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Introduction

In a short article entitled "Discussing the Inadequacy of Eliminating the Classical Language" 論古文之不宜廢, the well-known translator Lin Shu 林紘 (1917) criticizes the shift from literature in the classical to vernacular language, which at the time was taken place in Beijing University, explaining that once the classical language was eliminated from the educational institutions, only Japanese scholars would be qualified to teach it in China. Despite progress made since these words were written, Lin Shu's insight, extrapolated to Chinese literature research, remains as valid today as it was at the height of the May Fourth Movement. As advanced as Chinese studies are, particularly regarding recognized authors such as Lu Xun 魯迅 or Zhou Zuoren 周作人, a more traditional approach to the question of modernity as proposed by a number of writers has not been studied with accuracy and scholarly details. While it is true that attention has been directed to the matter, and that recent years have witnessed new groundbreaking studies in a variety of neglected topics and authors, scholarship has remained faithful to its own inherited tradition, accepting at face

1 For the polemic between the classical and the vernacular, see Michael Gibbs Hill (2013, 219-21).
2 For a review of these deficiencies see César Guarde-Paz (2015, 183-86).
value many biased accounts against non-revolutionary figures, such as accusations of Lin Shu's defective translations, Liu Tieyun's treachery, and Li Boyuan's plagiarism.

Besides outstanding advances in classical Chinese literature conducted, for instance, by Hayakawa Shinnosuke 林田喜三郎 (b. 1932) and Tōkō Masakazu 高木正一 (1912-1997) on pre-Yang literator, and by Arai Ken 安井健 (b. 1929) and Uchiyama Chinari 内山千知 (b. 1928) on poetry and fiction, research on late nineteenth century and early twentieth century Chinese literature has been highly influenced by political trends in China and Japan, especially after the improvement of political relations between both countries following the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement signed in 29 September 1972 (Sato 1987; Wong 1988, 114). It was also at this time that politically-oriented scholarship shifted to a more open and revisionist position which included late Qing literature and translation studies, providing readers with solid philosophical foundations for further expansion. Unfortunately, a large bulk of this research, published over the last forty years, remains virtually unknown outside Japan.

3 For instance, criticism of Lin Shu's "use of classical Chinese and his being more than a cavalier with the original texts" is accepted at face value in Mark Gane (2008, 21), as it is also in Gao Xinglong (2009, 2010). On occasion, scholars have gone as far as to misinterpret evidence, as is the case with two studies by Wang Shouzhi 王壽致 (2000) and Wu Zhengqing 吳正清 (2001) we shall address promptly.


5 Hong-yok Ip and his co-authors' (2003) review on scholarship of the May Fourth Movement ignores Japanese scholarship (490-509). In China there have been attempts to introduce Japanese scholarship, such as Tarumoto Teruo 髙本常雄 (2006b). Also, collaboration between Chinese scholars and the Shinshinron shihetsu kenkyū 清末小說研究 group has increased over the past decade, but relations have been circumspect due to the language barrier and, probably, to the growth of nationalism in recent years, which has led some scholars to affirm that "translated literature is not Chinese literature" (Tarumoto 2006a, 4). For instance, no Japanese scholar was invited to the Lin Shu Research International Symposium held by the Lin Shu Research Institute in Fuzhou 福州, October, 2014, although many
In order to introduce this research to English-language scholars, this paper begins with offering a historical background on the development of late Qing and early Republican fiction studies in Japan, covering research societies, publications, and scholars in the field. Second, it discusses questions related to new directions in the study of the May Fourth Movement. Third, it addresses groundbreaking studies on writers and translators outside the main stream of research, covering Lin Shu, Liu Tieyun 蘆柳泉, and Li Boyuan 李伯元. Further discussion examines thematic studies, limiting ourselves to editorship, detective fiction, and Japanese political fiction—themes that were highly relevant because their authors engaged in important questions related to cultural reforms and the evolution and formation of modern fiction, its genres, and concerns.

**Historical background**

Japanese scholarship on modern Chinese fiction is usually categorized into three generations, based on the motivations and scope of their research: the first generation emerged in the 1930s and 1940s when Chinese literature was introduced to Japan. The second wave began in the 1950s, following the establishment of the People’s Republic of China in 1949. Finally, a third generation appeared in the 1970s after the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement signed in 1972 (Wong 1988, 113-14, 123). Although division into “generations” can be historically misleading, it can be useful for analytical purposes to examine the trends and motivations behind Japanese scholarship.

The roots of Japanese scholarship on this literature can be traced back to the Chinese Literature Association 中国文学研究会 (Chūgoku bunka kenkyūkai) founded in March 1934 by the alumni Okazaki Toshio 岡崎俊夫 (1909-1959), Takeuchi Yoshimichi 竹内義章 (1910-1977) and others from the Chinese Philosophy and Literature Department of the Imperial University of Tokyo, participants had collaborated in Japanese publications before.

