

Two Voices in One

Two Voices in One:
Essays in Asian and Translation Studies

Edited by

Laurence K. P. Wong,
John C. Y. Wang and Chan Sin-wai

**CAMBRIDGE
SCHOLARS**

P U B L I S H I N G

Two Voices in One: Essays in Asian and Translation Studies,
Edited by Laurence K. P. Wong, John C. Y. Wang and Chan Sin-wai

This book first published 2014

Cambridge Scholars Publishing

12 Back Chapman Street, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE6 2XX, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2014 by Laurence K. P. Wong, John C. Y. Wang, Chan Sin-wai and contributors

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (10): 1-4438-5832-3, ISBN (13): 978-1-4438-5832-8

CONTENTS

Preface	vii
Acknowledgements	xi
There's a Word for It—Or is There?	1
Stuart H. Sargent, Stanford University	
Translating a Chinese Garden: Texts and Images from the Kangxi Emperor's <i>Imperial Poems on The Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat</i>	7
Richard E. Strassberg, University of California, Los Angeles	
“Multiflorate Splendour”: A Commentary on Three English Translations of Scene 10 of <i>The Peony Pavilion</i>	23
John C. Y. Wang, Stanford University	
Sitting with Sima Qian: Recollections of Translating the <i>Shiji</i> (1988–2011)	47
William H. Nienhauser, Jr., University of Wisconsin	
From the Page to the Stage: Translating Wordplay for the Eye and Translating Wordplay for the Ear	89
Laurence K. P. Wong, Hong Kong Academy of the Humanities	
Translation Technology on the Fast Track: Computer-Aided Translation in the Last Five Decades.....	105
Chan Sin-wai, The Chinese University of Hong Kong	
Learning Chinese Expressions through Translation	151
Chaofen Sun, Stanford University	

Problems in Translating “Circulatory” Terms from Aristotle’s Greek and Mencius’ Chinese: <i>pistis</i> “persuading/being persuaded” and <i>zhì</i> 治 “governing/being governed” in English	159
Douglas Robinson, Hong Kong Baptist University	
Contributors.....	175

PREFACE

In looking back upon the development of translation studies over the past decades, in attending international academic conferences, or in reading monographs and collections of essays by translators and scholars of translation studies, we can easily become aware of the highly complex nexus that binds together translation and translation studies on the one hand and a host of other disciplines on the other. We see, for example, translation and translation studies linked to comparative literature, cultural studies, linguistics, semiotics, philosophy, politics, and sociology in titles of books and journal articles as well as in the various themes that organizers of conferences come up with every year. Of the more common academic fields or disciplines, however, Asian Studies is less often associated with translation or translation studies. When the Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong and the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Stanford University jointly organized an international conference on “Translation and Asian Studies” in 2011, the theme of the conference may have appeared unusual. One may even have asked: “How can Asian Studies and Translation or, for that matter, Translation Studies be yoked together?”

The answer to the above question can be found in the entry “East Asian Studies” in *Wikipedia*:

East Asian Studies is a distinct multidisciplinary field of scholarly enquiry and education that promotes a broad humanistic understanding of East Asia past and present. The field includes the study of the region’s culture, written language, history, and political institutions. East Asian Studies is located within the broader field of Area studies and is also interdisciplinary in character, incorporating elements of the social sciences (anthropology, economics, sociology, politics, etc.) and humanities (literature, history, film, etc.), among others. The field encourages scholars from diverse disciplines to exchange ideas on scholarship as it relates to the East Asian experience and the experience of East Asia in the world. In addition, the field encourages scholars to educate others to have a deeper understanding of, and appreciation and respect for, all that is East Asia and, therefore, to promote peaceful human integration worldwide.¹

¹ *Wikipedia*, 1 August 2013.

The entry shows that East Asian Studies encompasses an extremely wide range of disciplines, each of which can be studied alongside translation or translation studies. In view of the multidisciplinary nature of translation studies, therefore, Asian Studies, which covers an even wider scope than East Asian Studies, chimes in naturally with translation studies both at the international conference held two years ago and in the title of this collection of essays, truly reflecting the current trend in the field.

What are the advantages, one may ask, of letting the two distinct voices chime together? To answer this question, let us switch to non-figurative language. First, by looking closely at Asian Studies, a translator or a scholar of translation studies can sharpen his or her awareness of the various issues involved in translation. Second, by establishing a close relationship between Asian languages and Asian cultures on the one hand and translation and translation studies on the other, translators and scholars of translation studies can branch out into many new areas in theoretical terms as well as in terms of practice.

In comparison with *Style, Wit and Word-Play: Essays in Translation Studies in Memory of David Hawkes* and *The Dancer and the Dance: Essays in Translation Studies*, two companion volumes published also by Cambridge Scholars Publishing in 2012 and 2013 respectively, *Two Voices in One: Essays in Asian and Translation Studies* contains fewer papers. However, with their new perspectives, these papers are as interesting as those contained in the two volumes published earlier, marking the satisfying completion of three years of international collaboration between the Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, first with the Centre for Translation and Comparative Cultural Studies, University of Warwick in 2008, then with the Institute for Chinese Studies and China Centre, Oxford University in 2010, and finally with the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Stanford University in 2011.

Complementing each other in the larger context of Asian and translation studies, the papers cover a wide range of topics, some of which have rarely been touched upon before.

In “There’s a Word for It—Or Is There?” Stuart Sargent, while introducing us to the fascinating world of snuff bottles, tells us the intriguing story of how he grappled with a translation problem that “reared its yellow-ochre head” several years ago, and how, after going back to the pre-fossilization period, he zeroed in on “sparrow brains.”

Equally intriguing is Richard Strassberg’s “Translating a Chinese Garden: Texts and Images from the Kangxi Emperor’s *Imperial Poems on The Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat*.” In this paper, the

author not only takes us on a “guided royal tour” of a resort which was off limits to the Emperor’s subjects, but also shows us how “[a]n important garden in China [...] involved several acts of translation.”

In “ ‘Multiflorate Splendour’: A Commentary on Three English Translations of Scene 10 of *The Peony Pavilion*,” John Wang, with his sensitive and meticulous analysis of three versions of what “is generally considered one of the greatest *chuanqi* 傳奇 plays ever written in China,” transports us back in time, to a period before the Kangxi Emperor was born, when, “[from] dream returning, orioles coil[ed] their song / through all the brilliant riot of the new season / to listener in tiny leaf-locked court.”

