必待上令而後立。此非以惠小民禁並¹²¹兼，實亦陰斬其權以之賸利已耳。是故凡業欲聯，貨賂朝行，制可夕下。從此罔利不為犯科，其無所人貲¹²²而私自為者，乃號奸聯私會。然雖覺察，不必廢也，但令歲納縱容之稅，則其聯自若。凡一地之工商業¹²³聯，皆總而屬諸其地之鄉聯。鄉聯尊於諸聯所立之規制約束，有考察之權，或許或察，鄉聯得主之，不必國君也。

¹²⁰ In the edition from 1981, *shijiadie* 市價跌 is not included.

¹²¹ A slightly different character appears in the original, which I unfortunately have no knowledge of. But it may seem, taking context into consideration, *bing* 並 is suitable as an alternative character.

¹²² The edition from 1981, write *zi* 資 ‘expences’ and not *zi* 貲 ‘estimate’ as in the original.

¹²³ *Shangye* 商業 ‘commerce’; ‘trade’ is a Japanese loanword, in this case a term coined using Chinese characters to render the Western term ‘commerce’; ‘trade’ (Japanese pronunciation *shôgyô*).

Back-translation:

On the reasons for different wages¹²⁴ and profit¹²⁵ in different undertakings¹²⁶

Therefore the establishment¹²⁷ of work corporations¹²⁸ has no other purpose than to limit¹²⁹ the competition in business. Therefore if the free competition arises¹³⁰, the market price will fall if the market price falls, then wages and profits naturally tend¹³¹ to diminish¹³². The European systems of business union in the beginning were self-managed by all the people of the cities and towns, and had nothing to do with the monarch, only the people of England¹³³ in the establishment of business union must wait for the orders¹³⁴ from above and then establish. This is not to benefit¹³⁵ common people and forbid annexation¹³⁶, in fact it is really to stealthily restrain¹³⁷ their rights in order to win¹³⁸ over that. Because of this, every business want¹³⁹ to unite, to gamble with goods may be allowed to proceed¹⁴⁰ in the morning¹⁴¹,

¹²⁴ I will discuss *yong* 庸 under discussion and terminology in the next passage.

¹²⁵ *Ying* 贏 in accordance with *yuli* 余利 ‘margin of profit’, *lirun* 利潤 ‘profit’ as used in ”論貴粟疏”:
”操其奇~”.

¹²⁶ *Ye* 業 in accordance with *shiyè* 事業 ‘undertaking’, *gongyè* 功業 ‘achievements’ as used in ”左傳 · 襄公十八年”:
”人其以不穀為自逸而忘先君之~矣”.

¹²⁷ *She* 設 has different meanings in Classical Chinese; relevant in this context are *chenlie* 陳列 ‘display’, *shezhi* 設置 ‘install’ and *shixing* 施行 ‘implement’; ‘establishment’.

¹²⁸ Referring to Yan Fu’s note on page 114 of the edition from 1981, *lian* 聯 is translated as ‘corporation’. Further he lists *gongsi* 公司 ‘corporation’; ‘company’, *shetuan* 社團 ‘mass organization’ and *faren* 法人 ‘corporate person’ as synonyms.

¹²⁹ *You* 囿 in this context means the same as *juxian* 局限 ‘limit’ as seen in ”庄子 · 天下” e.g: 辨者之~也.

¹³⁰ Referring to the modern term *qilai* 起來 ‘arise’.

¹³¹ *Qu* 趨 in accordance with *quxiang* 趨向 ‘tend’; ‘incline to’.

¹³² *Bao* 薄 have several meanings, and according to TLS, 古漢語常用字字典 and 漢語大字典 it usually means ‘little’ or ‘thin’. However, in accordance with context, I have translated the term as ‘diminish’.

¹³³ England has been translated with *Yinglun* 英倫, and *Yinggelan* 英格蘭. *Yingguo* 英國 is the modern term.

¹³⁴ Referring to *mingling* 命令 ‘order’; ‘command’.

¹³⁵ *Hui* 惠 can mean *renai* 仁愛 ‘humanity’, *enhui* 恩惠 ‘favor’, and *roushun* 柔順 ‘gentle’. According to TLS it can also mean ‘be generous towards’. A combination of these, and with context and original text in consideration, I will translate it as ‘benefit’.

¹³⁶ *Bingjian* 並兼 is translated in accordance with *bingyè* 兼並 ‘annex’; ‘merger’.

¹³⁷ Encountering the character 勒, ‘strap on horse’s breast’, it would be reasonable to assume it is the character 勒 lēi ‘tie’; ‘strap tightly’. According to 古漢語常用字字典 this can also be pronounced jìn, so I use the semantic domain ‘tie’; ‘strap tightly’ and translate it to ‘restrain’.

¹³⁸ The first character of *juanli* 駿利 has been difficult to translate in this context, so I have interpret the word to be *shengli* 勝利 as in ‘win’; ‘triumph’.

¹³⁹ In classic Chinese *yu* 欲 has the same meaning as *yao* 要 has in modern Chinese.

¹⁴⁰ Referring to the modern word *fangxing* 放行 ‘proceed’.

¹⁴¹ According to zdic.net *chaoxing* 朝行 is the same as *chaolie* 朝列 meaning ‘assemblage of courtiers at the imperial court’. However, in Classical Chinese, parallel constructions are common, and in the sentences

restrictions¹⁴² may be imposed¹⁴³ in the evening. Henceforth to deceive for profits¹⁴⁴ is not to break the law, it does not count upon others but does things without permission, this is¹⁴⁵ called adulterine guilds¹⁴⁶. Although one is aware¹⁴⁷ of this, it does not need to be abolished¹⁴⁸, but to order¹⁴⁹ them to pay¹⁵⁰ a yearly conniving/secretive tax, thereby its union will be at ease. All the unions in one place, to sum up¹⁵¹, belong to the country unions of that place¹⁵². Country unions respect the regulations¹⁵³ and restrictions¹⁵⁴ established by all [other] unions, they got the power¹⁵⁵ to observe, to allow¹⁵⁶ or to investigate¹⁵⁷, country unions can¹⁵⁸ be in charge¹⁵⁹, it does not need to be the monarch.

Discussion:

We can see from this passage that the arguments are put into a different order than in the English version, hence not 信-faithful in an *ad sensum* or *ad verbum* perspective, so I will verify whether the Chinese translation is 信-faithful by conveying the intended meaning of

货赂朝行，制可夕下 we can clearly see parallelism. With time *chao* 朝 and *xi* 夕 before the verb *xing* 行 and *xia* 下, it makes sense *chao* 朝 has the meaning ‘morning’ in connection with *xi* 夕 ‘evening’.

¹⁴² Referring to the modern word *zhizhi* 制止 ‘inhibit’.

¹⁴³ I translate *xia* 下 as ‘impose’, as in *xia mingling* 下命令.

¹⁴⁴ *Wang* 罔 can mean *pianqu* 騙取 ‘gain sth by fraud’; ‘defraud’ as seen in ”商君書·賞刑” ex: 則不能以非功~利.

¹⁴⁵ *Nai* 乃 in classical Chinese has the same somantic domain as the modern *jiushi* 就是.

¹⁴⁶ *Jianlianshui* 奸聯私會 is translated as ‘adulterine guilds’ according to Yan Fu’s own notes.

¹⁴⁷ *Jue* 覺 can mean *xingwu* 省悟 ‘realize’; ‘aware’, and combined with *cha* 察 which can mean *kaocha* 考察 ‘inspect’; ‘observe’, I translate them together as ‘aware’.

¹⁴⁸ *Fei* 廢 in this context has the meaning *benghuai* 崩壞 ‘decay’; ‘abolish’.

¹⁴⁹ Translating *ling* 令 as *mingling* 命令 ‘order’; ‘command’.

¹⁵⁰ *Na* 納 translated as *jiaona* 交納 ‘pay (to the state/etc)’.

¹⁵¹ *Zong* 總 is translated as *zongkuo* 總括 ‘sum up’.

¹⁵² *Jie...zhu* 皆...諸... has the same meaning as the modern construction *suoyou...dou* 所有...都...

¹⁵³ *Zhi* 制 has numerous meanings, however, in context with *gui* 規, I translate it as *guizhang* 規章 ‘rules’: ‘regulations’.

¹⁵⁴ *Yueshu* 約束 ‘control’; ‘restrain’ can also function as noun, hence I translate it as ‘restrictions’ as seen in ”論語·雍也” e.g. ~之以禮.

¹⁵⁵ Referring to the modern terms *quanli* 權力 ‘power’; ‘authority’ and *quanshi* 權勢 ‘power and influence’.

¹⁵⁶ *Xu* 許 is translated as *yunxu* 允許 ‘permit’; ‘allow’.

¹⁵⁷ According to TLS *cha* 察 is the most general word for ‘investigate’, defining it as ”sort out clearly”

¹⁵⁸ *De* 得 can have the same meaning as the modern words *nenggou* 能夠 ‘can’; ‘be able to’ and *keyi* 可以 ‘can’; ‘may’.

¹⁵⁹ *Zhu* 主 is translated as *zhangguan* 掌管 ‘be in charge of’ as seen in ”史记·吕太后本纪” e.g. 太尉絳侯勃不得人军中~兵.

Adam Smith. I have translated *gonglian* 工聯 as ‘work corporation’, which according to context seems to be Yan Fu’s rendering of the English ‘town-corporate’. By first making clear what Adam Smith’s intention with this passage is, we can compare it to the Chinese. In my understanding of the English, this passage is a criticism of the corporation laws and the highest leader, namely the king. They hinder free competition by extorting money, and defending oppressive monopolies. Yan Fu’s sentence “*this is not to benefit common people and forbid annexation, in fact it is really to stealthily restrain their rights in order to win over that*” can mirror this. Further, Adam Smith explains an adulterine guild, as in order for the people to exercise their usurped privileges, they had to pay a fine to the king. Yan Fu does not mention any kind of payment to the king, however he mentions “*a yearly conniving tax*”. Further, he explains adulterine guilds as to do things “*without permission*”. Consequently, it seems that Yan Fu does not grasp the roles of the town-corporations and the king, where they both attempt to reduce free competition.

Discussing his principles, as mentioned, it is obvious in this passage that he has not translated either *ad sensum* or *ad verbum*, but with arguments in a random order. He has managed to a slight degree to preserve the main concepts of the English passage, but he is failing to clearly describe the roles of the town-corporations and the king, which are important in the text. Hence, he is failing to preserve 達-comprehension.

Regarding free competition in general, in his preface, Yan Fu points out:

試觀中國道咸間，計臣之所論議施行，與今日朝士之言痛商可以悟矣是故一理既明之後。若揭日月而行，而當長夜漫漫。習非腴是之日。則必知幾之神，曠世之識而後與之。

A living example in China is commercial policy: free domestic trade policy (liberalizing commercial activities) was strongly debated among decision-makers twenty years ago, but now is a matter of national consensus. After a certain concept reaches consensus, it is easy to put it into practice. But before that day comes, there are long nights when incorrect concepts prevail; and during that time one needs unusual insights to unveil the truth (Lai 2000:29)¹⁶⁰.

Here Yan Fu describes a changing attitude towards free competition in the Chinese society being a national consensus at the time, compared to earlier. However, he mentions that free

¹⁶⁰ Translation Cheng-chung Lai.

competition was not fully grasped, and that the concept was misunderstood. It may not be necessary to dwell upon the Canton system, the treaty of Nanking, the Boxer protocol or the Opium wars – the so-called *bainianguochi* 百年國恥 ‘century of humiliation’ in this context, but we can affirm that the aversion against Western theories in late Qing China, such as free trade and free competition in this context, were still dominating. Yan Fu tried to explain the basic features of the constructive and benefiting competition Adam Smith discusses, but if we look back on the situation in the beginning of 20th century, it may however seem that his effort was overshadowed by the ideology prevailing at that time.

Terminology:

Regarding the key term in this passage, ‘free competition’, according to his note¹⁶¹ Yan Fu translates it with *wujing* 物競. According to MCST, *wujing* 物競 was translated as ‘struggle for existence’ in 1913, in *Chinese New Terms and Expressions, with English Translations, Introduction and Notes* compiled by Evan Morgan. Surprisingly, MCST also inform of a 1931 edition of *Tiyanlun* 天演論 (1898), Yan Fu’s translation of Thomas Huxley’s *Evolution and Ethics*, where *wujing* 物競 was used to appoint ‘struggle for existence’. It may, however, have been used in an alternative introduction of the edition MCST are referring to. But it may be likely that Yan Fu was not consistent in his translation of *wujing* 物競, and appointed it to both ‘free competition’ and ‘struggle for existence’. According to MCST, Yan Fu also used *renwuzhijing* 任物之競, but I have not encountered this term, and it seems that *wujing* 物競 was used as the standard term for ‘free competition’ in YF.

In 1907, Japanese Kiyoshi Shimizu listed ‘free competition’ with the translation *ziyoujingzheng* 自由競爭 in his dictionary 漢譯法律經濟辭典. After this, the Japanese term appeared in several works: in 1913 in Keiya Tanabe’s 漢譯日本法律經濟辭典 translated to Chinese by Wang Wozang, in 1923 in Tang Jingao’s 新文化辭書 and in 1934 in Gao Xisheng and Guo Zhen’s 經濟科學大辭典. According to *Hanyingcidian* 漢英詞典, we can see that the modern term for ‘free competition’ is *ziyoujingzheng* 自由競爭, hence we may

¹⁶¹ Note on p. 181 in the edition from 1981.

conclude that yet again the Japanese loanword survived, and Yan Fu's term *wujing* 物競 for 'free competition' was defeated.

Regarding 'free trade', according to note on p. 119 in the edition of YF from 1981, Yan Fu translated it as *wuzhetongshang* 無遮通商, however already in 1903 the Japanese term *ziyoumaoyi* 自由貿易 for 'free trade' appeared in 國際公法大綱 in the compilation 政學叢書, which is still used in modern Chinese.

IV. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 8

A well-known chapter, discussing fundamental relations on factors manifested in primordial conditions and how it is different in a capitalistic state. In this passage, Adam Smith explains wages of labour, respectively two sources of demand for labour, the *revenue* and the *stock*, and the rise and fall of them leading to either rise or fall in national wealth. Wage of labour is an important topic in WN, and Adam Smith discusses wage especially in Book 1, chapter 6-9. The key terms are *yong* 庸, *yong* 傭, 'increase' and 'decrease'.