---

6 A similar division is suggested in Satō (1987) which emphasizes the difference between pre- and post-1949 research (1.7-8).
although it was not formally established until August 4, following Zhou Zuoren and Xu Xucheng's visit to Japan that year. This group constituted what many authors consider the first generation of Japanese scholars engaged in modern Chinese literature. They had an interest in leftist politics—related to the authors they studied—and employed Chinese literature as a mirror to the problems of Japanese modernization (Wong 1988, 114). Their association also published a modern journal, *Chinigakuteki Bungaku* (later *Chinigakuten Bungakus*), which started circulation on 5 March 1935 and lasted through ninety-two issues until the dissolution of the association in March 1943. Takeuchi's interest in the literary movements of contemporary China had started in the mid-1930s, when Japanese forces had begun to occupy the mainland. For the Japanese scholar, the occupation caused a deep sense of guilt which may have contributed to his passionate study of Chinese leftist literature. However, after the attack on Pearl Harbor on 7 December 1941, all remorse was gone (Iida 2002, 49; Hoppens 2015, 68; Takeuchi 2004, 151). In the same month, he wrote a short communication for the *Chinese Literature Monthly*, "The Great East Asia War and Our Decimation (A Declaration)" 大東亜戦争と我々の決意 (大東亜), in which he expressed his pride in Japanese militarism and nationalism (Takeuchi 1942, 481-84). This communication was shortly followed by his resignation from the society, linked to his refusal to involve the society in a war propaganda event, and his exile to the Chinese front (Ush 2011, 317).

The journal was later re-launched in March 1946 and restored publication in late May 1948 with its 109th issue. Apart from providing introductions to and criticism on Chinese literature and Sinology, Japanese relations topics, it incorporated a column on translation theory, which ran from November 1940 to December 1941 (from Issues 66 to 79). The Chinese Literature Association conducted translations of modern Chinese writers, including Lu Xun and Zhou Xuan.

7 For a complete history of this society, see Xiāo Wénnǐ 蕭文琴 (2010) and Zhu Lìmín 朱利民 (2013).
8 For an index, see Sun Lichuan 孫立傳 and Wáng Shūnhóng 王樹洪 (1991).
Zuoren. One of their most important accomplishments was that they challenged the accepted standards of translation theory and sinological studies in Japan. During the Meiji 明治 and Taishō 大正 periods (1868-1926) was "an almost ideological drive" on translation which was determined by Japan's foreign relations with China and the West. China and Chinese literature and translations were important because of their "mediating role [...] in the encounter with the West," and the way foreign texts were imported was not conditioned by faithfulness, but rather by how the text could be made useful for Japan (Haug 2011, 15-16). Takeuchi Yoshimi (1941), one of the founders of the Chinese Literature Association, considered translations "to be the ultimate interpretation of the original work" 原文解釈の究極である (645). This new approach, at odds with translation theories favored during the first decades of the century, confronted scholars with new methodological problems such as how to properly translate literature and the relations between source and translated materials.

After his return from China, Takeuchi Yoshimi, who had become one of the most respected experts on Lu Xun after his breakups with the Chinese Literature Association, established two new groups: the Lu Xun Research Association 鲁迅研究会 (Rojin kenkyūkai) in 1952, which published thirty-five issues of their homonymous journal from 1953 to 1966, and Friends of Lu Xun 鲁迅之友会 (Rojin no tomokai) in 1954 (Calichman 2004, viii). However, Japanese scholarship still remained circumspect for many years, and it was generally dependent on studies in the mainland until the 1970s. Wong (1988) explains Takeuchi's views and methodology "influenced the other Japanese scholars very deeply. This may explain why the Japanese scholars in the past had been paying their attention selectively to a few Chinese writers only" (114).9 Tarumoto's (2009) meticulous survey of twenty-four Japanese works on modern Chinese literature shows that "Japanese scholars during this period were paying attention to the literary trends of China" and "because common belief was being repeated [...] new views did not appear": they uncritically followed previous research published in the continent, focusing on writers such as Lu

---

9 See also Saič (1987, 7-8).
Xun or Zhou Zuoren and adopting a hostile attitude toward those authors who opposed the May Fourth Movement (206).^{10}

Two important societies emerged at the time: the ta Society 伽文 (la no ka) and the Chinese Literary Arts Research Association 中国文芸研究会 (Chūgoku bunrei kenkyūkai). The former was founded around 1973 and published the ta journal (later ta ibi 伽文記 and ta tokkai 伽文拝) until 1989, edited by Nakajima Toshio 中島利雄 (b. 1947) and Shimomura Sakiyō 下村作利男 (b. 1949). It focused on post-Cultural Revolution literature but also edited, with the Chinese Literary Arts Research Association, a Guide of Modern and Contemporary Chinese Literature Research 中國近現代文學研究ガイド (Chūgoku kinkodai bunseki kenkyū guide) in 1985.