Travelling even further back in time, to the Han Dynasty, William Nienhauser, Jr. tells us how he and his team went about a truly international project, the sheer magnitude of which is sufficient to take our breath away. His paper, entitled “Sitting with Sima Qian: Recollections of Translating the *Shiji* (1988–2011),” is valuable and interesting not only from the point of view of translation and translation studies, but also from the point of view of East Asian Studies and Chinese history.

Like Nienhauser’s paper, Laurence Wong’s, entitled “From the Page to the Stage: Translating Wordplay for the Eye and Translating Wordplay for the Ear,” also focuses on translation in practice, though certainly not on the breathtaking scale described by Nienhauser. Referring to everyday examples as well as examples taken from Shakespeare’s *Hamlet*, the author discusses the various issues involved in translating the untranslatable.

While Stuart Sargent, Richard Strassberg, John Wang, William Nienhauser, and Laurence Wong are making excursions into the world of the humanities in connection with translation and translation studies, Chan Sin-wai is doing something different. In “Translation Technology on the Fast Track: Computer-Aided Translation in the Last Five Decades,” he shows us, with ample convincing evidence, at what tremendous speed computer-aided translation has been developing since 1967, so much so that, after reading the paper, one becomes inclined to replace the phrase “on the Fast Track” in the title with the words “at the Speed of Fibre Optics.”

In “Learning Chinese Expressions through Translation,” Chaofen Sun, from the perspective of a linguist and language teacher, looks at translation as a tool for language-teaching. Giving examples that are both entertaining and instructive, he convinces us that even literal translation, a translation technique that appears to have little to commend it, has a role to play in language-teaching. With a teacher who can put literal translation to good use, all is grist to his mill.

Grist to Douglas Robinson's mill is philosophy. In "Problems in Translating 'Circulatory' Terms from Aristotle's Greek and Mencius' Chinese: *pistis* 'persuading/being persuaded' and *zhi* 治 'governing/being governed' in English," the author sees a relationship between two great philosophers who used two widely different languages more than two thousand years ago to get their ideas across, and argues his case cogently, moving freely between two cultures.

In view of its many unique features, *Two Voices in One*, then, is not just another run-of-the-mill collection of essays in translation studies haphazardly put together. On the contrary, it is one that contains new tones, new chords, and new melodies: it is a collection with a difference.

Laurence K. P. Wong, John C. Y. Wang, Chan Sin-wai
May 2014

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

In going over the manuscript of *Two Voices in One: Essays in Asian and Translation Studies*, we cannot resist the temptation to replay in our minds fond memories of the International Conference on “Translation and Asian Studies,” jointly organized by the Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong and the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Stanford University and held in the spring of 2011 on the campus of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, to which the volume owes its conception.

We say “fond memories,” not only because the conference was a great success, but, more importantly, also because we received encouraging support from many colleagues and friends, without which “success” would have remained a fond hope. We would, therefore, like to express our gratitude once again to Professor Joseph Sung, Vice-Chancellor of The Chinese University of Hong Kong, who came to address the conference despite his busy schedule; to Professor Hsiung Ping-chen, then Dean of the Faculty of Arts, who kindly hosted a dinner in honour of all the participants; to Professor Philip Leung Yuen Sang, current Dean of the Faculty of Arts, who was supportive from beginning to end; to Professor Chaofen Sun, then Chair of the Department of East Asian Languages and Cultures, Stanford University, who did so much to bring about the collaboration between two departments of two fine universities; and to all the distinguished scholars who presented papers at the conference.

We are equally appreciative of the support we received from academic and non-academic colleagues in the Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, with whose dedication we were deeply impressed. We would like to thank, in particular, Ms. Rosaline Chan, Ms. Florence Li, Ms. Miranda Lui, and Mr. Andy Liu, who always set themselves high standards when it comes to ensuring the success of the Department’s conferences.

Miranda must be mentioned twice. Working closely with us in preparing the manuscript of *Two Voices in One*, she has become an expert on *The Chicago Manual of Style* and proved exceptionally efficient in spotting typographical errors lurking in the jungle of words, waiting in ambush to pounce on us. For her meticulous formatting and proofreading

as well as for her always reliable co-ordination, let us say a second warm “Thank you!”

As in the past two years, we owe Ms. Carol Koulikourdi and Ms. Amanda Millar of Cambridge Scholars Publishing a debt of gratitude for their efficiency and professionalism.

Finally, we would like to thank Cambridge Scholars Publishing for its acceptance of our book proposal, thereby recognizing the close but not often noticed relationship between two important disciplines: Asian and Translation Studies.

Laurence K. P. Wong, John C. Y. Wang, Chan Sin-wai
May 2014

THERE'S A WORD FOR IT—OR IS THERE?

STUART H. SARGENT

DEPARTMENT OF EAST ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
STANFORD UNIVERSITY

The market for Chinese snuff bottles has remained robust through the recent stumbles of the world economy. At the first auction of the massive Mary and George Bloch collection of Chinese snuff bottles, on 29 May 2010, a Chinese real-estate tycoon broke the world bidding record for an enamel-on-copper snuff bottle by successfully bidding HK\$9,280,000 on one; on 28 November 2010, the same individual set a new record price for a porcelain snuff bottle, HK\$8,384,000, for a waisted-gourd-shaped snuff bottle with a painted and moulded gourd-and-vine design on the surface. Of course, there were cheaper bottles, down in the five figures (four figures in US\$), but I did not attend these auctions, nor did I telephone in a bid. My participation was as an editor, researcher, and translator. It was I who edited the snuff-bottle descriptions, which had been written in English over the span of a dozen years by Hugh Moss (a well-known dealer and collector who has lived mostly in Hong Kong since the 1970s); and it was I who translated them into Chinese.

In the course of this work, I was obliged to deal with the English term *root amber*. This term is mildly problematic in English insofar as we know now that roots have nothing to do with the colourful striations in the material. It is far more problematic for the translator into Chinese, however, because it designates a variety of amber for which there appears to be no stable Chinese term. It is as if Chinese curators and collectors do not recognize root amber as a discrete type of amber requiring a name. Anyone who works with kinship terms in Chinese and English will recognize this problem of having specific terms in one language and only general terms in the other. I can *tell* you that Helen is my father's younger sister, but English does not give me an economical *term* for that relationship: I can refer to Helen as "my aunt," even "my paternal aunt," but beyond that I have to use lots of words to explain what the formal and informal Chinese terms *gumei* 姊妹 and *xiao guma* 小姑媽 tell you in two

or three syllables. Chinese who come into contact with a root-amber snuff bottle can *see* what the material looks like (just as *I know* whether Helen is older or younger than my father, even if the vagueness of English might suggest that it does not really matter), and they have words to describe root amber, but is there a *word* for amber that looks like this? If not, of course, one has the option of just using the general Chinese term *hupo* 琥珀. But it happens that there is a Chinese term that was reported in the nineteenth century as a term for root amber, and there are other terms that current texts apply to root amber—as well as other kinds of amber. How I sorted through these options and came to the conclusion that *my* Chinese language shall have a word for root amber is the topic of this little essay.