Adam Smith (ST) page 61, paragraph 21:

Of the wages of labour

The demand for those who live by wages, therefore, necessarily increases with the increase of the revenue and stock of every country, and cannot possibly increase without it. The increase of revenue and stock is the increase of national wealth. The demand for those who live by wages, therefore, naturally increases with the increase of the national wealth, and cannot possibly increase without it.

釋庸

是故欲庸率之長，必俟求傭者多，欲求傭者多，必俟通國歲入積畜之益進，而歲入積畜進者，國財舉多也。然則庸率之進退，與國財之增減，猶影響之於形聲。國財不增，而求庸率之進者，猶却行而求前也。

Back-translation:

*Explaining wage*¹⁶²

Therefore if one wants an increase¹⁶³ in wage rate, one must wait¹⁶⁴ for the demand for employees¹⁶⁵ to increase¹⁶⁶, if one wants the demand for employees to increase, one must wait for the time when the whole country's¹⁶⁷ annual revenue¹⁶⁸ accumulation¹⁶⁹ increases¹⁷⁰, and with increase in annual revenue and accumulation, the national wealth¹⁷¹ is raised¹⁷². That being so¹⁷³, the progression and regression¹⁷⁴ of wage rate [will fluctuate] with the increase

¹⁶² *Yong* 庸 will be discussed under discussion and terminology.

¹⁶³ *Chang* 長 is translated as *chengzhang* 成長 or *zengzhang* 增長 'increase'.

¹⁶⁴ *Si* 俟 is translated as 'wait' in accordance with *denghou* 等候 and *dengdai* 等待. Also referring to the alternative character *ci* 伺 'wait upon'.

¹⁶⁵ According to 古漢語常用字字典, *yong* 傭 means to 'recieve salary', and is similar to *yong* 庸. I will translate *yong* 傭 as 'employees' in order to seperate *yong* 庸 'wage' and *yong* 傭 'employee'.

¹⁶⁶ In accordance with the original text, *duo* 多 can also cover the meaning 'increase'.

¹⁶⁷ *Tongguo* 通國 is the same as *quanguo* 全國 translated as "the whole country", however, in the original passage, Adam Smith refers to "every country".

¹⁶⁸ *Ru* 入 is translated as *shouru* 收入 'income', *jiaona* 交納 'pay (to the state)'. According to TLS it can be translated as 'revenue'.

¹⁶⁹ Referring to the modern term *jilei* 積累 'accumulate'.

¹⁷⁰ According to TLS *yi* 益 can be translated as 'increase' and *jin* 進 as 'progress'. Hence I translate *yijin* 益進 as 'increase'.

¹⁷¹ Referring to Yan Fu's own comment on page 62 of the edition from 1981, regarding translation of *guocai* 國財.

¹⁷² *Ju* 舉 is translated as *juqi* 舉起; *taiqi* 抬起 'raise'.

¹⁷³ Regarding *ze* 則 in *ranze* 然則, it is not the same character as in the original Chinese version, however, one that I have never encountered before, and which cannot be found in any dictionary. I have chosen *ranze* 然則 in agreement with the context.

¹⁷⁴ *Jintui* 進退 can also be translated as 'advance and retreat' in modern Chinese. In Classical Chinese, *jin* 進 usually is translated as 'progress'. With *tui* 退 having the meaning *tuique* 退卻 'retreat', *jiantui* 減退 'recede; drop' and *shuai* 衰 'decline', I translate it with 'regression'.

and decrease of national wealth, resembling¹⁷⁵ shadow and echo which follow the form and sound. If national wealth has not increased, and [then] seeking progression of wage rate, it is similar to go backwards¹⁷⁶ when seeking to move forward¹⁷⁷.

Discussion:

It is difficult to separate Yan Fu's use of the terminologies *yong* 庸 and *yong* 傭 in this passage. He has used *yong* 庸 earlier in his translations, and by presuming he is consistent with his translation *yong* 庸 for 'wage', I will discuss this passage in light of this. Adam Smith's purpose with this passage is not to explain the increase or decrease of particularly the 'wage rate' (*yonglü* 庸率), but '**those who live by wages**', namely the labourers or the employees, which we can see in the English headline. He explains that labourers (those who live by wages) increase if revenue and stock of every country increase, and cannot increase without it. However Yan Fu understands it, as the 'wage rate' will increase if the employees increase. Further, Yan Fu says that if the employees increase, the whole country's annual revenue accumulation will increase, which is equivalent to what Adam Smith states in his first sentence. Moreover, both agree when revenue increases, national wealth will also increase. Lastly, Adam Smith explains that if labourers ('those who live by wages') increase, then the national wealth also will increase, however Yan Fu again misunderstands the original term and states that if the wage rate increase or decrease, along will also the national wealth increase or decrease. Adam Smith refers to national wealth and labourers as complementary, and that they cannot increase without the other also increasing. Yan Fu has preserved this in his last sentence "*it is similar to go backwards when seeking to move forward*". However

¹⁷⁵ *You* 猶 is translated as *rutong* 如同 'similar to' or *haoxiang* 好像 'seem'; 'be like' as seen in "孟子·離婁上" e.g. 民之歸仁也，~水之就下. In TLS, *you* 猶 is listed as "the general, almost copula-like word for resemblance of any kind" translated as 'resemble'. In accordance with context, I translate it with both 'resemblance' and 'similar'.

¹⁷⁶ TLS translate *que* 卻 as 'withdraw'. Here I translate it with the modern meaning *tui* 退 'go backwards'.

¹⁷⁷ Referring to the modern word *qianjin* 前進 'move forward'.

ultimately, it seems if Yan Fu has been distracted by Adam Smith's reference to labourers as 'those who live by wages'. Adam Smith states a fairly consistent relationship between work and capital effort, and that the demand for labour force therefore cannot increase without the state capital first increasing. Yan Fu does not preserve this.

In discussing Yan Fu's principles, Adam Smith does not discuss changes in wage, but those who live by wages, whereas Yan Fu dwells on changes in wage rate. Hence, the passage will be misleading and unclear, and therefore not 信-faithful, which will also be at the expense of 達-comprehension. But, if he has misunderstood Adam Smith's reference to 'those who live by wages', we cannot say that he has not followed his principles, the problem lays more in the fact that he has not understood the passage. Though his inconsistency in terms for 'increase' and 'decrease', which I will discuss further down, may contribute in lack of 達-comprehension.

Terminology:

Yan Fu uses *yong* 傭 'employee' in this passage, which is also listed in MCST. According to *Hanyudacidian* 漢語大詞典, *yong* 傭 means 'employ'; 'be employed', 'hired labourer' and 'wage'. Yan Fu translates 'wage' with *yong* 庸, which is also listed in MCST. Combined with *lǜ* 率¹⁷⁸, it is translated as 'wage rate'. *Hanyudacidian* 漢語大詞典 informs of that *yong* 庸 has similar connotations as *yong* 傭, and translates it as *shouguyong* 受雇傭 'be employed' and *gongqian* 工錢 'wage'. *Hanyudazidian* 漢語大字典 lists several meanings for *yong* 庸, among them 'reward' used by Mengzi. In accordance with Yan Fu's reasoning, context and preceding passages, it seems likely that Yan Fu used *yong* 庸 to translate 'wage' and *yongliu* 庸率 as 'wage rate', however it is difficult to know Yan Fu's own understanding of the English term 'those who live by wages', or even the Chinese terms *yong* 傭 and *yong* 庸.

In Classical Chinese, according to *Guhanyu Chanyongzi Zidian* 故漢語常用字字典, common meanings of *yong* 庸 was 'need', 'ordinary', 'appoint'; 'employ' and 'merit'. In Classical Chinese, according to TLS, 'wage' was translated as *lu* 祿 and in late Qing China, according to several listing of dictionaries and books in MCST, common translations of 'wage' was

¹⁷⁸ Referring to modern Chinese term *bilǜ* 比率 'rate'.

gongqian 工錢, *gongjia* 工價, *gongyin* 工銀, *laoyin* 勞銀, *xinjin* 辛金 and *xinfeng* 辛俸.

However, as mentioned, *yong* 庸 is similar to *yong* 傭, and has also occasionally the meaning ‘wage’. In this passage, Yan Fu treat them as two individual terms, and from the context we can see that he translates *yonglü* 庸率 with ‘wage rate’ and *yong* 傭 as employees. His use of the two terms ultimately becomes confusing. First of all, Adam Smith is not discussing ‘wage rate’, but ‘those who live by wages’ namely the employees, *yong* 傭; second, his individual use of the two very similar characters with similar meanings may have created misunderstandings.

The Japanese loanword *gongzi* 工資, which is also used in modern Chinese, was available in late Qing China with the meaning ‘wage’, and *Tongyici Cilin* 同義詞詞林 lists up several synonyms, among them *yongjin* 傭金; *hangyong* 行傭; *yongqian* 傭錢 and *yong* 傭, meaning ‘wage’. Hence we can see that *gongzi* 工資 ‘wage’ is similar to *yong* 傭, which Yan Fu translates as ‘employee’. Yan Fu uses a *danzi* 單字 ‘single-character term’, as opposed to the Japanese *liangzici* 兩字詞 ‘two-character term’, and by this, we see his reluctance of using Japanese terminology, but rather translate ‘wage’ with *yong* 庸, which could be misinterpreted.

Further, it seems that Yan Fu struggled with rendering terms like ‘increase’ and ‘decrease’. We can see Yan Fu are not consistent in his use of translations of ‘increase’, as it seems he has no general and consistent economic terminology for the terms, but translates them with *chang* 長, *duo* 多, *yijin* 益進, *jin* 進, *juduo* 舉多 and *zeng* 增 or ‘decrease’, which he translates with *tui* 退, *jian* 減 and *buzeng* 不增.

Following the reasoning above, it seems he has misunderstood the reference ‘those who live by wages’, and his employing of the two very similar terms *yong* 庸 and *yong* 傭 as two individual terms creates confusion throughout his translation.

V. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 6

This chapter, despite its fairly prosaic title, begins with “In that early and rude state of society” and introduces the well-known ‘beaver and deer’ parable. This passage presents a

representative explanation of how prices reflects the profits of stock, rent and naturally wages, which he discusses also in several other parts of WN. The key terms are ‘civilisation’ and Yan Fu’s term *mucai* 母財 ‘capital’

Adam Smith (ST), page 47, paragraph 24:

Of the component part of the price of commodities

As in a civilised country there are but few commodities of which the exchangeable value arises from labour only, rent and profit contributing largely to that of the far greater part of them, so the annual produce of its labour will always be sufficient to purchase or command a much greater quantity of labour than what was employed in raising, preparing and bringing that produce to market. If the society were annually to employ all the labour, which it can annually purchase, as the quantity of labour would increase greatly every year, so the produce of every succeeding year would be of vastly greater value than that of the foregoing. But there is no country in which the whole annual produce is employed in maintaining the industrious. The idle everywhere consume a great part of it; and, according to the different proportions in which it is annually divided between those two different orders of people, its ordinary or average value must either annually increase or diminish, or continue the same from one year to another.

Yan Fu (TT), page 30, paragraph 11:

論物價之析分

治化既進，則物價全出於功力者少，而兼之以租與息利者多。故通國之所歲登，較之原用之功力，所贏倍蓰。繼乃更以所贏，食工役，墾荒地，轉滯財，交相資以殖其貨，則歲歲之出皆進乎前，數稔之間，法宜大富，而民生大舒。然而不能者，則害富之事眾也。國有無名之費，而積畜者不盡為母財，有些惰游手之民，而食積畜者不盡有

所出，而奇邪¹⁷⁹虛耗，一切無所贏之為作，又無論已。此天下之所以富國少而貧國多也。大抵勤惰愚智之民相待之比例率，國財之盈不足與物產之廉貴恆視之。

Back-translation:

On the component¹⁸⁰ analysis¹⁸¹ of commodity price

When civilisation¹⁸² has already¹⁸³ progressed, then it becomes rare that the commodity price is completely¹⁸⁴ based on of labour force/cost, but rather at the same time¹⁸⁵ based upon rent and interest¹⁸⁶. Therefore with rich harvest¹⁸⁷ of the whole country, compared with the original use of labour force, the profits are more than doubled¹⁸⁸. Furthermore, to use what has been gained to feed¹⁸⁹ labourers, to cultivate¹⁹⁰ barren land, to circulate stagnate wealth¹⁹¹, to exchange money¹⁹² in order to breed¹⁹³ its goods, then the outputs of every year surmount the former year, within a few¹⁹⁴ years, if the legislation is suitable¹⁹⁵ wealth will be great¹⁹⁶,

¹⁷⁹ I am not familiar with the character in the original edition. The edition from 1981 lists *xie* 邪 as an alternative character.

¹⁸⁰ In accordance with the original headline, *fen* 分 can be translated as ‘fraction’; ‘component’.

¹⁸¹ Referring to the modern term *fenxi* 分析 ‘analysis’.

¹⁸² I will discuss Yan Fu’s rendering of ‘civilisation’ under terminology.

¹⁸³ *Ji* 既 as the modern term *jiran* 既然.

¹⁸⁴ *Quan* 全 is translated as *wanzheng* 完整; *qiquan* 齊全 ‘complete’.

¹⁸⁵ I translate *jian* 兼 as ‘at the same time’ as seen in ”荀子·君道” e.g. ~聽齊明而百事不留.

¹⁸⁶ The same meaning as the modern term *lixī* 利息.

¹⁸⁷ *Suideng* 歲登 in accordance with 漢語大辭典 is translated as ‘rich harvest’.

¹⁸⁸ What Yan Fu perhaps wants to convey is that the profits compared to the stake is more than doubled with a rich harvest.

¹⁸⁹ *Shi* 食 generally means ‘eat’, but when pronounced *sì* it means ‘feed’.

¹⁹⁰ *Ken* 墾 is according to TLS translated as ‘till’, however, in combination with *di* 地 ‘land’, ‘cultivate’ would seem as a reasonable translation.

¹⁹¹ It is reasonable to assume that 食工役, 墾荒地, 轉滯財 are following the parallelism often seen in Classical Chinese. The verbs *shi* 食, *ken* 墾 and *zhuan* 轉 are monosyllable and the objects *gongshe* 工役, *huangdi* 荒地 and *zhicai* 滯財 are disyllable, following a certain pattern. With this in mind, the translation presented would be compliant.

¹⁹² In accordance with the original and context, I translate *zi* 資 as *qiancai* 錢財 ‘wealth’; ‘money’.