On the other hand, the Chinese Literary Arts Research Association was founded in March 1970 by Aiura Takashi 亀原孝 (1926-1990) from Osaka University of Foreign Studies (now School of Foreign Studies), with the assistance of Kamita Osamu 鎌田章 (1936-2013), Yamada Keisuke 山田清介 (b. 1937), and Ōta Susumu 大沢道雄 (1930-2012). It publishes its semi-annual journal Wild Grass 野草 (Yasō) since October, 1970, as well as the monthly Bulletins of the Chinese Literary Arts Research Association 中國文芸研究会会報 (Chūgoku bunrei kenkyūkai kaibō) since May, 1974. It was originally formed by a dozen members but has since expanded to include over 230 scholars from across the country (Sugawara 2015, pers. comm.). These societies belong to the second generation of Japanese scholars specialized in modern Chinese literature, who inherited the trends of their previous colleagues: although the number of authors they treated expanded, they remained, due to their politically-centered view of research, limited to the inner circle of the authors associated with the May Fourth Movement (Wong 1988, 115).

Because their main purpose was to learn from the process of modernization in China, Japanese scholarship limited itself to preconceived notions, "focusing itself on the literary trends of China". 10 I follow Gow's (1974: 39) characterization of the May Fourth Movement in its "broader sense" covering "the period roughly from 1917 through 1921" when "traditional Chinese ethics, customs, literature, history, religion, and social and political institutions were fiercely attacked" (1).
Following the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement on 29 September 29 1972, an improvement in the political relations between the two countries lead to an increase in academic exchanges (Wong 1988, 123-24). Soon after, the Cultural Revolution ended with the death of Mao Zedong. XXI, and the open policies implemented by Deng Xiaoping opened the markets to foreign investments from Western countries and Japan. In that same year the Sino-Japanese Joint Statement was ratified by both parties. The Treaty of Peace and Friendship between Japan and China was signed on 12 August 1978.

As a result, many scholars shifted their interest to a curriculum-oriented approach. These changes also led to the depoliticization of research and allowed new authors to be the subjects of their scholarly

---

11 See also Tarumoto Tetu (2006b): “I do not have the slightest interest in the practice of writing papers by selecting information according to a pre-designed conclusion based on a given ‘ideology’.” 对於學術研究的作者和論文的敘述方式，我更是毫不感興趣的 (239).

---

12 In the inheriting trends they followed was their criticism of late Qing fiction which originated in “literary revolutionaries” such as Chen Duxiu 傅雷 and Hu Shi 胡適. These authors did not hesitate to attack any advocate of Chinese traditional values or classical Chinese, arguing against the quality of their translations. Later I will show that this criticism was baseless but served to discredit traditional writers and, for a long time, also restricted scholarly interest in them. As Tarumoto (2008b) explains:
exploration, "trigger[ing] a broad interest in China on every level of Japanese society, prompting a veritable "China boom" (Satō 1987, 1)." 11 Years after the establishment of the Ia Society, Tarumoto Teruo, a lecturer at Osaka University of Economics at the time, founded in 1977 the Society for Late Qing Fiction Research (Shinmatsu shōsetsu kenkyūka), whose main purpose was to address the problem of "credibility" (shinpō) of the source texts and to organize the basic materials with the creation of indexes and catalogues (Tarumoto 1977, 112). Translations have since been evaluated following a source-oriented approach; a good translation is that which closely resembles the original and has internal consistency in the use of its terminology, without aberrations or additions.

Indexing of late Qing and early Republican sources can be traced back to Sun Kaiji's 晚清(1902-1986) indexes of novels from Tokyo and Dalian totaling published in the 1930s, and Qian Xincun's 乾春村 (better known as A Ying幹英) 1954 Index of Late Qing Plays and Fiction 晚清戏曲小説目録 (Wan Qing xiqü xiaobiao mu) published in Shanghai, which listed 1,070 (later expanded to 1,107) novels. After the foundation of the society, indexes started to be published in its journal, Late Qing Fiction 清末小説 (Shinmatsu shōsetsu, originally Shinmatsu shōsetsu kenkyūka), until the combined efforts of Tarumoto Teruo, Nokamura Tadayuki 野村達行 (1915-1993), Nakajima Toshio 中島利雄 (b. 1947) and Yamauchi Kazue 山内かずえ led to the completion of the Index of Late Qing and Early Republican Fiction 清末民初小説目録 (Shinmatsu Minzoku shōsetsu mukuroku) in 1988 and a new edition in 1997 which included 16,014 works, 4,974 of them being translations. Up to this day, the society publishes annually an electronic version of this index. 12

Apart from indexing, the society has published two journals: Late Qing Fiction 清末小説 (Shinmatsu shōsetsu), which stopped publication in December 2012, and Late Qing Fiction Communication 清末小説から (Shinmatsu shōsetsu kara), an electronic quarterly 12 For the academic interest and cultural exchange in these years, see Hagiwara Nobutoshi 市川信雄 (1972) and Shirado Norio 曽野信夫 (1986).