The problem reared its yellow-ochre head in lot 128 of the first Bloch auction (http://www.e-yaji.com/auction/photo.php?photo=157&exhibition=1&ee_lang=eng). Hugh Moss's description of the material reads, "Slightly variegated, opaque yellow-ochre, and transparent reddish-brown amber (of the variety known as 'root amber')." His commentary adds, "The material that we have come to know as 'root amber' has been put to delightful use in this unique bottle, giving the variations in colour a major role in the design"; and "This bottle may be assigned to a small group of irregular, sculptural, root-amber snuff bottles, probably dating from the mid-Qing period, whose members are always spectacular."

The term *root amber* derives from the fact that this kind of amber was once believed to have been created by resin mixing with earth around the tree roots before the process of fossilization began. As we just mentioned, that theory has been debunked by now. Thus, Moss's caption shows a careful progression from treating *root amber* as a conventionally agreed-on name that may not be literally accurate (hence the quotation marks) to a simple, unmarked adjectival use of the phrase.

The Chinese term that was reported in the nineteenth century as apparently applying to this type of amber is *quena* 雀腦 (sparrow brains). *Sparrow-brain amber* might have been an option in English, if *root amber* is essentially a misnomer, but Moss decided to use *root amber* anyway because, as he explains in the print catalogue of the Bloch collection under no. 1575,¹ the name is well established among collectors and dealers—and *sparrow brains* is "not the most romantic of terms."

So, "root amber" it is—in English. But in translating into Chinese, I elected to use *quena*, romantic or not. It should be noted that there is no literal equivalent of *root amber* in Chinese, although the term comes from

¹ Hugh M. Moss, *A Treasury of Chinese Snuff Bottles: The Mary and George Bloch Collection*, vol. 7 (Hong Kong: Herald International Ltd., 2009).

a Chinese belief that the roots of pine trees were involved in the genesis of the material, as we shall see in a moment. Here is my rendition of Moss's description of the material: *hupo, bu touming xiong huang se yu touming tuo hong se xiangjian* (“*quenaο*” *hupo*). 琥珀，不透明雄黃色與透明雌紅色相間（“雀腦”琥珀）。In this first mention of the term, I used quotation marks to signal that the term was novel. In the commentary, I dropped the quotation marks: *Diao jiang qiaomiao de liyong le quenaο hupo de banwen lai goucheng tu'an*. 雕匠巧妙地利用了雀腦琥珀的斑紋來構成圖案。And in translating the final sentence quoted above from Moss, I simply referred to “sparrow-brain snuff bottles”: *Ben hu shuyu yi xiao pi de bu dingxing diaosu xing de Qing zhong qi quenaο biyanhu, shi zhi jie shuangxin yuemu*. 本壺屬於一小批的不定形雕塑性的清中期雀腦鼻煙壺，視之皆爽心悅目。

It is unusually difficult to determine whether *quenaο hupo*, let alone *quenaο biyanhu*, will be understood by the Chinese reader. The latter term should have included the “amber,” I now recognize: *quenaο hupo biyanhu*. But even with that correction, the term will probably seem strange to most readers. As far as I can determine, the sole place where *sparrow brains* is associated with amber is a work on snuff and snuff bottles by Zhao Zhiqian 趙之謙 (1829–1884), a calligrapher and painter of some importance. In his *Yonglu xianjie* 《勇廬閒話》,² Zhao states that “*yi zhong za song gen zhe, cheng quenaο*. 一種雜松根者，稱雀腦” (amber mixed with pine root is called “sparrow brains”). Many works on snuff bottles and the materials from which they are made allude to this passage, sometimes mentioning Zhao Zhiqian's authorship, sometimes not; sometimes quoting him verbatim, sometimes paraphrasing him in modern Chinese. But while this gives the impression that *sparrow-brains amber* is a universally recognized and accepted term, one never finds it actually used by dealers, collectors, and museums.

Google searches are one tool I use to determine whether a term is in actual use (or has contemporary meanings that muddy the waters, which, for example, discourages the use of *yingshi* 硬石 to translate *hardstone*, as *yingshi* has already been co-opted to translate the Hard Rock Cafe name, perhaps because *Fengkuanɡ Yaogunyue Canting* 瘋狂搖滾樂餐廳, though it would correctly identify the international chain's theme as rock and roll, not mineralogy, is way too long). One problem with searching for *quenaο* in Google or any other large universe of texts is that actual sparrow brains

² Zhao Zhiqian, *Yonglu xianjie* 《勇廬閒話》, *Congshu jicheng* 叢書集 edition, (rpt.; Beijing: Zhonghua Book Company 中華書局, 1985), 8.

are used in Chinese medicine, and it is very difficult indeed to find any occurrences of *quenaο* that are not in medical recipes; the relatively few occurrences related to amber are the sorts of quotations of Zhao Zhiqian mentioned above—and these quotations function only to give the appearance of knowledge, never in the context of any identification of an actual artifact as being made of sparrow-brains amber.

The same is true of *Duxiu* 讀秀, a database of over two million monographs and journals that is often the first place I search, no matter what kind of information I am looking for. If one searches *Duxiu* for 雀腦 and 琥珀, not as a phrase but with a space between them, well over 250 hits are returned. However, one will be very, very discouraged: all of them except a very few are from medicinal texts. (Because both amber and the brains of sparrows had medicinal uses, the two terms will appear in hundreds of medical books, but not in the same sentence.)