¹⁹³ Here, *zhi* 殖 has the same meaning as *fanzhi* 繁殖 ‘breed’ or *zhongzhi* 種植 ‘grow’. We can see in the original, Adam Smith is referring to the noun ‘produce’ (/ˈprɒdjuːs/) and not the verb ‘produce’ (/prəˈdjuːs/), hence the latter *huo* 貨 is translated as ‘goods’.

¹⁹⁴ Referring to *jige* 幾個 ‘a few’.

¹⁹⁵ Referring to *heshi* 合適; *shiyi* 適宜 ‘suitable’.

¹⁹⁶ Alternative translation of 法宜大富 could be ”the law favours/encourages great wealth”.

and the lives of people will be carefree¹⁹⁷. However the reason that it is not the case is because there are many things detrimental to wealth. The state has unnamed expenses, and people who save do not use their savings as capital¹⁹⁸, when¹⁹⁹ scolding²⁰⁰ the lazy²⁰¹ people, and those who eat the food stocks do not all have expenses²⁰², not to mention²⁰³ there are all kinds of strange²⁰⁴ squandering, all work that does not induce any profit. This is why in this world there are few rich countries but many poor countries. Generally speaking, the percentage of people who are diligent or lazy, wise or stupid, can be regarded²⁰⁵ as coordinate with whether the national wealth is great or deficit, and if the material goods are expensive or cheap²⁰⁶.

Discussion:

In the first and second sentences of this passage, Adam Smith explains the importance of rent and profit in the value of commodities, and that labour is not the only factor contributing to what is produced in the market. If quantity of labour is increased, the production will increase even more²⁰⁷. We can see that Yan Fu has preserved this in his first and second sentence, yet a somewhat shorter explanation of it. A small remark is that Adam Smith refers to “*rent and profit*”, whereas Yan Fu refers to “*rent and interest*”, however, Yan Fu refers later also to

¹⁹⁷ I translate *shu* 舒 as ‘carefree’ in accordance with *shuhuan* 舒緩 ‘relaxed’, *shuzhan* 舒展 ‘cheerful’, *shuchang* 舒暢 ‘happy’; ‘carefree’ and with TLS translation ‘peaceful’.

¹⁹⁸ I will discuss *mucai* 母財 ‘capital’ under terminology.

¹⁹⁹ Conditional sentence, *you* 有 has the meaning ‘when’.

²⁰⁰ In the dictionaries and database I have checked, *zi* 訾 (pronounced zǐ) appears only in the database TLS combined with the character *hui* 毀 ‘destroy’; *huizi* 毀訾 meaning ‘scold’. In WenLin, *zi* 訾 is not listed with any meaning, however, *zi* 訾 (also pronounced zǐ) in combination with *hui* 毀 ‘destroy’ (similar to the character 毀 listed in TLS, but the radical is slightly different, with *tu* 土 and *gong* 工) means ‘slander’. In 古漢語常用字字典, *zi* 訾 is not listed, though *zi* 訾 is listed as having the same meaning as *huibang* 毀謗 ‘slander’ or *feiyi* 非议 ‘reproach’ as seen in ”吕氏春秋 · 怀宠”: e.g. 排~旧典. *Zi* 訾 is probably a version of *zi* 訾, and it would seem that ‘scold’ would be an appropriate translation of *zi* 訾.

²⁰¹ Referring to *landai* 懶怠 ‘lazy’; ‘idle’ and in combination with *youshou* 游手 ‘remain idle’; ‘lazy’ would seem as an appropriate translation.

²⁰² This sentence is more or less directly translated, reflecting the Chinese text, however, in this form it is difficult to grasp the meaning. Hence I have taken the liberty to freely translate this sentence in how I interpret what Yan Fu wanted to convey: ”there are people who are lazy and do nothing, and there are people who live on their savings but produce nothing”.

²⁰³ *Wulunyi* 無論已 is translated as ”not to mention”.

²⁰⁴ TLS translate *qi* 奇 as ‘strange’ and several dictionaries refers to *qiyi* 奇異 ‘strange’.

²⁰⁵ *Shi* 視 is translated as *kandai* 看待 ‘look upon’; ‘regard’; ‘view’ or *duidai* 對待 ‘treat’; ‘approach’.

²⁰⁶ *Lian* 廉 is translated as ‘cheap’ according to TLS, as seen in ”黃崗竹樓記”: e.g. 其價~而工省也.

²⁰⁷ Which in economics refers to as *scalability*.

profit. Further, Yan Fu mentions the advantages: “*to circulate stagnate wealth, exchange money, breed its goods... if the legislation is suitable, wealth will be great and the lives of people will be carefree*”. The English version does not mention the exact benefits, but from the increase in value. This seems to be Yan Fu’s attempt on further explanation and introduction of this economic theory. Further, Yan Fu presupposes that if wealth shall increase, the “*legislation should be suitable*”, which is not to be found in the English version. Further, in the third sentence, Adam Smith points out that there is no country that can employ all of the annual produce in maintaining the industrious. Yan Fu points out that “*this is not the case*” and he explains it in a more general way than Adam Smith, namely “*...because there are many things detrimental to wealth*”. Further Yan Fu states, “*the state has unnamed expenses*”, which is probably the output of the annual produce not used in maintaining the industrious that Adam Smith is referring to. This reflects his understanding of the concept. Both Adam Smith and Yan Fu refers to the idle people of the society, and that there are, as Adam Smith points out, “*two different orders of people*”, which Yan Fu translates “*people who are diligent or lazy, wise or stupid*” and because of this “*average value must either annually increase or diminish, or continue the same from one year to another*” or as Yan Fu translates it; “*the national wealth is great or deficit, and if the material goods are expensive or cheap*”. Adam Smith refers to “*average value*”, which Yan Fu translates as “*national wealth*”. However, the “*average value*” Adam Smith is talking about, as I have understood, is the average value of the national wealth, and not the national wealth as a whole, hence Yan Fu’s translation is misleading. Lastly, Yan Fu states: “*why in this world there are few rich countries but many poor countries*”. This is not to be found in the original, and it is difficult to know why Yan Fu states that people’s squandering is an explanation for the wealth or poverty of a country, when economically speaking, this is quite narrow in explaining the condition of a country.

In order to affirm his preservation of 信-faithfulness in this passage, we have to look at the text as a whole, since it is clearly not translated *ad-verbatim* or *ad-sensum*. As mentioned, he abbreviated the discussion on rent and profit in the value of commodities, which are the most important subject of the English passage. As we can see from the preceding discussion, he also had some additions, which are not in the English version. He may have misunderstood the consequences when referring to the reasons for countries being poor or rich. But it ultimately seems that Yan Fu has managed to preserve the main concept behind price of

commodities, and in that way we can argue that he has preserved 信-faithfulness and 達-comprehension as defined by him.

Terminology

Ziben 資本 is the modern word for ‘capital’, originally a Japanese graphic loan (pronounced *shihon*). According to MCST, *ziben* 資本 appeared in American missionary Calvin W. Mateer’s compilation *Technical Terms; English and Chinese*, with the translation *financial capital*, published in 1902. This reflects that *ziben* 資本 was an established term in China at that time. With Yan Fu’s dislike of employing Japanese loanwords, it is not surprising he coined his own term in rendering ‘capital’, the term *mucai* 母財, literally translated as ‘mother capital’. In Classical Chinese, *cai* 財 have the meaning *caiwu* 財物 ‘properties’, *caifu* 財富 ‘wealth’ and *chengjiu* 成就 ‘achievements’, in modern Chinese it generally translates as ‘wealth’ or ‘money’. In combination with *mu* 母 ‘mother’, the neologism, has no similarity in the semantics or the structure of the term ‘capital’ and we can call it a native neologism²⁰⁸.

Paul B. Trescott argues:

He [Yan Fu] translated clearly Smith’s descriptions of basic categories of capital goods. Yan coined the term mother capital, probably as a way of dramatizing the importance of capital goods for productivity and economic growth.

Further he accurately states that the term recurred often in Yan’s text. (Trescott 2007:32) But the readers of YF, may not have understood, or at least had difficulties understanding this particular and peculiar term without further explanation.

Regarding the term ‘civilisation’, *Huayingyinyun Zidian Jicheng* 華英音韻字典集成 (1903) listed *jiaohua* 教化 and *ganhua* 感化 as standard terms, and *jiaohuaguo* 教化過, *tongwulide* 通物理的 and *shilifade* 識禮法的 for ‘civilised’. As we can see from the passage, Yan Fu uses *zhihua* 治化 in rendering ‘civilisation’, a term he also used in *Tianyanlun* 天演論, his translation of Huxley’s *Evolution and Ethics*. In his article, Shen argues that *zhihua* 治化 is in fact the opposite of the Western term ‘civilisation’ (Shen 2008:324). According to several

²⁰⁸ A terminology with no relationship with the foreign term (Temmerman; Knops 2004:155).

dictionaries, 治 is in Classical Chinese generally translated as *zhili* 治理 ‘administer’; ‘govern’ and *guanli* 管理; ‘manage’; ‘supervise’ as seen in ”史記·夏本紀”: e.g. 堯求能~水者. TLS lists ‘govern’, ‘control’, ‘orderly’ and ‘punish’ as alternative translations. Accordingly, *zhihua* 治化 literally would mean ‘transformed through administration/government’. One may speculate on whether being civilised in late Qing was synonymous with being bureaucratic. However, the English word ‘civilisation’ derives from the Latin word ‘civilis’; ‘civitas’ meaning ‘civil’ and ‘city’; ‘city state’, also indicating relations with the state²⁰⁹. Again, according to *Guhanyu Changyongzi Zidian* 古漢語常用字字典, *zhi* 治 can occasionally mean *taiping* 太平 ‘peace’; ‘tranquillity’, and function as the opposite of *luan* 亂 ‘chaotic’; ‘disorderly’ as seen in ”戰國策·秦策三”: e.g. 以亂攻~者亡 and in ”史記·秦本紀”: e.g. 於是法大用, 秦人~. Hence, *zhi* 治 in *zhihua* 治化 could be understood as the latter, and the word ultimately reflects the definition of a civilisation. The standard term for civilisation in modern Chinese is *wenming* 文明, and was firmly established in Chinese language in late Qing China, and was in use already in 1881 in Zheng Guanying’s “易言 (二十篇本)” in 夏涑元 (ed.), “鄭觀應集”. Hence, we can see yet again that Yan Fu did not rely on already established terms.

VI. An analysis of Book 4, Introduction

This passage is the first in Book 4, introducing political economy, obviously an important topic of WN. Book 4 is basically a criticism of government interference in economical processes and restrictions. In this particular passage, Adam Smith briefly explains the basic factors of political economy. The key term is ‘political economy’.

Adam Smith (ST) page 375, paragraph 1:

Of Systems of Political Economy; Introduction

Political economy, considered as a branch of the science of a statesman or legislator, proposes two distinct objects: first, to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or more

²⁰⁹ Civil law meaning *administer the citizens*.

properly to enable them to provide such a revenue or subsistence for themselves; and secondly, to supply the state or commonwealth with a revenue sufficient for the public services. It proposes to enrich both the people and the sovereign. The different progress of opulence in different ages and nations has given occasion to two different systems of political economy with regard to enriching the people. The one may be called the system of commerce, the other that of agriculture.

Yan Fu (TT) page 1, paragraph 1:

引論

計學者，制治經國之學一支。其所講求者二：

一曰足民食，次曰富國用。計學之所求，在君民各足而已。世異民殊，國之進於富厚者各異，故言計學者有二宗焉，而皆以足民為本，曰商宗，曰農宗。

Back-translation:

Preface

Economics is a branch of the study of the systematic administration and rules²¹⁰ of the state. There are two things it seeks to explain²¹¹: the first²¹² is to have enough food for the people; the second is to increase/enrich the state with assets²¹³. What economics seeks to achieve is simply²¹⁴ that the needs of both the monarch and the people are satisfied²¹⁵. At different times and in different²¹⁶ peoples, how the state progresses towards wealth also differ, therefore it is

²¹⁰ *Jing* 經 is in accordance with the original text, translated as *changgui* 常規 ‘rule’. TLS define *jing* 經 as “basic feature of a doctrine or a system of rules”.

²¹¹ *Jiang* 講 is translated as *jiangjie* 講解 ‘explain’ as seen in “梁書·院孝緒傳”: e.g. 后於鐘山所~.

²¹² In this sentence, *yue* 曰 has the function as copula. TLS defines it as “relation between a category and things of that category”.

²¹³ *Yong* 用 is translated as *zicai* 資財 ‘capital’ and ‘materials’; ‘assets’ as seen in “荀子·天倫”: e.g. 強本而節~.

²¹⁴ *Eryi* 而已 is translated as ‘simply’.

²¹⁵ TLS present the definition for *zu* 足 as “occasionally come to refer to the feeling that something is satisfactory”.

²¹⁶ *Shu* 殊 is translated as *butong* 不同; *qubie* 區別 ‘different’.

said that economics has two systems, both takes providing for the people as its principle, the mercantile system and the agriculture system²¹⁷.

Discussion:

The first sentence of this passage is an introduction into the two branches of political economy, “*the science of a statesman or legislator*” or as Yan Fu puts it “*the study of the systematic administration and rules*”. We can see that Adam Smith is referring to the statesman and legislator as who are keeping the rules of the society, whereas Yan Fu points to the administration and rules of the society, and not the person maintaining it. Further Adam Smith explains that the first branch is to provide for the people, or more properly, to **enable** the people to provide for themselves. Yan Fu merely proposes that the state has to provide for the people, hence he does not convey the independence of the people, which Adam Smith is referring to. Further, it may seem that he has not understood the individual terms ‘revenue’ and ‘subsistence’ in this context, since he translates both of them with ‘food’. The second branch is explained by supplying the state or the commonwealth with revenue sufficient for the public services, also based on providing for the people. Yan Fu states that the second branch is “*to increase the state with assets*”, and does not mention the public service. However, if we take the last sentence into consideration, he mentions that “*both takes providing for the people as its principle*”, an indication on his understanding of the two branches. Further, in the fifth sentence, where Adam Smith refers to the different progress of opulence in different ages and **nations**, Yan Fu refers to “*different times and in different people*”. However, in Yan Fu’s sentence “*how the state progresses towards wealth also differ*”, he mentions the state, which in a way conveys *nations*.