13 This index can be downloaded at the website of the society, http:// shinmatsu.main.jp.
published since 1986. Some articles have also been collected in book form, A Chronology of Late Qing and Early Republican Fiction 1

 inspected initial collection (Shinseki Mawko shietsu nenpy, 1999) listing original works and translations from 1860 to 1919, Collected Studies on Late Qing Fiction 1

 inspected initial collection (Shinseki Mawko shietsu uden, 2003) gathering nine essays on Liu Tieyun and Li Boyuan, and Collected Essays on The Commercial Press 商務印書館研究論集 (Shimu inshokuk kenkyuk ronsh, 2006) assembling historical essay on the relations between The Commercial Press and the Japanese publishing house Kinkōdō 客籍堂, a Sino-Japanese joint venture from 1902 to 1913. Active contributors include Tatsumoto Teruo, who has worked extensively on editorship relations between China and Japan, Chinese translations of Sherlock Holmes and The Arabian Nights, Liu Tieyun’s The Travels of Late Can and, more recently, Lin Shu’s 15

 Watanabe Hiroshi 浪洋社 lys (b. 1968) on the identification of Chinese translations from this period; Sawamoto Kyoko 資本喜子 on Liu Tieyun and Lin Shu; and Sawamoto Ikuma 資本懷馬 on the history of Chinese publishing houses.

 One of the major achievements of the third generation of Japanese scholars has been that their scholarship transcends the limitations inherited from Yoshimi’s "centerstage" approach, in which scholars had been restricted within the boundaries of a notion of modernity established by "revolutionaries" such as Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi. These authors shared a common denominator: they wrote against tradition and classical literature. Today we are inclined to perceive them as central figures in the process of modernization because of our historical perspective: they are the ones who molded China and they have, to some extent, the monopoly of modernity. They are, briefly said, the victors who wrote their history. However, their paradigm was not the only one, and we know now that there were other competing visions to the problem of modernization, as it has been acknowledged by scholars such as Hung-yok Ip, et al. (2003, 504), Michael Hookx (2003, 55), Jon Eugene von Kowallis (2006), Shengqigui Wu (2013) and so on.15

 Although Japanese scholarship aims to demonstrate that these

 14 For a bibliography see Tatsumoto Teruo (2003).

 15 I owe this reference to an anonymous reviewer.
reformist ideas were an innovation pioneered by late Qing authors rather than, by Republican revolutionaries, their most relevant achievement has been their revisionist approach to the criticism raised against late Qing authors. This has tremendous consequences for our understanding of modern Chinese literature because, if these authors were unfairly treated, then their particular conceptions of modernity and the role they played in introducing new ideas to China should be reevaluated. It is to them we now turn.

Author-centered Studies

Lin Shu

Japanese scholarship on Lin Shu has increased over the last few years. This is not surprising given not only the number of works he translated and the political ostracism he suffered, but also his efforts in social reform (Gao 2009). Japanese studies on Lin Shu can be divided into three categories: identification of unknown translations, comparative translation studies, and the "cases of false accusation" against him.

The studies of the first category have been dominated by a number of papers published by Watanabe Hiroshi. Watanabe's methodology has set a standard for cross-linguistic treatment of late Qing translations of Western fiction, presenting a comparative analysis of the source and the translated text, together with a modern Japanese translation and a resume of the whole work, followed by a list of foreign names and their Chinese translation—an important instrument for improving our understanding of how foreign names were translated. Offering a contextualization of both translator and translator, Watanabe presents a comparative evaluation between contemporary Japanese translations and Lin's renderings.

Both comparative translation studies, which deal with the quality of Lin Shu's work and the sources employed, and the reevaluation of the criticism against him have been mainly conducted...
by Tarmoto Teruo and collected into two separate books, *Cases of False Accusation against Lin Shu (Rin jo enzai jiken) (2008)* and *Research Essays on Lin Shu (Rin jo kenkyuuronshu)*. The first volume includes nine essays that deconstruct the received imagery from the May Fourth period with philological accuracy. After a long and meticulous introduction covering Lin Shu’s conflicts with Chen Duxiu and Hu Shi and other devotees of the Literary Revolution regarding the substitution of classical Chinese by vernacular and some rumors about their dismissal from Beijing University,*

Tarmoto deals with “The cases of false accusation against Lin’s Shakespeare” (林齋シェイクスピア冤罪事件, "Rin zaitei Shikusuya enzai jiken") that were voiced by Liu Bannong 刘半农 and Qian Xuanzong 钱玄同 (1918; under the pseudonym Wang Jingxuan 王敬轩). Hu Shi (1918), Zheng Zhenduo 程振德 (1924), A Ying (1937, 1938) and others, according to the A Ying. Lin Shu is to be criticized for rendering Shakespeare’s theatrical works into prose, instead of preserving the “play form” of the original. Tarumoto traces the origin of this idea back to Liu Bannong and Hu Shi, who used it as an excuse to attack Lin Shu’s prose and the treatment of Shakespeare’s plays. After showing that Lin Shu’s translation was in fact based on Charles and Mary Lamb’s prose adaptation of Shakespeare, *Tales from Shakespeare (1807)* and, thus, that he was being faithful to his source, Tarumoto continues with another noted case of false accusation: the translation of Norwegian playwright Henrik Ibsen’s (1828-1906) *Ghosts (1881)*, a work which was also rendered into prose by Lin Shu. After tracing back to Zheng Zhenduo, the modern critic against this work, the author compares different English translations of Ibsen with Lin Shu’s rendering, concluding that the original work employed for its translation was not a normal edition but a novelizations of a play version (shobureka) based on Dacre M. Dell’s edition, *IVES’ GHOSTS* Adapted as a Story. (1920).