A web site I use very frequently to educate myself on descriptive terminology for art objects (let me admit here that most of my research throughout my career has been in Song poetry, not handicraft arts, so I am constantly learning new terms) is the Taiwan e-Learning & Digital Archives Program at <http://catalog.digitalarchives.tw/dacs5/System/Hotkey/Hotkey.jsp>. Unfortunately but tellingly, the term 雀腦 does not occur on this site. These digital archives do contain a snuff bottle made from this kind of amber, but the record simply says it is amber and describes the colour: *hupo, bu touming hong he se*. 琥珀，不透明紅褐色。 Only by looking at the picture at <http://catalog.digitalarchives.tw/dacs5/System/Exhibition/Detail.jsp?OID=1465022> does one realize that the variegated colour marks it as root amber (or sparrow-brains amber, if you will). How does one find this bottle if the caption does not include the key term? The archives have a stepped-search function, so one can enter 琥珀 first, then search for 煙壺 within those results. Of the nine amber snuff bottles returned by the search, the eighth and ninth are obviously of the “sparrow brains” type, both variegated in colour and opaque. In the case of the ninth bottle, a special term is used for the amber, but it is not “sparrow brains” or “root amber.” We shall turn to this other term next, but for now we can conclude that the experts at the National Palace Museum in Taiwan have no specific term for what Western collectors call “root amber”: amber is amber.

The museum's caption to the ninth bottle identifies the material as *mila* 蜜臘 (beeswax), adding that this is (a kind of?) amber. One may hesitate to accept this identification, for *mila* and amber are treated as distinct stones. More seriously, if one goes through a series of objects identified as

mila, it appears that the term has no stable referent or definition. In the digital archives in Taiwan, for example, a search for 蜜臘 returns forty-eight objects of very different colours and degrees of translucency. If one eliminates the numerous rosary beads, one ends up with six objects carved from materials that vary widely in colour and translucency. A search for 蜜蠟, the same term written with a different character, produces similar results, with the addition of two snuff bottles that clearly imitate beeswax. The term *amber* does not figure in the captions for these objects. Conclusions: (1) *mila* is not properly used as a term for our sparrow-brains amber; and (2) the term *mila* itself is being misapplied in many, if not most, of the archives' captions.

The *Hanyu da cidian* 《漢語大詞典》 tells us that *mila* 蜜臘 is “of the same kind” as amber but is lighter in colour, which would be consistent with the two snuff bottles with the waxy yellow colour that are identified as *mila* in the digital archives. (Both belong to the National History Museum, whose captions are generally devoid of any detail in my experience, but in these two cases the identifications of the material have the virtue of being consistent with each other and convincing as descriptive of the material's properties.) The *Hanyu da cidian* asserts that *mila* is also called *jinpo* 金珀, but the digital archives in Taiwan use this term for only two objects in the Palace Museum that are a translucent reddish brown and for a string of court necklace beads of similar colour that are described as *jin huang se touming de hupo* (ji *jinpo*) 金黃色透明的琥珀 (即金珀) (translucent golden yellow amber (i.e., *jinpo*)).

Neither of these terms, then, is consistently associated with a particular kind of fossilized tree resin, nor have I found any source that even suggests that either one of them refers to the same material as “root amber” or “sparrow brains.”

These attempts to find a term that is actually used in the contemporary Chinese-speaking world for root amber have failed. Unless I want to resort to the general term *amber*, I must turn to Zhao Zhiqian for guidance; he described the material that concerns us, and he said it had a name. I elect to use that term, *quena*, and expand it to *quena hupo* for clarity.

The role of the translator in creating new words or reviving old ones is well recognized in the history of the development of modern Chinese. Some terms that came back into the language from Japanese brought new meanings that had been adopted by the Japanese to translate Western concepts, such as *zongjiao* 宗教 or *shehui* 社會. In this case, I do not think one could say I am giving the term a new meaning; I am simply restoring a meaning it reportedly had in the nineteenth century. The only alternative, I

fear, would be to write *bu touming xiong huang se yu touming tuo hong se xiangjian de hupo* or something like it every time one wanted to refer (in Chinese) specifically to this kind of amber. At the same time, of course, I am urging that other terms that have been used to refer to this type of fossilized tree resin in present “expert” discourse need to be replaced by “my” term: *mila* and *jinpo* need to be reserved for other specific materials.

It is odd to be “laying down the law” for a language I have yet to achieve complete mastery in, even after nearly a half-century of effort. But I have not made up the term *quenao*; I have simply taken Zhao Zhiqian at his word that the term was used for this kind of amber in his century and have proposed that the term be used, therefore, where it is needed in our century.

TRANSLATING A CHINESE GARDEN:
TEXTS AND IMAGES
FROM THE KANGXI EMPEROR'S
*IMPERIAL POEMS ON THE MOUNTAIN ESTATE
FOR ESCAPING THE SUMMER HEAT*

RICHARD E. STRASSBERG
DEPARTMENT OF ASIAN LANGUAGES AND CULTURES
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

Gardens are not normally perceived as incorporating acts of translation, yet some can be fruitfully understood in this way. In the past, some gardens in the West that were inaccurately called “Chinese,” “Japanese,” or “Asian” are nowadays recognized as adaptations where intercultural elements have been incorporated within the native idiom. Similarly, Western elements included in traditional Chinese gardens, as in some Lingnan-style gardens, may also be read as citations where the vocabulary of one stylistic language has been translated into another. Even today, when Chinese gardens are being built outside China with a high degree of authenticity in design, materials, and construction methods, acts of translation are still required to conform to modern building codes and usages, though these changes may not always be visible.¹

An important garden in China that involved several acts of translation was the original *Bishu Shanhuang* 避暑山莊 (Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat) that was built by the Qing Dynasty emperor Kangxi 康熙 (r. 1661–1722). Its design was a transformation of the Han Chinese literati garden of Jiangnan into a new form of a northern, imperial palace-garden that was suitable for a ruler who wished to combine the best of Manchu and Chinese cultures. When Kangxi decided to represent this garden in poems and prose, he published a book in both Chinese and

¹ See T. June Li, ed., *Another World Lies Beyond: Creating Liu Fang Yuan, the Huntington's Chinese Garden* (San Marino, California: Huntington Library, 2009).