Regarding ‘nations’ versus *guo* 國 ‘state’, Adam Smith wants us to understand ‘nation’ as a ‘society’, where society is the total sum of individuals whom a society consist of and in that way the individuals will be the ultimate beneficiaries in pursues of the state interests. With my understanding of ‘society’, ‘nation’ and ‘country’ in the original, they seem to be synonymous²¹⁸. However, *guo* 國 in YF, with Classical Chinese meaning, referring to ‘the

²¹⁷ *Shangzong* 商宗 and *nongzong* 農宗 is translated as ‘mercantile system’ and ‘agriculture system’ in accordance with Yan Fu’s own notes.

²¹⁸ Which the title *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations* indicates. Further Adam Smith also often uses *general interest* or *public happiness* in accordance with *nation*.

state'; 'kingdom', is a counterpart of 'the people'; 'individuals' Adam Smith is referring to. In that way, Adam Smith is referring to the sum of individuals in the society, whereas readers of Yan Fu's translation could understand it in a sense of only the state interests. According to Benjamin Schwartz, the semantic load of *qun* 群²¹⁹ and *guo* 國²²⁰, in their most frequent usage, can hardly be divorced from their connotation of relating to state and government (Schwartz 1964:117). In our first passage concerning division of labour, Yan Fu refer to *minsheng* 民生 'people's livelihood', and even if it was not Yan Fu's intention, *guo* 國 may have, however, overshadowed *minsheng* 民生 and the readers may have understood it as merely a concern of the power of the state. This does not only concern this particular passage, however YF in general.

Regarding his principle 信-faithfulness, this passage is different from the other passages. In the earlier passages, we can see that Yan Fu has managed to preserve the main concept to some extent, with some distortions of course, but has not been faithful in *ad verbum* or *ad sensum*. Though, in this passage, as we can see from the previous discussion, he may have misunderstood the relations between the people and the state, but he has managed to preserve an *ad sensum* translation, without any particular additions or deletions.

Terminology:

In his foreword, Yan Fu presents a brief etymological explanation of the meaning of the term 'economy'. Further he presents his own translation of the term:

計學，西名葉科諾密，本希臘語，葉科此言家，諾密為聶摩之轉。此言治言計則其義始於治家。引而甲之為凡料量經紀擲節出納之事，擴而充之為邦國天下生食為用之經。蓋其訓之所苞至衆。故日本譯之以經濟。中國譯之以理財。顧必求物合。則經濟既嫌太廓，而理財又為過隘。自我作故，乃以計學富之。雖計之為義，不正於地官之所掌，平準之所書。然考往籍，會計計相計偕諸語，與常俗國計家計之稭，似與希臘之聶摩較為有合。故原富者，計學之書也。

²¹⁹ B. Schwartz translates *qun* 群 with 'social organism'.

²²⁰ B. Schwartz translates *guo* 國 with 'nation-state'.

What is now called economics in the West corresponds to what we call *jixue* ('learning of calculation') in Chinese. Etymologically economy comes from the Greek *oikonomia*, with the meanings of 'management' and 'calculation', derived from 'the management of the household'. It stems from the meaning of thrift in consumption and calculation in the process of production. It's meaning has since expanded into the planning and management of national production and expenditure. Translated into Japanese, the term 'economics' is *jingji* ('managing the nation and supplying the people'). This broad term is used to indicate the wide range of this discipline. In Chinese we translate it as *licai* ('management of finance'). Precisely speaking, *jingji* is too broad, and *licai* is too narrow; so I use the term *jixue* to denote economics. What I mean by *jixue* ('learning of calculation') is not limited to the narrow sense of 'calculation'; it refers also to the broad sense of calculation in land production, supply of and demand for food, natural resources, national accounting, etc.; it also refers to national planning, which correspond well to the original meaning of 'economy' in Greek. That is why I consider *WN* to be a book on economics (Lai 2000:27)²²¹.

As we have mentioned before, he opposes the use of Japanese loanwords, in this case *jingji* 經濟 (Jap. *keizai*), which he argues contains a wider range of meanings. The semantic background was too strong, and therefore not suitable in rendering the Western concept 'economy'. Again, he dismisses the translation *licai* 理財 because it was too narrow. *Licai* 理財 was coined by Inone Tetsujiro (1855-1944), who agreed with Yan Fu that the concept *jingjixue* 經濟學 (Jap. *kezai-gaku*) had a wider meaning than that of 'economics' (Lippert 2004:123). He then later translated the term with *licaixue* 理財學 (Jap. *rizai gaku*), and Yan Fu used this term in several articles prior to YF, in, for example *Xixue Menjing Gongyong* 西學門徑功用 written in 1895, e.g. 西洋言理財講群學者 and 西洋最要之理財一學 (Shen 2008:326). However, as we can see in his introduction to YF, he later criticised the term for being too narrow.

Yan Fu was consistent in his use of the translation *jixue* 計學 for 'economy' in his translation of *WN*. He used it in all of his translated works, but it seems it was not used by other scholars or translators. But, it appears in a few works, and according to MCST, *jixue* 計學 was mentioned in *Xinerya* 新爾雅 in 1903, used in Dai Hongci and Duan Fang's *Lieguozhengyao* 列國政要 published in 1908, listed in Huang Moxi's *Putongbaike Xindacidian*

²²¹ Translation: Cheng-chung Lai.

普通百科新大詞典 in 1911, and Karl Ernst Georg Hemeling translated the term as ‘political economy’ in his “English-Chinese Dictionary of the Standard Chinese Spoken Language and Handbook for Translators” in 1916. MCST and Wolfgang Lippert (Lippert 2004:125) states that he also uses *yekenuomi* 葉科諾密 in rendering ‘economy’ in YF, this though is slightly misleading, as he never uses it as a standard term for ‘economy’, but in his preface he uses it merely to present the Greek pronunciation *οἰκονόμος* (*oikonomos* ‘one who manages a household’) in Chinese.

In his article on the formation of the term ‘political economy’ in Japanese and Chinese, Wolfgang Lippert argues that we have to understand what ‘political economy’ means in the West before discussing the development of the term ‘economy’ in Chinese language:

‘Political economy’ was in use for a long time before the modern term ‘economics’ became the standard form. It implied some advice to the sovereign as to how economic activity should be conducted to promote ‘wealth’ and ‘welfare’ (Lippert 2004:119).

We can see from Adam Smith’s use of ‘political economy’ that ‘economy’ was not yet the standard term in 1776.

The Japanese term for ‘political economy’ is *keizai-gaku* 經濟學 (‘economy-science’), whereas the autochthonous Chinese term *zhengzhi* 政治 ‘political’ had its first appearance in 1844 in *Haiguotuzhi* 海國圖志, and combined with the Japanese loanword *jingjixue* 經濟學, forms the word *zhengzhijingjixue* 政治經濟學 (Lippert 2004:119-20). However it was not included in Lobscheids dictionary “English and Chinese Dictionary”, which indicates it was not yet an established term in late Qing China. However, as early as 1827, the term *jingji* 經濟 (Jap. *keizai*) was used in Japan by economist Sato Nobuhiro in his work *Jingjiyaolu* 經濟要略, rendering the Western term ‘political economy’ and in late Edo, it was firmly established through dictionaries (Lippert 2004:120).

Masini presents a detailed list of all books and articles published in Chinese, which includes subjects of ‘economics’ before and after 1900 (Masini 1993:183-4). MCST lists up several equivalents for ‘economy’, among them *jiejian* 節儉 and *jiansheng* 儉省 listed in Calvin W. Mateer’s dictionary “Technical Terms; Chinese and English” in 1902. In accordance with these, we can see several co-existing terms rendering ‘(political) economy’, and it indicates confusion around which term should be the standard.

The Japanese loanword *jingji* 經濟 derives from Classical Chinese literature, from *jingshijisu* 經世濟俗 and *jingshijimin* 經世濟民, but also as a contraction *jingji* 經濟, used in *Wenzhongzizhongshuo* 文中子中說 by Wang Tong (583-616) and in *Songshi* 宋史 by Wang Anshi (1021-86) (Lippert 2004:122). Later, it was borrowed to Japanese language and was associated with financial affairs and management. Liang Qichao, as we can see from earlier discussions, encouraged scholars to use Japanese loanwords, and naturally also the term *jingji* 經濟. However, as with many other neologisms that streamed into the Chinese language, readers had difficulties understanding *jingji* 經濟, especially because it had been used in China for a long time with the meaning ‘statesmanship’; ‘administration’. In several of Liang Qichao’s essays, we can observe an effort of explaining the different terminologies. In his effort of explaining *jingji* 經濟 in its new meaning ‘economy’, he lists several definitions and equivalents, such as: *fuguo* 富國學 (‘the science of how to enrich the country’), *zisheng* 資生學 (‘the science of the resources and the livelihood’), *licaixue* 理財學 (‘the science of how to put property in order’), *shangwu* 商務 (‘business affairs’), *shangxue* 商學 (‘the science of business’), *pingzhun* 平準學 (‘the science of how to keep the prices at an equal level’, obviously derived from *pingzhun* 平準法 ‘the method of equalizing’ in ancient China, a system of grain purchase that enabled the government to retail it cheaply in times of scarcity) and *shengjixue* 生計學 (‘the science of the means of existence’) (Lippert 2004:125). It was common to present definitions and synonyms for new terms, and the first dictionary of such kind was the *Xinerya* 新爾雅 published in 1903. From this dictionary we can see that neither *jingjixue* 經濟學 nor *jixue* 計學 with the meaning ‘economy’ was firmly established at that time:

論生財析分交易用財之學科。謂之計學。亦謂之經濟學。俗謂之財學

*The science treating production and analyzing exchange and the use of property is called jixue or jingjixue. Usually it is designated as licaixue*²²² (Wang; Ye 1903:37).

Despite his later effort of introducing *jingji* 經濟, Liang Qichao had previously been sceptical to the Japanese translation, and in his article in *Xinmincongbao* 新民叢報 he argues that the terminology was ambiguous, and at the same time he refers to Yan Fu's terminology *jixue*

²²² Translation: Wolfgang Lippert (Lippert 2004:125) .

計學 as unable to cover the meaning of ‘political economy’. Hence he presented the terminology *zhengzhulicaixue* 政術理財學 as a suitable translation for ‘political economy’. The terminology was debated among scholars; it was more accurate than the Japanese translation *jingji* 經濟 and Yan Fu's translation *jixue* 計學, however, with its four characters it was too long, hence difficult to combine with other words, as was more practical with *jingji* 經濟, e.g. *jingjijie* 經濟界 ‘economic circles’, *jingjishehui* 經濟社會 ‘economic society’ and *jingjiwenti* 經濟問題 ‘economic question’. It was further encouraged by scholars to search for a more “*yaxunzhiming* 雅馴之名” refined terminology in ancient books (Shen 2008:327).

As we can see, several terminologies were used to translate ‘(political) economy’ around the time Yan Fu translated WN, and, as mentioned, it may seem to be a prevailing confusion around which terms were to be the standard. However the “English and Chinese Standard Dictionary” published in 1912 lists *jingji* 經濟 and *licai* 理財 as equivalents for ‘economy’, and the term *jingji* 經濟 marks the triumph by being listed in *Shehuikexue Dacidian* 社會科學大辭典 in 1929 (Lippert 2004:126), whereas Yan Fu’s terminology *jixue* 計學 was defeated, yet again, by the Japanese loanword *jingji* 經濟.

VII. An analysis of Book 1, Chapter 8

Adam Smith discusses China in several parts of WN, noting the advantage of her large internal markets. He agrees with the early French economist François Quesnay that the market of China was not inferior to the market of Europe, but was suffering under a single sovereign (Arrighi 2009:4). Adam Smith predicted that: “an eventual equalization of power between the conquering West and the conquered non-West might finally come true” (Arrighi 2009:2). In this passage he describes China as with a developed economy and with great resources, however stationary and with a bottom stratum far exceeding Europe. The key term is ‘China’.

Adam Smith (ST), page 63-64, paragraph 22:

Of the Wages of Labour

China has been long one of the richest, that is, one of the most fertile, best cultivated, most industrious, and most populous countries in the world. It seems, however, to have been long stationary. Marco Polo, who visited it more than five hundred years ago, describes its cultivation, industry, and populousness, almost in the same terms in which they are described by travellers in the present times. It had perhaps, even long before his time, acquired that full complement of riches which the nature of its laws and institutions permits it to acquire. The accounts of all travellers, inconsistent in many other respects, agree in the low wages of labour, and in the difficulty which a labourer finds in bringing up a family in China. If by digging the ground a whole day he can get what will purchase a small quantity of rice in the evening, he is contented. The condition of artificers is, if possible, still worse. Instead of waiting indolently in their workhouses, for the calls of the customers, as in Europe, they are continually running about the streets with the tools of their respective trades, offering their service, and as it were begging employment. The poverty of the lower ranks of people in China far surpasses that of the most beggarly nations in Europe.

Yan Fu (TT), page 42, paragraph 11:

釋庸

夫支那五洲上腴，非所謂天府之國耶？民庶而非不勤，野廣而非未闢，特治不加進者幾數百千年。當蒙古為君時，義大里²²³人瑪可波羅嘗游其國，歸而以事下獄，著書紀其耕桑之業闡溢之形，其書見在，取以較今人游記之所言，殆無少異。蓋其國之政法民風，遠在元代之前富庶已極其量，而后則循常襲故，無所加前。且諸家紀述，踳駁多有，獨至指工庸之儉薄，閔生計之多艱，則如出一人之口。田事之備，撻中爬土，日出而作，晚歸得米，鼓腹酣歌，已為至足，至於雜作傭工，則方此猶劣。歐洲之傭

²²³ The edition from 1981, has written *li* 理 instead of *li* 里 as in the original.

，居肆待事，人有雇者，就而呼之。而支那之傭，則負戴作具，行唱於塗，勺人賃雇。蓋支那小民，其顛連躬²²⁴厄，雖歐洲極貧之國所未嘗聞也。

Back-translation:

Explaining wage

As for China²²⁵, it has been the most fertile²²⁶ among the five continents²²⁷, is it not the so-called country governed by heaven?²²⁸ Its people are numerous²²⁹, but none are not diligent, the fields²³⁰ are wide, but never unplowed^{231,232}, only the government alone²³³ has not progressed²³⁴ in several hundred or thousand years. At the time when Mongolia ruled, the Italian Marco Polo once²³⁵ travelled to that²³⁶ country, upon his return [to Italy] he was imprisoned²³⁷ for some matter, and wrote a book, recording the prosperous²³⁸ circumstances²³⁹ around the industry of ploughing the field and planting mulberry trees, this book still exists, [if] we take it to compare with what is said in travelogues nowadays, there is

²²⁴ The edition from 1981, has written *qiong* 窮 instead of *gong* 躬 as in the original.