The next essay in the collection, “The Case of False Accusation against Lin’s *Spenser*, 林齋スペンサー冤罪事件, (Rin zaitei Supunseru enzai jiken), examines a rather unknown work, Lin Shu’s translation of Edmund Spenser’s *The Faerie Queene* (1590-1596). Criticism has been relatively measured, limited to a few

17 *For which see, in English, Hill (2013, 192-230).*
authors (Han Guang 1935, 83), and therefore it has received particularly little attention when compared with Shakespeare or Iben. Critics state that Spenser’s epic poem was translated by Lin Shu into prose, not respecting the original verse form. Tarumoto shows once more that the original source employed in the Chinese translation was a “school edition” published in 1905 by MacMillan, a novelization of the original work, and that Lin Shu explains in the prologue he translated from the MacMillan edition.18

The book continues with a remarkable essay on Lin Shu’s translation of Miguel de Cervantes’s Don Quixote (1605), which was considered by Zhou Zuozen among others to be a great disappointment (shuang ye juji geng shen) for Chinese literature due to its significant abridgements (Zhong Mi 1922, 2a). This opinion still prevails among mainland scholars, despite the fact that it was already suspected by Tai Loi Ma in 1981 that Lin Shu’s translation followed the adapted edition of Peter Motteux (1700–1703) (95),19 which has been deemed as very deficient and poor in quality and contents. Through meticulous analysis of Don Quixote’s English translations, Tarumoto shows the similarities and possible filiation between Motteux edition and the Chinese translation, thus vindicating once more Lin Shu’s faithfulness to the original work he employed. The study concludes with three essays dissecting the origins of Zheng Zhenduo’s and Lu Xun’s critiques and some final words on their influence on later scholarship.

One year after the publication of Contra of False Accusation against Lin Shu, Tarumoto collected eleven additional essays in a new book, Research Essays on Lin Shu, which covers a wider range of topics, from the aforementioned cases of false accusation to Lin Shu’s economic situation. The first essay, “The case of the false accusation of Lin Shu by A Ying: Concerning the Preamble to Familiar Stories Recited from Afar” 鈎錐による拙篋案事件—「今昔風聞」序を 堪べて (“A Ei ni you Lin enzi jiken—Ginben Eigo jo wo megute”) revisits the same issue raised in his previous book: Lin Shu’s infamous translation of Shakespeare’s plays. In this occasion,

18 This was also suspected by Tai Loi Ma in 1981, 74.
19 For criticisms in Mainland, see Zhang Quanzhi 燕全之 (1997, 92); Han Honggu 韩洪贵 (2005, 126–27).
the author analyzes both the commercial advertisements of the translation and its prologue, showing how Lin Shu, in fact, made a distinction between Shakespeare's ab (poems), read aloud in theatres, and his own version, which he calls jibi 製筆 (short sketches) or jibi 製事 (records). Furthermore, although former scholars were ignorant of Lamb's Tales and may have overlooked what was said in the prologue to this work, the same cannot be said about A. Ying, who records Lamb's version in his index while blindly accepting the inherited criticism against Lin Shu's translation methodology.

The next three essays deal with different aspects of Lin Shu's Shakespeare, and are presented, in some way, as an extension of the former. "Lin's Translation of Hamlet: from Familiar Stories Revived from Afar" 林譯「哈姆雷特」—「哈姆雷特」から（「林譯「哈姆雷特」」から）（"Lin yaku 'Hamurēto: Gihōban Suigo kara"）compares different passages of Lin Shu's translation with the original, concluding that, despite some minor faults and abbreviation, Lin Shu's text is rather faithful to the original. For example, the terms "apparition," "ghost," and "spirit" are consistently translated as long 靈, shen 神, and gui 鬼. Tsurumoto also briefly critiques of Zhou Zanren, who slandered Lin's translations, by showing how his version of Shakespeare's "The History of Ali Baba" 《阿里巴巴》(Xia nü nu, 1905) is tarnished by many faults, among them, a change in the plot of the original story. This research into comparative literature continues in the third chapter, "The First Chinese Translation of Lamb's Tales of Shakespeare and Lin's Translation. Focusing on 'Twelfth Night'" (ラムズ 'ジェイクス ピア物語' 初の翻訳と林譯「「十二夜」を中心に「ラムズ・バイ・ノワール」を翻訳) Here Tsurumoto offers a comparison between the anonymous translation of Shakespeare's "Twelfth Night" (collected in 海外奇譚 Haowai qitian) and Lin Shu's version, Marriage in Direct (結婚) (Hunngai), showing that none of them represents a literal translation: although both being in classical Chinese. Whereas the former often paraphrases the original adding unnecessary text to it, the latter frequently abbreviates the original. Tsurumoto's main point here is that Lin Shu's translation methodology was not different from common practice in China. This is attested once more in his fourth essay, "Lin's Translations of Shakespeare: Quilter-Couch's Julius
Caesar” 林訊 森為 一時激論 視 “ジュリアス・シーザー” (“Rin yaku Sheikustoria: Kizuki Kichi ban ‘Jutiasu Shita”), where, from a comparison between Lin’s translation and Arthur Thomas Quiller-Couch’s Historical Tales from Shakespeare (1899), the author not only redeems Lin Shu, but establishes that at least two-thirds of his translation relied on the original play rather than Quiller-Couch’s edition.