Manchu versions. The accompanying illustrations in this book were woodblock prints that were translations of a set of paintings or drawings by a court artist. These were rendered again by an Italian missionary into European-style copperplate engravings. Some sets of these engravings made their way to the West with the original Chinese text replaced by captions added in Italian or Latin. Subsequently, some of these engravings were reengraved and published with the captions translated into English. Such multiple acts of translation of the Mountain Estate are indicative of the distinctive, multi-cultural nature of Qing court culture as well as of the character of the extraordinary ruler who was critical in defining it. The transmission of these images abroad also reflects an earlier phase of globalization as China and the West began to interact more closely through trade and cultural exchanges.²

The Mountain Estate is located in modern Chengde 承德, Hebei 河北 some 150 miles north of Beijing in what was originally a largely uninhabited area bordering Mongolia and Manchuria. The site of the estate comprises a plateau surrounded by scenic mountains and hills with abundant water from a river, hot springs, clean air, and refreshing breezes in summer. It was originally the location of one of a series of lodges and campsites where Kangxi and his entourage stopped over on their way to the annual autumn hunt at Mulan 木蘭 one hundred miles further north. Kangxi began building the Mountain Estate in 1703, and from 1708 until the end of his life, he typically spent about half the year here, from April to October or early November, before returning to Beijing. Subsequently restored and expanded by his grandson, the Qianlong 乾隆 emperor (r. 1735–1796), it has suffered several periods of neglect and destruction over the centuries and has recently undergone a substantial reconstruction that is continuing. Today, it occupies about 1,400 acres and is a popular tourist destination that became a UNESCO World Heritage Site in 1994.

In its original form under Kangxi, the Mountain Estate was intended to be a private retreat for the emperor in his later years.³ It became his

² See Richard E. Strassberg, “*Yizuo Qingdai yuyuan zhi chuanbo: Kangxi Bishu Shanzhuang sanshiliu jing ji qi zai xifang de chuanbo lichen*” 〈一座清代御苑之傳播：康熙避暑山莊三十六景及其在西方的傳播歷程〉 “Transmitting a Qing Imperial Garden: Kangxi’s Thirty-Six Views of Bishu shanzhuang and Their Journey to the West,” in *Fengjing yuanlin* 《風景園林》 (*Landscape Architecture*) 83 (June 2009): 93–103.

³ This essay considers the Mountain Estate as it was originally constructed and used by Kangxi in contrast to what it later became under Qianlong. Its subsequent existence has been studied in Phillipe Fôret, *Mapping Chengde: The Qing*

favourite residence that reflected the new form of imperial identity that he defined for himself and subsequent Qing rulers, one which combined the attributes of a Manchu khan with those of a Chinese emperor. Here, he enjoyed a more reclusive lifestyle than in Beijing, away from the complex politics, daily court rituals, and unhealthy climate of the capital. While continuing to govern the empire through memorials that were daily forwarded to him and occasionally receiving visitors, he resided within the walls of the Mountain Estate accompanied only by a few selected members of his immense family and by palace eunuchs. Sometimes, a few of the European missionaries serving his court were also allowed to dwell here. But the thousands in his entourage, principally soldiers, were quartered in the town outside. Kangxi mostly pursued the active outdoor life esteemed by Manchus, especially archery and hunting, as well as engaged in the elegant, leisure pastimes of a Han literatus in his garden such as writing poetry and prose, practising calligraphy, enjoying the theatre, and studying a variety of intellectual subjects.

In 1711, as Kangxi was approaching the milestone age of sixty (*sui* 歲), the second phase of construction on the Mountain Estate was completed, and the emperor decided to produce a book of his poems and prose descriptions together with illustrations in order to commemorate both occasions. This became the *Yuzhi Bishu Shanzhuang shi* 《御製避暑山莊詩》 (*Imperial Poems on the Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat*, postface 1712). As part of his lifelong project of defining a distinctive, multi-cultural form of Qing imperial identity, Kangxi made use of many kinds of media to create portraits that deployed various personae. He especially utilized the Imperial Printing Office in the Hall of Military Glory (Wuyingdian 武英殿) in the Forbidden City to produce a vast array of publications. These included volumes of his poetry and prose, woodblock prints with his inscribed colophons, and other prestigious books with prefaces that he composed.⁴ The *Imperial Poems* was a unique project that followed the model of texts and images produced by Han

Landscape Enterprise (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000) and in the essays in James Millward, et al., eds., *New Qing Imperial History: The Making of Inner Asian Empire at Qing Chengde* (London: Routledge, 2004). For a recent art-historical study of the depictions of the Mountain Estate under Kangxi, see Stephen Whiteman, *Creating the Kangxi Landscape: Bishu Shanzhuang and the Mediation of Qing Imperial Identity* (Ph.D. diss., Stanford University, 2011).

⁴ For a survey of Qing imperial publications, see Weng Lianxi 翁連溪, *Qingdai neifu keshu tulu* 《清代內府刻書圖錄》 (*Illustrated Catalog of Qing Dynasty Imperial Printing*) (Beijing: Beijing chubanshe 北京出版社, 2004).

Chinese literati and artists to celebrate private gardens, and it may have been influenced as well by representations of European palaces such as Versailles that Kangxi had seen in Western books that he possessed. Scenes in gardens along with other landscapes had long been utilized by Chinese writers as a form of self-portraiture. Kangxi likewise selected thirty-six views (*jing* 景) in the Mountain Estate and composed a series of poems about them along with prose descriptions and a general preface. These were presented to a select group of readers as highly personal, visionary vignettes that both disclosed his private emotions as well as collectively projected his imperial identity.

In the *Imperial Poems*, Kangxi first appears in a general preface, “*Yuzhi Bishu Shanzhuang ji*” 〈御製避暑山莊記〉 (“Imperial Record of the Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat,” 1711), as the dutiful Qing sovereign who has consolidated the empire and ushered in a period of peace and prosperity. He then shifts personae in the ensuing descriptions and poems, becoming a sensitive Chinese literatus wandering through various landscapes in an ideal, self-created microcosm. The arrangement of the sequence of thirty-six views traces a purely imaginary itinerary which no visitor could actually follow, for it would require innumerable zigzagging back and forth across this vast estate. Rather, the sequence is composed like the scenery in a painted landscape handscroll. The first few views provide an entrance into the Mountain Estate followed by a string of scenes that present a pattern of *yinyang*, contrasting themes climaxing in the middle view, no. 18, where the emperor climbs up a tower and beholds a panoramic, grand view of the world that is in a perfect state of dynamic equilibrium. The second part contains more contrasting scenes until the final ones, which are like a fading out as Kangxi appears alone, contemplating his own mortality.

In the poems, Daoist themes of nurturing vitality in Nature and those evoking the Chinese ideal of reclusion are often voiced, but these tend to be combined with Confucian expressions of rededication to ruling the empire, thus forming hybridized sentiments in which duty and pleasure are combined. Among the innovations of the Chinese text was the addition of an extensive commentary by an editorial committee of six leading court scholar-officials. The commentary indicates that every word or phrase was derived from another great work of literature in the past, creating a vast hypertext that extends to virtually all the great books of Chinese literature. In fact, these annotations are mostly identical with the text of an important dictionary of two-character poetic phrases, *Peiwen yunfu* 《佩文韻府》 (*A Treasury of Rhymes to Adorn Literature*, 1704–1711), that Kangxi had commissioned during this period. This reveals how Kangxi’s poems,

which were written in eleven different genres, were composed; they are all pastiches of other poems. It also configures the emperor as the supreme Han Chinese literatus by demonstrating his command of virtually the entire range of Chinese literature. He appears, in effect, as a master scholar who is teaching his readers how to assemble a correct poem, both technically and with reference to an orthodox canon of precursors.