²²⁵ I will discuss *Zhina* 支那 under terminology.

²²⁶ *Yu* 腴 in accordance with the original, it means ‘rich’ as in natur resources, thus I translate 腴 as ‘fertile’, which we also can see in the original. Referring to the terminology 肥美 ‘fertile’; ‘rich’.

²²⁷ *Wuzhou* 五洲 will be discussed under terminology.

²²⁸ *Ye* 耶 is similar to the modern question particle *ma* 嗎, however, slightly more rhetorical.

²²⁹ *Shu* 庶 meaning *zhongduo* 眾多 ‘numerous’.

²³⁰ *Ye* 野 can be translated as *minjian* 民間 ‘among the people’ or ‘popular’ and *yeman* 野蠻 ‘savage’. In this sentence, it is clear that it means *jiaowai* 郊外 ‘outskirts’ or *tianye* 田野 ‘field’; ‘open country’, as seen in ”左傳·僖公二十六年”:e.g. ~無青草.

²³¹ *Bi* 辟 has several meanings in Classical Chinese, e.g. *zhili* 治理 ‘administer’ as seen in ”尚書·金縢”: e.g. 我之弗~, 我無以告我先王. However, it can also mean *kaipi* 開辟 ‘open/set up’; ‘create’ seen in ”商君書·弱民”: e.g. 農~地. TLS translate it as ‘till’, and in combination with *ye* 野, ‘till’ would be a reasonable translation. Ultimately I will translate it as ‘plow’ in this sentence.

²³² The sentences 民庶而非不勤, 野廣而非未辟 are both subject predicate constructions.

²³³ *Te* 特 has several meanings, such as *gongniu* 公牛 ‘bull’, *shengchu* 牲畜 ‘livestock’ and *dandu; danzi* 單獨; 獨自 ‘alone’; ‘solely’. In this context, the latter would be accurate.

²³⁴ Referring to the modern Chinese term *jinbu* 進步 ‘progress’.

²³⁵ Referring to the modern Chinese term *zengjing* 增經 ‘once’.

²³⁶ Besides the usual genitive form, *qi* 其 can be similar to *na* 那 ‘that’, as seen in ”史記·項羽本記”: e.g. 今欲舉大事, 漿非~人不可.

²³⁷ *Yu* 獄 can mean either *guanci* 官詞 ‘official jargon’ or *jianlao* 監牢 ‘prison’. In modern Chinese *xiayu* 下獄 means to ‘imprison’.

²³⁸ *Tianyi* 闐溢 can be translated as ‘prosperous’.

²³⁹ Here I treat *xing* 形 with the translation *xingshi* 形勢 ‘situation’; ‘circumstances’ as seen in ”戰國策·秦策三”: e.g. ~弗能有也.

nearly²⁴⁰ no difference. The country's politics and law²⁴¹, and the popular ethos had attained the ultimate extent of prosperity far before the Yuan dynasty, and they as usual²⁴² followed the old routine²⁴³ as before, nothing was added to what was before²⁴⁴²⁴⁵. But all the different notes, are filled with contradictions, only when it comes to pointing at the low wage for workers and the many difficulties of making a living, it is like [what they say] comes from one person's mouth²⁴⁶. Employees in the fields, digging in the earth, when the sun comes up they work, late [in the evening] they return to receive rice, with a full stomach, they sing to their heart's content, as for those doing manual trivias, they are weak²⁴⁷ if compared with these people [who work in the field]. The employees in Europe, sit²⁴⁸ in their workshops²⁴⁹ waiting for being employed, when people needs employees²⁵⁰, they achieve²⁵¹ this by calling for them. Yet the employees in China, carry on their shoulders their work tools, walking and singing on the roads, begging people to employ them. [The life of] China's common people has hardship and personal disasters, which even in the most²⁵² poor countries in Europe never²⁵³ has been heard of.

²⁴⁰ *Dai* 殆 is according to TLS translated as 'nearly'. Several dictionaries translate it as *jinyu* 近於 'be little short of'; 'border on' as seen in "荀子·王制": e.g. 若是, 則大事~乎弛, 小事~乎遂.

²⁴¹ *Gai* 蓋 functions merely as an introductory particle in order to separate the sentences.

²⁴² *Chang* 常 and *gu* 故 are in this sentence parallel, with *chang* 常 meaning 'usual' and *gu* 故 meaning 'as before'.

²⁴³ *Xi* 襲 is translated as 'continue'; 'follow the old routine' in accordance with the preceding *xun* 循 in the sentence, as in *yinxun* 因循 seen in "史記·秦始皇本紀": e.g. 五帝不相復, 三代不相~.

²⁴⁴ This sentence is probably a translation of the original sentence ...to have been long stationary. The sentence reflects stagnation, which is what Adam Smith presents in the original.

²⁴⁵ I have encountered several problems with translating and understanding this sentence. I will present an alternative translation: *But later due to following conventions and imitating precedents, [it] has not succeed what had achieved formerly.*

²⁴⁶ I have had discussions with several specialists in Chinese language regarding this sentence. My first understanding of it was that all the different notes was filled with reflections of the chaos prevailing in China and that they all had the same views. However, the sentence standing, is in accordance with the original. Ultimately this sentence means that there were several contradictions in the many notes about China, though, they agree in one thing, namely wage and that families had difficult circumstances.

²⁴⁷ *Lie* 劣 is translated as *ruoxiao* 弱小 'weak'.

²⁴⁸ *Ju* 居 is translated as *zuo* 坐 'sit'.

²⁴⁹ *Si* 肆 is translated as *zuofang* 作坊 'workshop'. TLS defines it as "building used to produce things".

²⁵⁰ Alternatively ...needs someone to do a job.

²⁵¹ *Jiu* 就 in this context means *dadao* 達到 'attain'; 'achieve'.

²⁵² *Ji* 極 is translated as *zui* 最 'most'. TLS defines it as "intense in-relation-to all".

²⁵³ In accordance with TLS definition "enduringly:always not", *weichang* 未嘗 is translated as 'never'.

Discussion:

In the first sentence, Adam Smith introduce various descriptions of China in the past, “*long being one of the richest, most fertile, best cultivated, most industrious and most populous country in the world*”. Further, he describes it as having been long stationary. Yan Fu similarly describes China, as having been the most fertile country, but does not include ‘richest’, ‘cultivated’, ‘industrious’ or ‘populous’ as individual terms. In the second sentence, Yan Fu do refer to China as; “*...it’s people are numerous*” and “*...the fields are...never unplowed*”, preserving ‘populous’ and ‘cultivated’ from the English version. However, this sentence as a whole seems to rather correlate with the second sentence in the English version, “*it seems, however, to have been long stationary*”. It is difficult to know why he included descriptions of the situation in China; “*it’s people are numerous, but none are not diligent, the fields are wide, but never unplowed, only the government alone has not progressed in several hundred or thousand years*”. It can indicate criticism of the government and it seems that Yan Fu wants to convey to the Chinese readers that it is not the people, who are diligent, or the agriculture that is the problem, but rather the frameworks and organization of the government. Adam Smith, on the other hand, refers to the whole country, not only the government, when he says it has long been stationary. By reviewing the first sentence, Yan Fu includes “*...is it not the so-called country governed by heaven?*”. By referring to ‘heaven’, Yan Fu again draw parallels to the Chinese traditional belief in a heaven, but here it presents itself as a criticism of Chinese government. As we can see from previous discussion, he may have included *heaven* in order to present the text with associations to Chinese traditional culture, and by referring to heaven so it will be familiar to the Chinese readers. Further, by referring to “*at the time when Mongolia ruled*” and later “*...far before the Yuan Dynasty*”, he also establish the period of time in a way Chinese people can relate.

In sentence three, Yan Fu mentions that Marco Polo “*...was imprisoned for some matter*”, which is not to be found in the English version. Why he included this is difficult to decide, but what Yan Fu is referring to, must be when Marco Polo was imprisoned upon his return to Italy, in a war between Venice and Genoa. Marco Polo dictated his affairs and travels in China to his fellow inmate, who later collected a manuscript, which today is known as *The Travels of Marco Polo*, assumingly the book Yan Fu is referring to. Moreover, where Adam Smith points out in the text that the travelogues describes the situation in China in the same terms as Marco Polo, Yan Fu captures this in the end of sentence three; “*...there is nearly no*

difference". In sentence four, Adam Smith continues by stating that China had reached its highest level of riches, which the law and the institutions were permitting it to acquire. Yan Fu preserves this in sentence four, where we assume that "*nature of institution*" in the original correlate with Yan Fu's translation "*politics*". Yan Fu further explains: "...*nothing was added to what was before*". Yan Fu also preserves Adam Smith's description of the contents of the travelogues, "...*inconsistent in many respects*" or as Yan Fu puts it "...*filled with contradictions*", and agree that wages are low and in difficulties in providing their families. Further, Adam Smith describes and compares the work situation in China and in Europe, which Yan Fu also describes, however in a slightly different way. First, Yan Fu translates 'artificers' as "*those doing manual trivias*", which seems more condescending. Further, Yan Fu points out that "...*employees in Europe, sit in their workshop waiting for being employed*", however Adam Smith says that "...*[in Europe] they are waiting indolently in their workhouses, for the calls of the customer*". Yan Fu is then referring to the occupation of waiting to be employed, whereas Adam Smith is referring to the occupation of waiting for customers. However, both agree that people in Europe are waiting in order to be occupied. Lastly, there is a slight difference in the description of Chinese people methods in seeking employment, where Adam Smith compares the Chinese people's way of employing themselves with begging employment, however Yan Fu says that the Chinese people's way of employing themselves is to beg.

Regarding Yan Fu's principles, his 信-faithfulness to this particular passage is preserved in conveying the main concept of the English version, namely a stationary China. However, with several details added without any relations to the English version, we can argue he was not 信-faithful in a traditional view. But according to his definition, additions were allowed, and by his own vague definition of the principle, one may say he was 信-faithful. Regarding 達-comprehension, Yan Fu's translation clearly conveys the situation in China, and by adding cultural associations it may have been easier for the Chinese readers to understand. But again, if 達-comprehension is to add information in order to convey the text as more understandable, we may say it is on the expense of 信-faithfulness, which makes it clear that the two principles are not complementary, as Yan Fu states. But, as mentioned, additions were allowed, and then in accordance with his own definition, it preserves also 達-comprehension.

Terminology:

In history, several terminologies have been used to translate ‘China’, such as *Tanguo* 唐國, *Han* 漢 (*dahan* 大漢, *hantu* 漢土, *handi* 漢地), *Qin* 秦, *Huaxia* 華夏, *Jiuzhou* 九州, *Wuzhou* 五洲, *Shenzhou* 神州, *Zhina* 支那 and *Zhongguo* 中國. It has naturally experienced topographical changes – domestic disturbance and dynastic changes has influenced the understanding of ‘China’ as a country and as a term. Further, dynasties wanted the term ‘China’ to be identifiable with their own dynasty and era. As we can see in the preceding passage, Yan Fu employs the terminology *Zhina* 支那 to translate ‘China’. Regarding *Zhina* 支那, Joshua A. Fogel points out:

“[*Shina*] (Jap. *Shina*, Ch. *Zhina* 支那) is not a dynastic name, not a synecdoche and definitely not a Japanese-origin term” (Fogel 1995:67).

In Japan, from Meiji period until 1945, *Zhina* 支那 was the term most commonly used to translate ‘China’. The term is believed to derive from Sanskrit rendering of *qin* 秦, and different characters have been employed to write *Zhina*, an indication that the characters 支 and 那 did not have any significant meaning. It has earlier been used in translations of Buddhist scriptures, and a Chinese Buddhist monk translated the term as ‘a nation of culture’. In 1713, Arai Hakusei reintroduced the term in Japan, and it has been argued that it came from Italian and Dutch²⁵⁴ pronunciation of ‘China’ (Fogel 1995:68). The term was not known in China at that time, and in 1877, on his trip to Japan, Huang Zunxian expressed that he had never seen the term before and guessed it derived from European languages²⁵⁵ (Fogel 1995:74).

In modern times, the term has become derogatory, however when it was reintroduced in Japan, it had no such connotations, and functioned as a neutral term (Fogel 1995:69). By Chinese people, however, the term was with time perceived as negative. Several Japanese scholars defended the term, as being a generic toponym for ‘China’, in contrast with the term *Zhongguo* 中國 ‘the central kingdom’. An example of such discussion took place in the Japanese newspaper *Asahi shinbun* 朝日新聞 in 1952. Chinese scholars argued back, that whenever they saw the two characters *Zhina* 支那, they saw Japanese imperialism and that

²⁵⁴ Through *rangaku*, dutch study.

²⁵⁵ Where he, in some way, was right.

the Japanese pronunciation *Shina* was similar to *shinu* ‘to die’. Further, 支那 has been explained to mean ‘thing’ or ‘item’, as well as meaning ‘control them’ with *zhi* 支 meaning ‘control’, and *na* 那 as a grammatical third person. Liu Shengguang argued in *Asahi shinbun* 朝日新聞 that:

“I can say with certainty that this expression [shina/zhina 支那] absolutely does not appear in Chinese writings” (Fogel 1995:72-74).

He is clearly wrong in his statement – along with Yan Fu, many other important intellectuals at the turn of the 20th century used the term, such as Liang Qichao, Zhang Binglin, and Wu Zhihui, which indicate that the term was neutral at that time. In 1911, *Zhinayu* 支那語 was listed in Huang Moxi’s 普通百科新大詞典 as translation of ‘Chinese language’, and in 1913 *Zhina* 支那 was listed in Evan Morgan’s “Chinese New Terms and Expressions” as translation of ‘China’.

As we can see, Yan Fu also uses *Wuzhou* 五洲, which is an old expression for *shijie* 世界 ‘world’. According to *Hanyudacidian* 漢語大詞典, different meanings has been appointed to *Wuzhou* 五洲 throughout Chinese history, however originally being a reference to central China.