The fifth and sixth essays are two brief insights of comparative literature: “Lin’s Translation of Chaucer” 林訊 森為 “Rin yaku Chaucer” studies Lin Shu’s translation of Chaucer’s Canterbury Tales from Chaucer, and “Lin’s translation of Hugo” 林訊 森為 “Rin yaku Hugo” deals with Zheng Zhenduo’s influential criticism of: A Record of the Righteous Deaths of Two Heroes 雙雄義死錄 (Shuangxiang yi si lu, 1921). Lin Shu’s rendering of Victor Hugo’s Quatrevingt-treize (1874). With meticulous philological scrutiny, Tarumoto shows how wrong Lin Shu’s defenses were, for the original book he used was, once more, not a common English translation but an abridged edition for school reading. Lin Shu’s translation, though not ad pedem translatae, was faithful to the original employed.

The seventh essay is the longest piece in this volume and also one of the most relevant for the modern reader of Lin Shu. Under the title “The place of Lin Shu in modern Chinese literature history” (中现代文学史における林纾の位置 “Chûgoku genzai bunkakushi ni okeru Rin Jr no ichi”), the author not only offers a critical review of mainstream scholarly literature on Lin Shu from the May Fourth Movement until 2008, but also surveys most recent studies from Taiwan, Hong Kong, Japan, and Western countries. He concludes that, although Western scholarship has been slightly generous with Lin Shu’s translations, recent Asian studies relied mainly on secondary literature from the mainland and, thus, inherited its methodological problems already exposed in his other essays, repeating the so-called “cases of false accusation.” This dependence and lack of accuracy can be seen, for example, in the way Lin Shu’s article “Discussing the Inadequacy of Eliminating the Classical Language” 論古文之不當廢 (“Lun guiwen shi bu dang fei”) is quoted by secondary literature as “Lun guiwen shi bu dang fei,” following Hu Shi’s error in his reply to this short piece, or the constant references to his political connections with the Anhui clique 婉為軍閥 (waxi jundfa) following
the publication of his story "Mr. Jing" (Jing sheng). This essay ends with an introduction to the polemic between Zhang Houzai 张厚载, Lin Shu's former student, and Beijing University, to be followed in the ninth contribution.

After a short parenthesis reexamining Lin Shu’s economy and the myth of his reduction to poverty in his last years, which is covered in the eighth essay, the author continues with a long, well-documented analysis of the controversy over rumors stemming from Zhang Houzai about the dismissal of Chen Duxiu. Qian Xiaotong and Hu Shi, "Chen Duxiu’s Dismissal of Beijing University: An Appendix to ‘A Chronicle of Cases of False Accusation against Lin Shu’" (陳獨秀的北京大學罷免—‘林紹堂事件’考). 紹秀的北京大學罷免—‘林紹堂事件’考) covers not only Chinese testimonies of the polemic, but also Japanese reports in contemporary newspapers, offering a new image on how Zhang's rumors were used by his opponents to attack Lin Shu on political grounds. This leads to the second part of the essay, where Tarumoto shows how these rumors became true when Chen Duxiu's regular visits to prostitutes earned him a bad name which forces Cai Yuanpei 蔡元培 to expel him. The author also recalls the testimony of Zhou Zouren 周作人 and Hu Shi regarding an incident between Chen Duxiu, a student and a prostitute, where the latter was injured and had to receive hospitalization. According to Tarumoto, when Lin Shu uses the sentence "rickshaw pullers from Luona City" (羅南市弄堂筆者 in "Luoma xin ji jian" (Luoma city event) in his short story "Nightmare" (夢驚), he is sarcastically recalling this incident, because Luona City was a famous street in Beijing with a hospital for prostitutes who were usually taken there by the local rickshaw pullers.

The tenth essay of this compilation is probably the least important for non-Japanese scholars, as it involves two works that were wrongly associated with Lin Shu by Matsueda Shigeo 松代重男 (1905-1995), following his translation of Zhou Zouren’s "About Lu Xun, 2" (關於魯迅的二事) in his short story "Nightmare" (夢驚). In this work, Zhou Zouren refers to two unidentified translations, "The White Cloud Paved with Sand" (Baiyuan ta) and "A Record of the Fairy Maiden" (仙女録) —the second one is lost—both signed by "Gold Blood" (Gouxue). Matsueda thought this was Lin Shu, who
once wrote under the pen name Mr. Gold Red 冷紅生 (Leng Hong Sheng), but it was, in fact, the pseudonym of Chen Jingzhan 陳景銓, a journalist and translator from Songjiang 松江, Zhejiang 浙江. The last essay, "Until There is: A Chronicle of Cases of False Accusation against Lin Shu" or, about Ideas and Research Methodology "「株式 契約事件簿」ができるまで—あるいは発想と研究方法について(“Rin Jo enzai jiken bo ga dekiru made: Arimawa hassō to kenkyū kōhō ni tsuite") re' takes the main findings presented in this study and describes the methodology employed in his research. It is, so to speak, a plea for academic excellence, expertise in the manipulation of texts, and refusal to appeal "ab auctoreitate" to secondary sources.