The *Imperial Poems*, like the construction of the Mountain Estate itself, was a labour of love whereby Kangxi sought to represent himself as he wished to be seen. He was involved in even the minutest details of producing this aspirational self-portrait, as evidenced by the many memorials that he exchanged with the officials of the Imperial Printing Office.⁵ Four hundred copies were ordered printed, two hundred in the original Chinese and two hundred in a Manchu translation, each bound with a set of the woodblock illustrations. He ordered that these books be presented to members of the imperial family as well as to leading members of the Eight Banners, while some copies were also to be placed in the libraries of various other palaces. In all probability, a small number were also presented to select officials who were very close to him as well as to a few highly privileged visitors. As unprecedented as this book was in many ways, it was even more unique because of Kangxi's decision to translate his text into Manchu.

Why a Manchu translation? Although the Qing Dynasty published a number of books on more practical subjects in Manchu and in Chinese-Manchu bilingual editions, there had been no attempt to publish translations of Chinese poems by individuals into Manchu.⁶ We can surmise that Kangxi decided on a Manchu version in order to appeal to at least two readerships. Firstly, although there were a number of Manchus who had become highly skilled in Chinese literature such as the chief editor of the *Imperial Poems*, Kuixu 揆叙 (ca. 1674–1717), many important Manchu members of the Eight Banners were still not well

⁵ For Chinese translations of some of the memorials in Manchu between Kangxi and the Imperial Printing Office concerning the *Imperial Poems*, see Guan Xiaolian 關孝廉 and Qu Liusheng 屈六生, eds., *Kangxi chao manwen zhupi zouzhe quanyi* 《康熙朝滿文朱批奏摺全譯》 (*Complete Translations of the Manchu Memorials with Imperial Comments during the Kangxi Era*) (Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe 中國社會科學出版社, 1996).

⁶ The only exception before Kangxi's *Imperial Poems* was a Manchu translation of the *Shijing* 《詩經》 (*Book of Songs*) issued during his father's reign in 1654 along with translations of other Confucian classics. Later, Manchu translations of the *Shijing* were reissued in 1733 and 1768 under Yongzheng 雍正 (r. 1662–1735) and Qianlong.

educated in Chinese, and some, not at all.⁷ They would not have understood the annotations or the literary allusions underlying his poems. Kangxi would have found it far more useful to represent himself to them as a Manchu khan, for a chauvinistic tendency persisted among some bannermen that was opposed to empowering the Han Chinese scholar-official class or promoting their culture at the expense of the traditional Manchu virtues. A second readership may well have been Manchu women. Manchu was written with an alphabet and was much easier to learn than the thousands of Chinese characters. The language itself was simpler and more direct in its significations. Furthermore, Manchu women were freer than Han Chinese women in many respects, and there does not seem to have been the same kind of constraints against women's literacy. In fact, Kangxi's first teacher of Manchu as a child was Mistress Sumala 蘇麻喇 (d. 1702), an influential palace woman.⁸ Empress Dowager Xiaohui 孝惠 (1641–1717), whom Kangxi revered and honoured as his mother, was still very much alive and accompanied the emperor to the Mountain Estate every year. Kangxi also had some sixty wives and some twenty daughters, and there were probably many other high-ranking Manchu women who would have found the Manchu translation more accessible.

The *Imperial Poems* was first written in Chinese and then translated into Manchu. The translation was done by Manchu translators employed by the Imperial Printing Office and then proofread and corrected by Kangxi himself.⁹ The Manchu language as it existed during the Qing Dynasty did not have a long history of written literature, for the Manchu script only fully developed from the Mongolian script by around 1632, barely a decade before the conquest of China. Instead, the poetic impulse was mostly expressed in an oral culture of folk songs and ballads.¹⁰ After settling in China, those Manchus who wished to compose more sophisticated poetry did so by utilizing the superior resources of the Chinese literary tradition rather than by developing a distinctly Manchu

⁷ Mark C. Elliott, *The Manchu Way: The Eight Banners and Ethnic Identity in Late Imperial China* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 293.

⁸ Bai Xinliang 白新良, et al., eds., *Kangxi huangdi quanzhuan* 《康熙皇帝全傳》 (*A Complete Biography of Emperor Kangxi*) (Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe 學苑出版社, 1994), 346.

⁹ See Kangxi's instructions to the Manchu translators in the Wuyingdian in Guan and Qu, *Kangxi chao* 《康熙朝》, no. 2154, p. 863.

¹⁰ On the development and changing status of the Manchu language during the Qing, see Mark C. Elliott, *Manchu Way* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 2001), 290–304; also Pamela Kyle Crossley, *The Manchus* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, 1997), 33–39.

form. Unlike the Chinese text, the Manchu version does not include the extensive annotations to the poems by the editors. Thus, the Manchu translation stands in relation to the original Chinese very much as an English translation does. In both cases, neither Manchu nor English vocabulary can convey the allusiveness of the original Chinese words, nor can they capture their tones, rhymes, and the rhythmic patterns of the poetic lines. What is conveyed, therefore, is basically a rendering of the semantic meaning, which may suffice for the preface and prose descriptions but unavoidably impacts important aspects of the poems.

Generally speaking, the Manchu translation is quite faithful to the semantic meaning of the Chinese text. Recently, two American scholars produced English renditions of the Chinese and Manchu versions of Kangxi's preface to the *Imperial Poems* that are so close to one another that they teasingly invited readers to guess which was written first, the Chinese or the Manchu. Following is the beginning of the Chinese text and two excerpts from these translations:

金山發脈用，暖溜分泉，雲壑淳泓，石潭青靄，境廣草肥，無傷田柯之害。風清夏爽，宜人調養之功。自天地之生成，歸造化之品彙…

(1) From Gold Mountain a vein in the earth broke through, and from the hot water was formed a spring. The clouds of steam forever filling the valley, the stones and pools turn green. Grass grows luxuriously everywhere, and there is no fear that harm will come to one's fields or home. The wind is pure, and the summers are cool, easily suiting and nourishing people. All things born or possible on heaven and earth fall into the category of creation ...