CONCLUSION

Wealth of Nations attracted Yan Fu's attention – his goal was to guide China out of stagnated development to a new path towards wealth and power, and WN was to serve as a mirror for China's potential, and as a cure for her unfortunate situation. In Yan Fu's translation, he met ample contradictions with the ideology of the Chinese society at the time, and it seems that his gospel of Adam Smith's economic theories did not harvest any success in late Qing China. He met a sceptical audience among the intellectuals of late Qing, among them Liang Qichao, who did not agree that the economic concepts of WN could be beneficiary for China. 'Laissez faire', 'free competition', 'material gain' and 'self-interest' contradicted the conservative Confucian ideology of that time China. In this thesis, we have tried to discover the reasons why the spread of YF in late Qing China was not successful.

Terminology

Regarding his terminology, as we can see from the back-translations, he often used terms unknown, or at least not firmly established in the Chinese language. Further, in several instances, his terminology does not reflect the original concepts of WN, such as *mucai* 母財 rendering the Western term 'capital'. His quote 一名之立，旬月踟躕 “*to formulate one single term took weeks and months of consideration*” reflects the effort and concentration he put into the translation of terms. However, he rather coined his own incomprehensible terms without further explanation, such as the phonetic term *banke* 版克, rendering the Western term 'bank', and resisted usage of Japanese terms and established terms. Yan Fu attempts to portray the concepts of WN through his body of terminology, but when the terminology was that difficult to grasp, the concepts were, and still often are, scarcely understood. The Japanese terms were more easily comprehended and ultimately defeated the *Yanyi* 嚴譯 'Yan-translations', which may also have been a personal defeat for Yan Fu.

Yan Fu was meticulous in his coining of terminologies, but not many survived the import of Japanese terminologies. In contrast with many of his contemporaries who preferred to use Japanese terminologies, he argued that they were not accurately conveying its concept, and opposed the use of several established Japanese terms. If we return to our main example of *yong* 庸, we notice that Yan Fu used this character for 'wage', instead of the Japanese term

gongzi 工資, which is still the standard in modern Chinese. This also is the case, with Yan Fu's translation *wujing* 物競 'free competition' versus *ziyoujingzheng* 自由競爭; *mucai* 母財 'capital' versus *ziben* 資本; *zhihua* 治化 'civilisation' versus *wenming* 文明 and *jixue* 計學 'economy' versus *jingji* 經濟. So why did the Japanese terminology triumph over Yan Fu's terminology? First of all, Yan Fu preferred to use *danzi* 單字 'single-character terms', which are common in Classical Chinese, as opposed to Japanese *liangzici* 兩字詞 'two-character terms'. However, after the Vernacular Movement (1917-1919), *liangzici* 兩字詞 'two-character terms' were perceived as more comprehensible (Cf. Yan Fu's *da* 達!). Secondly, his translation methods, principles and written style may have limited him – his observation of Chinese characters was indeed profound, but the original semantic domain of the Chinese characters may have restricted him in coining terms. Even though Japanese language was heavily influenced by Chinese language, the Japanese translators could boldly reform the original meaning of the Chinese characters. Moreover, Japanese translators did not have to consider such principles or translation methods as those of Yan Fu. All in all, we can with certainty conclude that the Japanese terminology has highly influenced Chinese language, and if Yan Fu had employed it, one may allege that his translation of WN could have had a wider range of readers, used to the terminology and well versed in the semantic fields of the Japanese equivalents.

***Translation Principles xindaya* 信達雅**

His translation methods and principles *xindaya* 信達雅, have been discussed in general in Part One, and in Part Two we have tried to show that he has not been faithful as in a traditional *ad verbum* or *ad sensum* translation. One might argue that single elements of *xindaya* 信達雅 contradict each other, but in Yan Fu's definition they were thought to be complementary. According to his own definition of 信-faithfulness – following his quotes – deletions, additions and rewriting of the original text were necessary, and, in this way, his translations were in general "free translations", as he says. Hence he defined a 信-faithful translation as the opposite of what we at the outset might presume, namely a *free translation*. In all likelihood, Yan Fu, a translator by profession, was aware of the traditional definition of translation, where faithful translation was the opposite of free translation. But following his

reasoning of a 信-faithful translation, one may doubt his own understanding on how to translate. By implementing the principles in the translated passages, he has somehow managed to preserve 信-faithfulness – by conveying the main concept of the original as a whole, and by rewriting the text and adding or deleting information he has preserved principles in framework of his own definition. However, in this context, and if we stick to the definition of ‘faithful’ as a translation in the more general usage of this term, we may question whether Yan Fu has the power to neglect topics he personally does not regard as significant or create principles with definitions opposite to the common tradition, and still adhere to a principle of faithfulness. It is, surprising, then, that he employs the term *xin* 信 as he does – it is not the same as we might expect ‘faithful’ to signify from the outset. We can safely say that his brand of faithful translation is somewhat peculiar. He believed he had the power to choose what was relevant for China at that time, and the readers of YF were served Western theories and concepts influenced by Yan Fu’s own understanding of them, which was, indeed, not always correct. Naturally, deletions can be made in order to convey the general essence in a more clear way, however, Yan Fu must be said to have exceeded the appropriate level of abbreviation, and the pursuit of reduction came at the expense of the original meaning, which is also asserted and noticed by several scholars (Hu 2002:64).

I have argued that his principles, especially *ya* 雅-elegance, may be justified and applicable in translation of fictional material with descriptive language, but not to that degree in a translation of theoretical economic material with mostly a precise, technical analytical language, because of the condensed style of Classical Chinese. His language is highly descriptive, and not as analytical as in the English version, and it may seem he has been restricted by his own principles and written style, so that the more precise language of the English WN, as well as many analytical aspects, have been lost in the translation. Further, I have suggested applying the principles after the text is translated, functioning merely as an evaluation.

If he were not faithful to the text, that is, in the broader and general sense of this term, was he then a betrayer, and then of what values? The concepts and meaning of the original, or to the sentence structure? To be faithful is ultimately a question of definition, whether it is *ad verbum* or *ad sensum*, or merely a translation corresponding and participating in the semantic relationships by retaining an overall textual meaning. In the end, it may be more accurate to address Yan Fu’s translation YF as an interpretative or an adaptive translation, where WN

functions more as a source of inspiration for the work that he presents as his translation.

Written Style

Yan Fu was highly influenced by archaic language of earlier classics, but his contemporaries, as well as modern scholars, have criticized his language as being incomprehensible. Yan Fu blamed the level of difficulty in the arguments and the logic of the material he translated, and not his written style or language. Further, he states that his translation was aimed at the intellectuals of late Qing who were proficient in Classical Chinese, and not for the “school children”. In a time when Vernacular Chinese became more common, Classical Chinese was still used for all official business, and in that way he reached out to his intended audience, the literary elite of the Chinese society. Further, I have also argued that Yan Fu used Classical Chinese language in order to reduce the opposition to Western learning, and he employed the principles of Chinese culture as a foundation reinforced with Western concepts. He concealed unfamiliar Western concepts behind familiar, traditional Chinese language and terminology in order to reach out to the people who made the decisions in the Chinese society. He states in his preface that many of the Western ideas could in fact have their origin in China, and his characteristic style of Classical Chinese was his way of *guyiyouzhi* 古已有之, an attempt of familiarizing Western “barbarian” economic concepts in a conservative and traditional Chinese society. But in this process he seems often to have lost so much of the intended meaning of Adam Smith that his aims were badly served.

The language of YF, as we can see from the discussion and quotes in Part One and in the translations in Part Two, is very demanding. Due to the difficult translations, and that it is not always clear what Yan Fu really wanted to convey, it has been necessary in the back-translations to interpret what he really meant through my own understanding of the text. Several of the passages are notoriously difficult to understand, but I have tried to capture the nuances of the terminologies to the best of my ability, by employing several dictionaries and databases. Besides the difficult written language, it has been complicated to back-translate also because of the additions, where there is no equivalent passage in the original to compare it.

As mentioned, literary Chinese language of late Qing is difficult to understand, and the hybrid language of Yan Fu, his own personal style of *wenyan* 文言, sometimes does not conform to common rules of grammar and syntax of Classical Chinese. It is difficult to know whether Yan Fu's written style belonged to some kind of subgenre of *wenyan* 文言 prevalent at the time and in the environment in which he worked. In order to categorize a specific written language or style, it requires certain criteria of syntax and grammar, and many of his sentences do not follow any common explicit syntax of Chinese, providing assistance to us as to how we should read his sentences. Yan Fu frequently attempts to copy the style of quite archaic literary Chinese material, giving the text an often quite heavy and impenetrable register, at times somehow impossible to follow.

To the extent that the back-translations are a faithful (in a general sense, and not in the Yan Fu sense) and literal rendering of Yan Fu's Chinese version, it becomes visible to what degree Yan Fu may or may not have understood the concepts of WN. Passage I is very freely translated, and he does not clearly grasp that the effects of the division of labour, is the greatest improvement in the productive powers of labour. Further, he may not have understood three important terms, namely 'skill', 'dexterity' and 'judgment'. In passage II, he has understood and explains clearly the main concept of 'self-interest', but he translates the main term 'self-interest'; 'self-love' with *si* 私 'selfishness', hence distorting Adam Smith's main intention of a constructive self-interest of an individual, benefiting the society as a whole. The same applies to his reference to *ziyingzhichong* 自營之蟲 'self-seeking insect' in the same context. In passage III, it seems that Yan Fu does not firmly grasp the roles of the town-corporations and the king, where Adam Smith discusses that they both attempt to reduce free competition. In passage IV, Yan Fu has difficulties in understanding Adam Smith's reference to 'those who live by wages', which is reflected in his use of *yonglü* 庸率 'wage rate' and *yong* 傭 'employee' as two individual terms. Further, he has failed to preserve in his translation that the demand for labour force cannot increase without the state capital first increasing. In passage V, Yan Fu presupposes that if wealth shall increase, the "legislation should be suitable", which is not found in the original. Further, he states that the reason that there are many poor countries and few wealthy countries is because of excessive squandering of people, not conveying the intended meaning of Adam Smith. Moreover, he uses the term *mucai* 母財 in rendering 'capital', and without any further explanation of this somewhat obscure neologism, readers may indeed have misinterpreted this important term. In passage

VI, Yan Fu does not preserve the independence of the individual, where Adam Smith states that the two branches of political economy both stands for enabling the people to provide for themselves. Further, Yan Fu does not clearly describe Adam Smith's perception of the relations between the people and the state, which may have been influenced, not to say polluted, by the semantic domain of *guo* 國 'state'. Hence the two political economic systems may be understood as merely a state concern, and not for the people. In passage VII, Yan Fu states that it is not the people or agriculture that is the problem for the lack of development in China, but rather the frameworks and organization of the government. Adam Smith, on the other hand, refers to the whole country, not only the government, when he says China has long been stationary.

As we can see, Yan Fu has managed to capture some of the main concepts, though he may have misunderstood essential factors contributing in understanding Adam Smith's philosophy as a whole. In the end there are too many distortions.

Additions and Deletions

According to Cheng-chung Lai, Yan Fu only translated 50-60% of WN. Yan Fu states in his preface that he omitted certain sections of WN, but it becomes clear in my back-translations that he also added information. Several of the translated passages are even longer than those of in the English version. Comparing the length of pages of Classical Chinese text with an English text or later translations written in Vernacular Chinese is indeed dubious, mostly because of the short and condensed style of Classical Chinese, where one character may express several words in English. But it is obvious that Yan Fu has deleted several sentences or sections from the original. I have argued that one cannot base the length on number of pages, but rather comparing sentences and the text as a whole, after one has translated the text.

Yuanfu Today

When WN is discussed on a general basis in modern China, scholars refer to it as *Guofulun* 國富論, which is the title of all the later Chinese translations of WN, and never *Yuanfu* 原富. This ultimately indicates that Yan Fu's translation of WN may have been forgotten in terms

of being an economic classic. I would dare the conclusion that this is due to the difficult and isolated terminology created by Yan Fu, his style of translation, and the lack of clarity of Adam Smith's arguments in the Chinese garb made for them by Yan Fu. During my work on the text, I have experienced that YF is definitely a difficult work to understand, and translate – in this case back-translate – since Yan Fu's coined terminologies are ambiguous and contains nuances and meanings very difficult to decipher. And since his characteristic approach and translation methods are difficult to understand, and may lack in precise definition, it is quite clear that YF is a text that should be discussed further. In this thesis, we have back-translated only a small part of this historically important text, but collecting knowledge from Chinese historical scientific texts for the use in modern academia, there is all reason that we should continue to study and discuss the contents and language of YF on a large scale with the aim of understanding the processes of Westernization of modern China.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Alleton, Viviane (2001), *Chinese Terminologies: On Preconceptions*, in Lackner et al. 2001:15-35

Arrighi, Giovanni (2009), *Adam Smith in Beijing: Lineages of the Twenty-First Century*, London: Verso

Baker, Mona (1998), *Routledge Encyclopedia of Translation Studies*, London: Routledge

Butler, Eamon (2011), *The Condensed Wealth of Nations; and the Incredibly Condensed Theory of Moral Sentiments*, UK by ASI (Research) Ltd. [access date: 03.08.2011
<http://adamsmith.org/files/condensed-WoN.pdf>]

Chan, Lung Jan (2003), *Norms in the Chinese Translations of Adam Smith's The Wealth of Nations (1776)*, master thesis, University of Birmingham

Chen, Yingnian (1982), *Jindai Ribensixiangjia Zhuzuo Zai Qingmozhongguo de Jieshao he Chuanbo* 近代日本思想家著作在清末中國的介紹和傳播 (*The Introduction and Diffusion of Works by Modern Japanese Thinkers in Late-Qing China*), Renmin Chubanshe

Chu, Cindy Yik-Yi; Mak, Richard K.S. (2003), *China Reconstructs*, University Press of America

Fogel, Joshua A. (1995), *The Cultural Dimension of Sino-Japanese Relations: Essays on the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, Armonk, N.Y.: M.E. Sharpe

Gao, Mingkai; Liu, Zhengtan (1958), *Xiandai Hanyuwailaici Yanjiu* 現代漢語外來詞研究 (*Studies of loanwords in modern Chinese*), Beijing: Wenzhi Gaige Chubanshe

Guo, Dali; Wang, Yanan (1936), *Guofulun* 國富論 (Translation of *Wealth of Nations*), Shanghai: Zhonghuashuju, Minguo

Hu, Peizhao (2002), *Dangbian "Yuanfu" yu "Guofulun"* 當辨“原富”與“國富論” (*Distinguishing "The Origin of Wealth" and "The National Wealth Theory"*)

[access date:11.06.2010 <http://wenku.baidu.com/view/d4ca946925c52cc58bd6beb2.html>]

Huang, Fuqing (1975), *Qingmo Liurixuesheng* 清末留日學生 (*Chinese Students in Japan in Late Qing Period*), Taipei: Zhongyang Yanjiu Yuan, Jindai Shi Yanjiu Suo

Huang, Ko-wu (2003), *The Reception of Yan Fu in Twentieth-Century China*, in Chu et al. 2003:25-44

Lackner, Michael; Amelung, Iwo; Kurtz, Joachim (2001), *New Terms for New Ideas; Western knowledge & Lexical Change in Late Imperial China*, Leiden; Brill

Lackner, Michael; Vittinghoff, Natascha (2004), *Mapping Meanings; The Field of New Learning in Late Qing China*, Leiden; Brill

Lai, Cheng-chung (2000), *Adam Smith Across Nations: Translations and Receptions of The Wealth of Nations*, New York: Oxford University Press.