Finally, we shall examine Yoshikawa Eiichi’s 吉川英治 (2000) brief paper “Lin Shu and the Literary Revolution” (73-93). Apart from dealing with the usual aspects of the controversy between Lin and the advocates of vernacularization, Yoshikawa also analyzes the relation between Beijing University chancellor Cai Yuanpei and Lin Shu and some issues related to his two novelettes, "Mr. Jing" and "Nightmare," which mocked Chen Duxiu, Hu Shi, and alto Cai Yuanpei. Yoshikawa’s insightful approach shows how Cai’s unfair criticism against Lin could have been motivated by a couple of references to his persons: The first mention would be his description of Cai Yuanpei in "Nightmare," where he is called “Great turtle” 大烏 (Yuanau), a pun with his surname Cai which also has this meaning. The second one can be found in Lin Shu’s (1919) letter to the chancellor of Beijing University, in which he speaks of “those who pull cart selling [soya] milk” (6), an allusion thec Lu Xun (1981) believed was meant to slander Cai (179), whose father was a soya milk seller. However, I find this possibility to be unlikely, because Lin Shu’s letter was meant to be an apology for the publication of "Nightmare," in which he had called Cai "Great turtle."

Liu Tieyun

Lisa F. 莉莎, courtesy name Tieyun, was a businessman, writer.

20 “Turtle” 亀 (wagai) referred to a man who visited prostitutes. Lin Shu was making fun of the fact that Beijing University was called “Boothil” 伏鳥 (onigyo nan) and Cai Yuanpei, its chancellor, could be its “Great turtle.”
and archaeologist, who also dedicated himself to poetry, music, and medicine. He is the author of the autobiographical *The Travels of Loo Can* 佬羧遊記, a social satire where he reflected his disillusionment with government and advocated private entrepreneurship through the figure of Loo Can, a private investigator modeled after the British detective stories of Sherlock Holmes (Wang 1997, 152).

Following the shift in Japanese scholarship in the 1970s and the study of authors outside of the May Fourth Movement circle, Liu's fame attracted considerable attention from Japanese scholars, with two works collecting individual contributions and one index that has become essential for researchers (Tarumoto 1983; 1990; 1992). Interest has increased over the past decade, with studies offering a dynamic approach to editorship, textual, and historical studies.

Editorship research has been conducted by Sawamoto Kyoko and Tarumoto Teruo, who have traced back the original publication of *Loo Can* and the complexities of its composition and redactions in various articles. Liu's novel started to be serialized in the bimonthly *Illustrated Fiction* 插画小说 (Xiaohua xiaoshuo) in 1903 and was interrupted by the author in the thirteenth issue (fourteenth in the original draft of Liu) after the editor, Li Boyuan, removed the eleventh chapter and made minor changes in the text. Liu finished the manuscript of the "first part" of the novel in 1905 and reissued the whole set, including the censored chapter, in the *Tianjin Daily News* 天津日日新聞 (Tianjin ri ri xinwen) in 1906. The author left a "third part" 物端 (wubian) in sixteen pages (one missing), which was published posthumously in 1929 (Wei 1962, 91). All these textual problems are familiar to English-language scholars and there is not an unanimous answer to some of the difficulties presented by the work of Liu Tieyuan (Wong 1983; Huang 2004). In order to shed light to these issues, Sawamoto shows the textual differences and tries to establish the textual supremacy of the Mengjin shushe edition for the first part, the materials issued in *Tianjin daily* for the second, and the original draft for the posthumous text, published one year later in Tarumoto's *Materials on Loo Can yuji 佬羧遊記目*, *Ritsen yoku shiryō*.

A second problem surrounding the publication of the *Loo*...
Can is the censorship of its Chapter 11 and the subsequent "misappropriation" 淫周 (ōyō) of some of its parts in Li Boyuan's Short History of Civilization 文明小史 (Wenming xiaoshǐ). This issue was addressed in two papers and is available to Chinese readers in a translation from the Society (Tarumoto 2006b, 42-63, 102-3). According to Tarumoto, who accurately compared the texts of Liu's Chapter 11 (in manuscript) to Li's Short History, Li should have been half responsible for the plagiarism, because Li's text was published inside Chapter 59 of Li's History after his death. The editors of the Illustrated Fiction, the ones responsible for the censorship, wrote under the pseudonym of Nanjing tingchang 南京亭長. This was indeed Li, but after his death the pseudonym was still used by Ouyang Juyuan 欧陽矩源, assistant editor in the Illustrated Fiction, who was ultimately responsible for the misappropriation.