(2) Gold Mountain sends forth dragon veins, warm rapids divide the springs, clouds and pools are clear and deep. There are rocky ponds and dense green vegetation, broad rivers and fertile grasslands, yet nothing harms the fields and cottages. The wind is clear, summer bracing; it is an ideal place for people to be nourished. Arising from heaven and earth's inborn qualities, it is the sort of place where people can commune with nature ...

The first rendition is by Mark Elliott based on the Manchu translation and the second, by Scott Lowe, is based on the original Chinese.¹¹

¹¹ Mark C. Elliott and Scott Lowe, trans., "Preface to the *Thirty-Six Views of Bishu Shan*," in J. Millward, *New Qing Imperial History*, 167–68.

It seems that Kangxi's intention in ordering the Manchu translation was more pragmatic than artistic; it did not result in the creation of new genres of poetry in Manchu based on Chinese models. In 1741, Qianlong republished Kangxi's *Imperial Poems* and included thirty-six poems of his own that were written in response. In 1745, he published his own book, *Yuanmingyuan sishi jing shi* 《圓明園四十景詩》 (*Poems on Forty Views of the Garden of Perfect Clarity*) about his residence outside Beijing.¹² Although Qianlong followed the exact model of Kangxi's book, in neither case did he order a Manchu translation despite his active promotion of a campaign to reverse assimilation among bannermen by reviving Manchu literature and culture. By the mid-eighteenth century, practically all educated Manchus were sufficiently literate in Chinese to appreciate the poems in the original, and both of Qianlong's books were intended for a much wider readership. Presently, I am involved in rendering the complete text of Kangxi's *Imperial Poems* into English, so the story of its translation into other languages continues.

The other aspect of the *Imperial Poems* that involves translation concerns the illustrations. The original images were painted or drawn in outline by a major court artist Shen Yu 沈喻 (d. ca. 1727) and engraved under the supervision of two of Kangxi's most skilful artisans, Zhu Gui 朱圭 and Mei Yufeng 梅裕鳳 (both fl. ca. 1696–1713).¹³ This involved the transposition of a vocabulary of calligraphic brushstrokes and ink tonalities into the single-toned, graphic language of woodblock engraving. The style of the thirty-six scenes employ a mode of illustration that had become fairly generic in finely printed books from the late Ming Dynasty onward. It incorporated formulaic elements from the manners of the great painting masters of the Song and Yuan Dynasties. These had become codified by later literati artists such as Dong Qichang 董其昌 (1555–1636) and his followers in the so-called Orthodox School of the Four Wangs,

¹² Qianlong reused the original woodblocks for the illustrations in the 1741 reprint and also had editorial committees similarly annotate his own poems for both of the later books. Continuity was probably provided by Zhang Tingyu 張廷玉 (1672–1755), an important official who served on the editorial committees for all three publications. However, annotating imperial poems was limited to these three books, and did not appear in other imperial publications, even in Kangxi's other published collections.

¹³ A set of the woodblock prints was published in *Bishu Shanzhuang sanshiliu jing* 《避暑山莊三十六景》 (*The Thirty-Six Views of the Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat*) (Beijing: Renmin meishu chubanshe 人民美術出版社, 1984). Various other reprints have appeared over the years.

which was favoured by Kangxi and patronized by the Qing court. The representation of the buildings and other man-made structures, though, does not employ the expressive *xieyi* 寫意 style of literati painting but rather, the documentary style of *jiehua* 界畫 architectural painting. Nor do these illustrations engage in a dialogical relationship with the emperor's poems, unlike some paintings of gardens that respond to the owner's lyrical vision or that are later commented upon by others in colophons, creating a conversation among a cultural community. In representing the Mountain Estate, the hierarchical distinction between sovereign and court artist was too great, and the latter was not expected to express the emperor's subjectivity. Thus, the woodblock illustrations mainly function to present the reader with supplementary information about the actual scenes while the emotionalized visions of the thirty-six views depend entirely on Kangxi's text. Not only do these largely static images lack animating elements such as the birds, fish, and clouds mentioned throughout the poems; they do not even attempt to represent the emperor's precise location and perspective. Instead, they convey more distant, frontal, panoramic landscapes that are appropriately impersonal.

According to the Italian missionary Matteo Ripa 馬國賢 (1682–1746), who was serving as a court artist, Kangxi had for some time desired to have someone at his court capable of producing European copperplate engravings, for he wished to print a monumental map of the Qing Empire that his Jesuit experts were in the process of creating, using Western surveying techniques. The emperor was well aware of the advantages of this printing technology from the European books in his collection. However, it was not yet available in China as neither the necessary materials nor the expertise existed within his domain. Ripa recorded that in June 1711, Kangxi asked some of his missionary-experts if anyone knew how to engrave copperplate images and that only he bravely volunteered to try. Ripa was actually no more than an amateur artist who had been accepted into Kangxi's service because of his skill in painting Western-style portraits in oil, which Kangxi admired. However, he had taught himself by copying other paintings, which would prove useful in translating the illustrations. Ripa readily admitted that he had only briefly observed the process of etching with *acquafortis* once in Rome before leaving for China but had never actually practised it. However, Kangxi immediately set him to work. After much trial and error, Ripa was able to find substitutes for European acid and ink from native materials as well as manufacture a rudimentary printing press. During the next two years, he managed to produce some seventy sets of his version of the illustrations of

the thirty-six views, which represent the first European-style copperplate engravings in China. He also trained two students in the technique.¹⁴

Ripa's translation of the idiom of woodblock illustration into the medium of copperplate engraving not only represented a striking technical advance at the time but also was an artistic statement that went beyond what Shen Yu, Zhu Gui, and Mei Yufeng attempted.¹⁵ Ripa was not constrained by traditional Chinese artistic decorum and was encouraged to produce a version of the images that was distinctly European. In each case, he began by using a stylus to faithfully trace the calligraphic lines of the woodblock images onto the copper plates, which were covered with a layer of pine soot. This resulted in a more uniform line which nevertheless preserved the original composition and most of its individual elements as well as the exact form and measurements of the architectural structures.