Lippert, Wolfgang (2004), *The Formation and Development of the Term 'Political Economy' in Japanese and Chinese*, in Lackner et al. 2004:119-128

Liu, Lydia H. (1995), *Translingual Practice: Literature, National Culture, and Translated Modernity – China, 1900-1937*, Stanford, California: Stanford University Press

Liu, Xiaomei (2006), *A Comparative Study of Yan Fu's XinDaYa and three Western Translation Theories: Possible Implications to Document Translation*, master thesis, The University of Queensland.

Masini, Federico (1993), *The Formation of the Modern Chinese Lexicon and its Evolution Towards a National Language: The Period from 1840 to 1898*, Berkeley: Journal of Chinese Linguistics Monograph Series

Niu, Yangshan; Sun, Hongni (1990), *嚴復研究資料 (Research materials of Yan Fu)*, Fuzhou: Haixiawenyi Chubanshe

Pellin, Tommaso (2004), *The Influence of the Contemporary Social Background on the Coinage of Technical Lexicons. The Case of the Lexicon of Political Economy in 19th Century China*, in Temmerman et al. 2004:153-163

Pi, Houfeng (2000), “Yuanfu” de Fanyi yu Chuanbo – jianyu Laijian Jiaoshouhangque “原富”的翻譯與傳播 – 兼與賴建誠教授商榷 (*The Translation and Spread of “The Origin of Wealth” – Discussions of Professor Jian Cheng*)

[access date:06.2000 http://ccs.ncl.edu.tw/Chinese_studies_18_1/18_1_15.pdf]

Pollard, David E. (1998), *Translation and Creation: Readings of Western Literature in Early Modern China*, Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company

Qiang, Li (1993), *The Social and Political Thought of Yen Fu*, Ph.D diss., Univeristy of London

Reynolds, Douglas R. (1993), *China, 1898-1912: The Xinzheng Revolution and Japan*, Harvard University Press

Schwartz ,Benjamin (1964), *In Search of Wealth and Power: Yen Fu and the West* , The Belknap Press of Harvard University Press

Shen, Guowei (2008), ”一名之立、旬月踟躕’之前之后—嚴譯與新國語的呼喚 (*Before and After "Deliberating for Weeks to Establish a Single Term": Yan Fu's Translations and the Call for a New National Language*), Kansai University

<http://www.icis.kansai-u.ac.jp/data/journal01-v1/journal01-23-shen.pdf>

Shen, S. (2000), *論信達雅：嚴復翻譯理論研究 (Discussion of XinDaYa; The Study of Yan Fu's Translation Theory)*, Taipei: Taiwan Commercial Publishing House.

Sisley, Joy (1999), *Power and Interpretive Authority in Multimedia Translation*, in Soukup et al. 1999:203-218

Soukup, Paul A.; Hodgson, Robert (1999), *Fidelity and Translation; Communicating the Bible in New Media*, Sheed & Ward

Sutherland, Kathryn (2008), *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Adam Smith (1776), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Tan, Ruqian (1985), *中日之間譯書事業的過去，現在與未來 (Translation Work from Chinese into Japanese, and from Japanese into Chinese: Past, Present and Future)*.

Introduction of Tan Ruqian, comp., pp37-117, Hong Kong: Institute of Chinese Studies, The Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Temmerman, Rita; Knops, Uus (2004), *NS3 The Translation of Domain Specific Languages and Multilingual Terminology Management*, St. Jerome Publishing

Trescott, Paul. B (2007), *Jingji Xue: The History of the Introduction of Western Economic Ideas into China, 1850-1950*, The Chinese University Press

Wang, Binbin (2005), *近代中文詞匯與日本的關係*, Xiandai Chubanshe

<http://www.douban.com/group/topic/5561604/>

Wang, Lawrence Wang-chi (2004), *Beyond XIN DA YA 信達雅*, in Lackner et al. 2004:239-265

Wang, Rongbao; Ye, Lan (1903), *新爾雅 (The new Erya)*, Shanghai: Mingquanshe

Wang, Y.C (1966), *Chinese Intellectuals and the West, 1872-1949*, University of North Carolina Press

Wright, David (2001), *Yan Fu and the Task of the Translator*, in Lackner et al. 2001:235-257

Yan, Fu (1898), *Tiyanlun 天演論 (Theory of Evolution)*, Shangwu Yinshuguan

Zhang, Zhidong (1898), *勸學篇 (Exhortation to Learn)*, Taipei: Wenhai Chubanshe

Dictionaries and databases:

漢語大字典 (1997), Hubei Cishu Chubanshe

古漢語常用字字典 fourth edition (2005), Huayu Jiaoxue Chubanshe

漢語外來詞詞典 (1985), Shangwu Yinshuguan

新詞語大詞典 (1978-2002) (2011), Shanghai: Cishu Chubanshe

漢語大詞典 (2001), Hanyu Dacidian Chubanshe

中文大辭典 (1973), Zhonghua Xueshuyuan

同義詞詞林 (1985), Shanghai: Cishu Chubanshe

漢典 <http://zdic.net/>

Harbsmeier, Christoph, <http://tls.uni-hd.de/> Thesaurus Linguae Sericae (An Historical and Comparative Encyclopaedia of Chinese Conceptual Schemes) (TLS)

Lackner, Michael; Amelung, Iwo; Kurtz, Joachim,
http://mcst.uni-hd.de/search/searchMCST_short.lasso Modern Chinese Scientific Terminologies (MCST)

Lobscheid, William (1903), 華英音韻字典集成 (*Commercial Press English and Chinese Pronouncing Dictionary*), Commercial Press

APPENDICES:

1. Faksimile of passage I, II, III, IV, V, VI and VII (the passage translated will be marked with red arrows)
2. Yan Fu's introduction to *Yuanfu*
3. Wu Rulun's foreword to *Yuanfu*

原富部甲上

英倫斯密亞丹原本

侯官嚴復幾道翻譯

篇一

論分功之效

天下之常言曰民生在勤然則力作者將斯人所定於天之分而無可逃者歟雖然均力作矣其得效則此多而彼少其致力則此益疾益巧而彼常拙常遲其故果安在也曰其事首判於功之分不分

功以分而收效益多此民生日用之中所在在可見者也顧其效於小工作易見於大製造難知小工作所居之地狹所用之人寡所作之事不繁可一覽而盡也至於大製造則不然其所仰給者非一塵之肆能所辦也往往取輪於甲求輿於乙衡軫蓋樟各異其地攬而聚之而後成車其功之分難以見也故欲明分功之有益力作

論分功交易相因為用

功分而生財之能事益宏其事非俟聖人起而後為之施設也非前知其能生財而後分之若此也蓋起於不得已焉夫人生而有群天與之以有欲其所以養此欲者求之一人之身不能備也則其勢必取於相資是故交易之事國而有之其利鈍繁簡各視其進化之深淺為差獨至禽獸則雖最靈者不能兩狗之逐兔也一角之一犄之有相資之用焉願其事起於適然各逐其欲而偶有合非相為約而各任其一事也鳥不相易蟲遠不相易果蓋易者必先有此彼之分此彼之分禽獸未嘗有也故交易之事惟人為能且禽獸之得食也於其類則以爭強者得之不問其誰屬也其於人則以媚搖尾磻舌伏身帖耳幸主人之已悅分其餒以果腹焉人之有求於其類也媵阿卑伏曲體順旨與禽獸同術者固有之矣然而不可常用也生夫群之中蓋無時焉不待無數人之我供而後足使必俟悅我者則竭畢生之精力所結而相驢者能幾人哉雖欲用禽獸之術自給豈有不能夫吾既常有求於群而他人之

惠養又不足恃。吾將何所恃以奉吾生乎。曰：恃天下之各恤其私而已矣。人自營之，蟲也。與自營之蟲謀其所奉我者，是非有以成乎其私，固不可也。市於屠，酷於肆，糴乎高廩者之家，以資吾一殮之奉，非曰屠肆高廩者之仁有足恃也。恃是三者之各恤其私而已。入日中之市，而與蚩蚩者爲易也。意皆曰：與我彼，吾與若是，是之於若，方彼之於若，爲有贏也。則市之人皆歆之矣。此吾所以奉吾生者也。今夫無所易而受人之惠養者，蓋有之矣。行句是也。然而無所易者，其一而有所易者多也。受財物於仁人，而是財物者不能適如其所求也。方舉是以與市人爲易，飢所食寒所衣，風雨所庇覆，皆必易焉而後得之。則固與不句者同也。然則交易者，固人道所不能外也。

有質劑，一謂相易以約者。有交易，一謂相易以物者。有買賣，一謂以財爲易者。而生事以供，亦有是三者而分功以著。射獵游牧之民，其中有善爲弓者，善爲矢者，以其弓矢易他人之禽獲牛馬，如是而得，方之自獵自牧之得爲多，則彼將終於

損益而計之則富國之道在費力省而成貨多一業縱損乎固合群之人有待於是業者之益也人之自爲業者一而有待於他成之業者不翅百故使舉國之業而皆去徒限是人勉一損而受百益也所益不亦大耶

是故工聯之設本旨無他所以固其業之物競蓋物競既興市價將跌市價跌則庸與贏自趨薄也歐洲業聯之制始皆城邑之民所自爲無關君上之事獨英倫民設業聯必待上令而後立此非以惠小民禁并兼實亦陰斬其權以之賸利已耳是故凡業欲聯貨賂朝行制可夕下從此罔利不爲犯科其無所入貲而私自爲者乃號奸聯私會然雖覺察不必廢也但令歲納縱容之稅則其聯自若凡一地之工商業聯皆總而屬諸其地之鄉聯鄉聯尊於諸聯所立之規制約束有考察之權或許或禁鄉聯得主之不必國君也

案凡約聯壟斷之事皆於本業有大利而於通國有大損若總其全效則貨棄於地者亦已多矣且其事必絕外交而後可使其國已弱力不足以禁絕外交而他

Passage IV:

事而有餘。資生有餘者。如田主債主與凡有財者之家。自隱其歲入。以贍一家之經費。有餘。則或全或分。將斥此餘以益收僮指其益之爲事。與餘之爲數。有相待者焉。自然之勢也。資事有餘者。無待之工。如織工如鞣匠。自隱其歲入。以購材具。食有餘。則將斥此餘以益雇傭夥。其益之爲事。與餘之爲數。有相待者焉。又自然之勢也。是故欲庸率之長。必俟求傭者多。欲求傭者多。必俟通國歲入積畜之益進。而歲入積畜進者。國財舉多也。然則庸率之進退。與國財之增減。猶影響之於形聲。國財不增。而求庸率之進者。猶却行而求前也。↑

然有不可不辨者。庸之進退。不關其群之貧富。而以國財增長之舒疾爲差。故雖在至富之國。其力役之庸。不必優獨勃興之國。方富之群。其庸率爲最大。如徒以富厚言。則居今之時。一、一千七百七十三年。一、吾英自優於北美。願在美之庸。乃遠過之。奴約郡中常庸日三先令六便士。在此爲二先令也。船匠日十先令六便士。益酒一升。值六便士。在此爲六先令六便士也。木作塲工日八先令。在此爲四先令六便士。

治化既進，則物價全出於功力者少，而兼之以租與息利者多。故通國之所歲登較之原用之功力，所贏倍蓰，繼乃更以所贏食工役墾荒地，轉滯財，交相資以殖其貨。則歲歲之出，皆進乎前。數稔之間，法宜大富，而民生大舒。然而不能者，則害富之事衆也。國有無名之費，而積畜者不盡爲母財，有些情游手之民，而食積畜者不盡有所出，而奇袤虛耗，一切無所贏之爲作，又無論已。此天下之所以富國少而貧國多也。大抵勤惰愚智之民，相待之比例率，國財之盈不足，與物產之廉貴恆視之。

篇七

論經價時價之不同。

都市民業不齊，而各業之中，功力之庸，與母財之息利，皆有常率。此其多寡饒儉之殊，由其群之有貧有富，其治之有進境，有中立，有退行，與其所治生業情形之互異。庸息如此，惟租亦然，係於民群之貧富與治化之進退矣。而其地勢之遠近夷險，與地方之豐瘠，又主之是故，一時一地庸租息常率者，生於理勢之自然，非人意所能。

原富部丁上

引論

計學者制治經國之學之一支其所講求者二一曰足民食次曰富國用計學之所求在君民各足而已世異民殊國之進於富厚者各異故言計學者有二宗焉而皆以足民為本曰商宗曰農宗二者皆予所欲明辨而詳言者則請先言商宗蓋商宗差晚出而吾黨英人事效當前易明曉耳

案斯密氏計學界說如此而後人病其渾僥著論說者希復用之今計學界說曰計學者所以窮生財分財用財之理也其於義進矣而名學家病其所用生分用三名之多歧義則又曰計學者所以講鼓功被物而與易值之力理者也進而彌精非明格致者未易猝解矣蓋斯密氏所標即用明旨本非界說正門其所以為



英倫斯密亞丹原本

侯官嚴復幾道翻譯



Passage VII:

那可以見矣。夫支那五洲上腴，非所謂天府之國耶？民庶而非不勤，野廣而非未闢。特治不加進者，幾數百千年。當蒙古爲君時，義大里人瑪可波羅嘗遊其國，歸而以事下獄。著書紀其耕桑之業，聞溢之形。其書見在，取以較今人遊記之所言，殆無少異。蓋其國之政法民風，遠在元代之前，富庶已極其量，而後則循常襲故，無所加前。且諸家紀述，踏駁多有，獨至指工庸之儉薄，閔生計之多艱，則如出一人之口。田事之傭，梓爨爬土，日出而作，晚歸得米，鼓腹酣歌，已爲至足。至於維作傭工，則方此猶劣。歐洲之傭，居肆待事，人有雇者就而呼之，而支那之傭，則負戴作具，行唱於塗，白人賃雇，蓋支那小民，其顛連窮厄，雖歐洲極貧之國所未嘗聞也。粵東附郭窮黎，牽舟作屋，不下數千萬家，名曰蜃戶，其生事至微，有西人船至，則環船而伺，幸其棄殘，江中爭相撈食，狗豕猫腊，半敗生蛆，苟得分沾，即同異味嫁娶無節，而好孕惡育，例不舉兒，都會棄孩，每夕多有，或以溺殺如豚犬然。此天下至極殘忍之事，而其國有公操其業以爲生者。

譯事例言

計學西名葉科諾密。本希臘語。葉科此言家。諾密爲聶摩之轉。此言治言計則其義始於治家。引而申之爲凡料量經紀樽節出納之事。擴而充之爲邦國天下生食爲用之經。蓋其訓之所苞至衆。故日本譯之以經濟。中國譯之以理財。願必求脗合。則經濟既嫌太廓。而理財又爲過陋。自我作故。乃以計學當之。雖計之爲義。不止於地官之所掌。平準之所書。然考往籍。會計計相計借諸語。與常俗國計家計之稱。似與希臘之聶摩較爲有合。故原富者。計學之書也。

然則何不徑稱計學。而名原富。曰從斯密氏之所自名也。且其書體例。亦與後人所撰計學。稍有不同。達用多於明體一也。匡謬急於講學。二也。其中所論如部丙之篇。二篇三部戊之篇五。皆旁羅之言。於計學所涉者寡。尤不得以科學家言例之。云原富者。所以察究財利之性情。貧富之因果。著國財所由出。云爾。故原富者。計學之書。而非講計學者之正法也。

謂計學創於斯密此阿好者之言也。夫財賦不爲專學其散見於各家之著述者無
論已。中國自三古以還若大學若周官若管子孟子若史記之平準書貨殖列傳漢
書之食貨志桓寬之鹽鐵論降至唐之杜佑宋之王安石雖未立本幹循條發葉不
得謂於理財之義無所發明。至於泰西則希臘羅馬代有專家而斯密氏所親承之
師友若庚智命若特嘉爾若圖華尼若休蒙大闢若哈哲孫若洛克若滿特斯鳩若
麥庚斯若柏祗其言論警咳皆散見於本書而所標重農之旨大抵法國自然學會
之所演者。凡此皆大彰著者也。獨其擇焉而精語焉而詳事必有微理無臆設而文
章之妙喻均智頑則自有此書而後世知食貨爲專科之學此所以見推宗匠而爲
新學之開山也。

計學於科學爲內籀之屬。內籀者觀化察變見其會通立爲公例者也。如斯密理嘉
圖穆勒父子之所論著皆屬此類。然至近世如耶方斯馬夏律諸書則漸入外籀。爲
微積曲綫之可推而其理乃益密。此二百年來計學之大進步也。故計學欲窺全豹。

於斯密原富而外。若穆勒、倭克爾、馬夏律三家之作，皆宜逐譯，乃有以盡此學之源流。而無後時之歎。此則不佞所有志未逮者。後生可畏。知必有廣續而成之者矣。計學以近代爲精密，乃不佞獨有取於是書，而以爲先事者。蓋溫故知新之義。一也。其中所指斥當軸之迷謬，多吾國言財政者之所同然。所謂從其後而鞭之二也。其書於歐亞二洲，始通之情勢，英法諸國舊日所用之典章，多所纂引，足資考鏡。三也。標一公理，則必有事實爲之證喻。不若他書，勃窣理窟，潔淨精微，不便淺學。四也。理在目前，而未及其時。雖賢哲有所不見。今如以金爲財，二百年以往，泰西幾無人不然。自斯密出，始知其物爲百貨之一，如博進之籌，取前民用無可獨珍。此自今日觀之，若無甚高之論。難明之理者，然使吾輩生於往日，未必不隨俗作見，並爲一談也。試觀中國道咸間，計臣之所論議施行，與今日朝士之言通商可以悟矣。是故一理既明之後，若揭日月而行，而當長夜漫漫，習非勝是之日，則必知幾之神，曠世之識，而後與之。此不獨理財之一事然也。

由於以金爲財。故論通商。則必爭進出差之正負。既斷斷於進出差之正負。則商約隨地皆荆棘矣。極力以求抵制之術。甚者或以興戎。而不悟國之貧富。不關在此。此亦亞東言富強者所人人皆墜之雲霧。而斯密能獨醒於二百年以往。此其所以爲難能也。

爭進出差之正負。斯保商之政。優內抑外之術。如雲而起。夫保商之力。昔有過於英國者乎。有外輸之獎。有掣還之稅。有海運之條例。凡此皆爲抵制設也。而卒之英不以是而加富。且延緣而失美洲。自斯密論出。乃商賈亦知此類之政。名曰保之實則困之。雖有一時一家之獲。而一國長久之利。所失滋多。於是翕然反之。而主客交利。今夫理之誠妄。不可以口舌爭也。其證存乎事實。歌白尼奈端之言。天運。其說所不可復搖者。以可坐致數千萬年過去未來之躔度。而無杪忽之差也。斯密計學之例。所以無可致疑者。亦以與之冥同則利。與之外馳則害故耳。

保商專利諸政。既非大公至正之規。而又足沮遏國中商業之發達。是以言計者群

然非之非之誠是也。然既行之後，欲與更張，則其事又不可以不謹。蓋人心浮動而身被之者，常有不可追之災故也。已真母本不可復收一也。事已成習，不可猝改二也。故變法之際，無論舊法之何等，非計新政之如何利民，皆其令朝願民夕狼顧，其目前之耗失，有萬萬無可解免者。此變法之所以難，而維新之所以多流血也。悲夫！言之緣物而發者，非其至也。是以知言者慎之。斯密此書論及商賈，輒有疾首蹙額之思。後人釋私平意觀之，每覺所言之過。然亦知斯密時之商賈，爲何等商賈乎？稅關屯棧者，公司之利也。彼以謀而沮其成，陰嚇七年之戰，戰費既重，而印度公司所待以楮柱其業者，又不訾。事轉相因，於是乎有北美之戰，此其害於外者也。選議員則購推舉，議權稅則賂當軸，大壞英國之法度，此其害於內者也。此曹顧利否耳，何嘗恤國家乎？又何怪斯密言之之痛也。雖然此緣物之論也。緣物之論，所持之理，恒非大公。世異情遷，則其言常過。學者守而不化，害亦從之。故緣物之論，爲一時之奏，割可爲一時之報章可，而以爲科學所明之理，必不可。科學所明者，公例，公例必無

時而不誠。

斯密於同時國事，所最爲剽擊而不遺餘力者，無過印度之英公司。此自今日觀之，若無所過人者。顧當其時，則英公司之輝赫極矣。其事爲開闢以來所未曾有。以數十百處污逐利之商旅，際蒙兀之積弱，印民之內訌，克來福一豎子耳，不數年間，取數百萬里之版圖，大與中國並者，據而有之。此亞烈山大所不能爲，羅馬安敦所不能致，而成吉思汗所圖之，而無以善後者也。其驚駭震耀各國之觀聽者，爲何如乎？願自斯密視之，其驢非驢，馬非馬，上焉旣不能臨民以爲政，下之又不足懋遷而化居，以言其政令，則魚肉身毒之民，以言其龍斷，則侵欺本國之衆徒爲大盜，何裨人倫，惟其道存，故無所屈。賢哲之言論，夫豈發於一時功利之見，而爲依阿也哉。嗚呼，賢已。

然而猶有以斯密氏此書爲純於功利之說者，以謂如計學家言，則人道計羸慮虧，將無往而不出於喻利，馴致其效，天理將亡，此其爲言厲矣。獨不知科學之事，主於

所明之誠妄而已。其合於仁義與否。非所容心也。且其所言者計也。固將非計不言。抑非曰人道止於爲計。乃已足也。從而尤之。此何異讀兵謀之書。而訾其伐國。覩鉞砭之論。而怪其傷人乎。且吾聞斯密氏少日之言矣。曰。今夫群之所以成。群未必皆善者。棧也。飲食男女。凡斯人之大欲。即群道之四維。缺一不行。群道乃廢。禮樂之所以興。生養之所以遂。始於耕鑿。終於懋遷。出於爲人者寡。出於自爲者多。積私以爲公。世之所以盛也。此其言。藉令褒衣大袂者聞之。不尤掩耳而疾走乎。則無怪斯密他日之悔其前論。戒學者以其意之已遷。而欲燬其講義也。

原富本文。排本已多。此譯所用。乃鄂斯福國學頒行新本。羅哲斯所斟酌者。羅亦計學家。著英倫麥價考。號翔臆。多發前人所未發者。其於是書。多所注釋。匡訂。今錄其善者。附譯之。以爲後案。不佞間亦雜取他家之說。參合已見。以相發明。溫故知新。取與好學深思者。備揚權討論之資云爾。

是譯與天演論不同下筆之頃。雖於全節文理。不能不融會貫通爲之。然於辭義之

間無所偵到。坳益獨於首部篇十一釋租之後。原書旁論四百年以來銀市騰跌。文多繁贅。而無關宏旨。則概括要義。譯之。其他如部丁篇三首段之末。專言荷京版克。以與今制不同。而所言多當時瑣節。則刪置之。又部甲後。有斯密及羅哲斯所附一千二百二年至一千八百二十九年之倫敦麥價表。亦從刪削。又此譯所附中西編年及地名人名物義諸表。則張菊生比部鄭稚辛孝廉於編訂之餘。列爲數種。以便學者考訂者也。

夫計學者。切而言之。則關於中國之貧富。遠而論之。則係乎黃種之盛衰。故不佞每見斯密之言。於時事有關合者。或於己意有所裨觸。輒爲案論。丁甯反覆。不自覺其言之長。而辭之激也。嗟乎。物競天擇之用。未嘗一息亡於人間。大地之輪廓。百昌之登成。止於有數。智佼者既多取之而豐。愚懦者自少分焉而瘠。豐瘠之際。盛衰係之矣。且人莫病於言非也。而相以爲是。行禍也。而相以爲福。禍福是非之際。微乎其微。明者猶或熒之。而況其下者乎。殆其及之而後知。履之而後艱。其所以失亡者。已無

藝矣。此予智者罟獲陷阱之所以多也。欲違其災舍窮理盡性之學其道無由而學矣。非循西人格物科學之律令亦無益也。自秦愚黔首二千歲於茲矣。以天之道舟車大通。通則雖欲自安於愚無進於明其勢不可。數十百年以往吾知黃人之子孫將必有太息痛恨於其高曾祖父之所爲者。嗚呼可不悲哉。

光緒二十七年歲次辛丑八月既望嚴復書於輔自然齋。

序

嚴子既譯亞丹氏所著計學書名之曰原富俾汝綸序之亞丹氏是書歐美傳習已久吾國未之前聞嚴子之譯不可以已也蓋國無時而不需財而危敗之後爲尤急國之庶政非財不立國不可一日而無政則財不可一日而不周於用故曰國無時而不需財及至危敗財必大耗欲振厲圖存雖財已耗愈不能不用故曰危敗之後尤急中國士大夫以言利爲諱又怙習於重農抑商之說於是生財之途常隘用財之數常多而財之出於天地之間往往遺棄而不理吾棄財不理則人之睨其旁者勢必攘臂而并爭於是財非其財吾棄財不理而不給於用則仍取給於隘生之途途益隘而取益盡於是上下交瘁而國非其國財非其財國則危敗之形立見危敗之形見而不思變計則相與束手熟視而無如何思變矣而不得所以變之方雖終日搶攘徬徨交走賊愕而卒無分毫之益中國自周漢到今傳所稱理財之方其高者則節用而已耳下乃奪民財以益國用已耳奪民財以益國用前所謂

取給於隘生之途是矣。此自殫之術也。節用之說施之安甯之世。能使百政廢缺不舉。而財聚留於不用之地。施之危敗之後。則節無可節。廢缺者不舉。而亦無可聚留。循是不變。是坐自困也。所爲變之之方者。何也。取財之出於天地之間者。條而理之。使不遺棄而已矣。取財之出於天地之間者。條而理之。使不遺棄。非必奇材異智而後能也。然而不痛改諱言利之習。不力破重農抑商之故見。則財且遺棄於不知。夫安得而就理。是何也。以利爲諱。則無理財之學。重農抑商。則財之可理者少。夫商者財之所以通也。農者生財之一途也。閉財之多途。使出於一。所謂隘也。其勢常處於不足。尙何通之可言。古之生財之途博矣。博而不通。則壅。故商興焉。禹之始治水也。旣與益稷。予衆庶稻。及他根食矣。又調有餘。補不足。懋遷化居。以通之。是商與農並興。驗也。專農一途。故不需商也。禹於九州田賦。旣等而次之。至其貢筐。則皆所鮮。所多。相通易之物。凡畋之所獵。漁之所獲。虞之所出。工之所作。升人之所職。舉財之出於天地之間者。無不財取爲用。夫是故勸商。其每州之終。必紀諸水。貢輸則皆商旅。

所以通之路也。是安有重農抑商之謬論乎。禹之理天下之財至纖悉不專農如此。而升利尤遠。蓋荆揚之金三品。至周而猶盛。故詩曰大賂南金。及漢武而後乃稍衰。歇。史公有言。豫章黃金。取之不足更費。其證也。然上溯神禹時已二千年矣。禹之興升利如此。又據九州水道推論之。使神禹生今時。其從事於今之路礦。可意決也。况乃處危敗之後。則若周宣之考室。衛文之通商。惠工。駮牝三千。蓋皆奉神禹爲師法。而可以利爲後而諱言之乎。今國家方修新政。而苦財賂衰耗。說者願謂五洲萬國。我爲最富。是貧非吾患也。而嚴子之書適成於是時。此亞丹氏言利之書也。願時若不滿於商。要非吾國抑商之說。故表而辨明之。世之君子。儻有取於西國計學家之言乎。則亞丹氏之說具在。儻有取於中國之舊聞乎。則下走所陳。尙幾通人財幸焉。

光緒辛丑十一月桐城吳汝綸