Ripa's version altered the woodblock images in a number of ways. While preserving the outer shape and proportions of the major trees, he reinterpreted these in a European manner by articulating the individual leaves and outlining the branches and trunks. Areas that had been left empty in the woodblocks such as the skies and lakes were filled in with clouds, shadows, and in one case, a blazing sun. Birds and fish were depicted as were lotus blossoms. The forms of many of the rocks and mountains were rendered more sculpturally, resembling alpine scenery, and in some cases, small buildings were added in the distance vaguely resembling a combination of Chinese and Western architecture. He added

¹⁴ Ripa described his engraving of the illustrations in various entries in his journal as well as in the abridged English translation that later appeared. See Matteo Ripa, *Giornale (1705–1724)*, vol. 2, ed. Michele Fatica (Naples: Istituto Universitario Orientale, 1996), 38ff and Ripa, *Memoirs of Father Ripa, during Thirteen Years Residence at the Court of Peking in the Service of the Emperor of China; with an Account of the Foundation of the College for the Education of Young Chinese at Naples*, trans. Fortunato Prandi (London: J. Murray, 1844; reprint, New York: Wiley & Putnam, 1846), 78, 84ff.

¹⁵ An edition of the *Imperial Poems* with Ripa's engravings was reproduced in facsimile as Kangxi et al., *Tongban yuzhi Bishu Shanzhuang sanshiliu jing shitu* 《銅板御製避暑山莊三十六景詩圖》 (*Engraved Copperplate Edition of Imperial Poems on the Thirty-Six Views at the Mountain Estate for Escaping the Summer Heat with Illustrations*) (Beijing: Xueyuan chubanshe 學苑出版社, 2002). This was probably intended for Kangxi as the illustrations are bound with the Chinese text written out by a court calligrapher without the annotations. Another set of the engravings alone can be accessed online by searching the collection database at the British Museum website at: <http://www.britishmuseum.org/research/search> under "Matteo Ripa" as well as under "Thirty-Six Views of the Imperial Summer Palace at Jehol," ID# 1955,0212,0.1.1.

additional details to the façades of the villas and pavilions. While the widths of the engravings were identical to that of the woodblocks, the height of the copperplates was slightly greater, enabling Ripa to further develop the sky or the foreground areas. However, the most striking alteration was the use of cross-hatching and other kinds of chiaroscuro shading to create tonal contrasts. This resulted in more dramatic atmospheres. The heightened emotionalism sometimes reflected the attitudes expressed in Kangxi's poems; and, in some cases, Ripa even went beyond the poems to endow the scenes with qualities that the poet never quite intended.

Compared to the woodblock prints, the engravings are less consistent in style. The Chinese engravers were all experienced professionals working in an established idiom, while Ripa's efforts were basically experimental. Both he and his students were engaged in a learning process, and the students did not possess his artistic background. The engravings thus roughly fall into three groups: one group is fully realized with various European-style alterations that only Ripa himself could have imagined. A middle group contains fewer additions and may have been the result of more collaboration, while a third group is extremely faithful to the woodblock prints with few changes; these might have been executed by his students themselves. Despite the liberties that Ripa took, or, perhaps, because of them, Kangxi was quite pleased with the results and was quoted as praising them as "*hen hao* 很好" (very good).¹⁶ He was so concerned about maintaining exclusive control over this new technique that he made Ripa and the students promise not to teach its secrets to anyone else. Immediately after the engravings were completed in April 1714, Kangxi ordered Ripa to begin engraving the Jesuit map of the Qing Empire, which he completed about three years later.

Kangxi never intended that his book or the illustrations circulate among a wide audience in China nor is there evidence that he wished to send any copies abroad. However, Ripa began to send sets of his engravings to European friends and correspondents as soon as they were printed. When he returned to Europe in 1724, he brought back a number of sets, and these are probably the ones now found in various collections in both Europe and North America. On his way back to Naples, where he

¹⁶ The entire set of thirty-six engravings was not completed until April 1714. Ripa recorded Kangxi's enthusiastic reaction in both his diary and in a letter to a fellow priest in Rome. The emperor ordered a number of sets printed and distributed to his sons, grandsons, and other noblemen. See Ripa, *Giornale*, 2: 136; also "Letter to Father Bussi in Rome, 26 August 1714" in the Print Collection, New York Public Library.

later founded a college for training young Chinese men as Catholic priests,¹⁷ he stopped in London, where he presented King George I (r. 1714–1727) with a copy of the Jesuit map of the Qing Empire. It is probable that he also made presents of sets of the engravings of the Mountain Estate, although their influence among British garden enthusiasts at that time remains a matter of debate among scholars.¹⁸ Ripa certainly presented a number of sets to others in Europe over the following two decades. Some of these bear Ripa's renditions into Italian or Latin of Kangxi's names for the views. A few contain even more valuable descriptions written in his own hand and based on his observations while residing at the Mountain Estate on a number of occasions.

Ripa's comments represent yet another translation of the Mountain Estate. All the sets that he sent or brought to Europe were of the engravings alone, without Kangxi's poetic text. It is doubtful if anyone in Europe at that time would have known the Chinese language well enough to understand such literature. Even Ripa, who spent thirteen years at the Qing court and often served Kangxi as an interpreter and translator, was probably not sufficiently educated in literary Chinese to properly comprehend the deeper significance of the titles and the poems. Nor did he realize the importance of the original sequence; each set now abroad is numbered and/or arranged in a different order. Thus, when he translated the titles and inscribed his own text, he was fundamentally reframing the perception of the Mountain Estate in the minds of European readers, who would have had a very different understanding of it as an imperial garden.

¹⁷ This became the famous Collegio dei Cinesi, which was later nationalized and incorporated into the present-day Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale." For studies of Ripa and the Collegio, see Michele Fatica, *Sedi e Palazzi dell'Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale" (1729–2005)* (*Seats and Palaces of Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale" [1729–2005]*) (Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 2005) and Fatica, ed., *Matteo Ripa e il Collegio dei Cinesi di Napoli (1682–1869)* (Naples: Università degli Studi di Napoli "L'Orientale," 2006).

¹⁸ In the past, some scholars have debated when Ripa's engravings arrived in England and whether they had any influence on the early development of the so-called "Chinese Garden." See Basil Gray, "Lord Burlington and Father Ripa's Chinese Engravings," *The British Museum Quarterly* XXII, nos. 1–3 (1960): 40–43 and a response in Patrick Conner, "China and the Landscape Garden: Reports, Engravings and Misconceptions," *Art History* 2, no. 4 (December 1979): 429–40. However, based on a recent dating of ca. 1725 for the binding of the set in the Morgan Library in New York, it appears more that Ripa did distribute one or more sets of his engravings in England when he passed through. Still, no record of their reception at this time has yet come to light.