Finally, two historical essays have been republished in Collected Studies on Late Qing Fiction (2003). The first one, "Liu Tieyun's Las Can youji and the Yellow River" 劉鐵雲《老残遊記》和黃河 ("Riyū Tetsuun 'Rōzan yūki' to kōga"), examines Liu's flood control of the Yellow River and its relation with Las Can. According to the author, the source for the reforms proposed by Liu was actually his father's work My Humble Opinion on River Flood Prevention 河防芻議 (Hēfáng chūyì). Tracing back the contents of commonly employed sources, Tarumoto shows that the origin of many misconceptions about the relationship between Las Can and the restoration works in the Yellow River is the result of taking quoted materials at face value. The case of Las Can is an interesting example because, as the author shows, Liu's experiences in irrigation were in fact collected in his Seven Discourses on River Control 河政七辯 (Zhīzhè qíbiàn) and only a small section of the Las Can reflects his involvement in flood control.

The second essay, "Liu Tieyan was wrongly charged" 劉鐵遠是冤枉的 ("Riyū Tetsuun wa enzai de aru"), is authored by Sawamono Kyōko and covers the story of Liu's arrest in 1908 and his exile to Ürümqi. Mainland and English-language scholarships have usually relied on the authority of Luo Zhenyu 罗振玉 and Hu Shì, who believed his arrest was motivated by his exploitation of mines in Shanxi in 1898 and the distribution of Russian grain to the poorest citizens of Beijing in 1900 (Zhu 2015, 352). More recently, Wang
Shuzi issei (2000) has tried to prove a third accusation that Liu was found guilty of salt smuggling in Liaoning in 1907 and was arrested as a traitor (209-37). Sawamoto harshly criticizes Wang’s arguments because he “wristedly quotes the original text to use it for his own convenience.” 細文をねじ曲げて引用し・自分の都合のよいように利用。 On the same grounds, Sawamoto raises additional doubts on the validity of the quotations provided by Wu Zhengqing. 林振清 in another paper, where he tries to present Wang Shuzi’s arguments as his own, Wu Zhengqing’s thesis is that Liu “ganged up” [sic] with the Japanese to establish a commercial firm to smuggle salt to Korea. However, as Sawamoto shows, the documentation provided has been selectively quoted in order to support the argument. When confronted with the original, the name of Liu does not appear in relation to any case of salt smuggling. Sawamoto concludes that there are no grounds to sustain the accusation of treachery 汎材 (bunjian) against Liu.

Li Boyuan

Li Boyuan has received considerable attention because of his misappropriation of Liu’s luohan can. Research has also been focused in the editions of his Eyewitness Reports and Exposure of Officialdom 官場現形記 (Guanchang xianxing ji). Most of them have been republished in Collected Studies on Late Qing Fiction (2003).

Research on the editions of the Eyewitness has been conducted exclusively by Tarumoto Teru, who has tried to recover from ostracism a so-called “bootleg” edition 海版 (kaiyuanban) and other ignored copies belonging to the “revised and annotated editions in Peking” 北京本 (beijingben). In his seminal article, Tarumoto analyzes two different yet closely related issues: the date of publication of this work in World Vanity Fair 世界繁華軒 (Shijie fenghua xuan) and the lawsuit against the “bootleg” edition. As it is well-known, the date of publication of Eyewitness is not clear because there is no complete copy of the journal. Tarumoto examines the contents of a microfilm copy from Shanghai Library, tentatively dated between 1903 and the six months of Guangxu 光緒 31 (1905). From this, he concludes that the serialized edition and its publication in book form were done simultaneously. Secondly, he discusses the lithographed
edition of Ouyang Juyuan, whose first half (Volume 1 to 36) was published by the Uphold Roots House 福本堂 (Chongben tang), while its second part (Volume 37-60) was lithographed by the Cantonese Book Co. 在東書局 (Yueyung shuju). Li filed a lawsuit against the Japanese company Chishinsha 朝日書屋 for reprinting in 1904 an illustrated edition of his work (the "bootleg" edition, which was in fact published by the Chinese businessman Xi Cuifu 喜村甫 under the pseudonym 日本吉田太郎 "Japanese Yoshida Taro") (Wang 2004, 234; Tarumoto 2008a, 1-19). It is possible, the author thinks, that the rights remained with Li’s publishing house but, after 1906, following the lawsuit on late 1905, they were acquired by the Cantonese Book Co. and later, in 1909, passed to the Uphold Roots House.

Two more articles deal with Ouyang’s edition, found by Tarumoto in Kyoto in late 1981, a typographic printed edition which seems to have been the model for the curious Uphold Roots-Cantonese edition (Tarumoto 2002a; 2002b). Although its year of publication is unknown, it preserves a note by Ouyang from the publishing house of Li Boyuan and, thus, it is plausible that it carried the recognition of its original author, who would have acknowledged its publication. If so, then both the original and the annotated and revised versions should have equal value for future research.

Thematic Studies

Japanese scholars have also covered a broad number of topics, including but not limited to Sino-Japanese editorship, Chinese translations of The Arabian Nights, detective fiction, and Japanese political fiction and its relation with the formations of late Qing fiction.

In 2000, the Society for Late Qing Fiction Research published Research on the Early The Commercial Press 初期商務印書館研究 (Shoki Shobōinshukan kenkyū), expanded six years later into Collected Essays on The Commercial Press 商務印書館研究論集 (Shobō inshokan kenkyū ronshū). They covered the commercial and literary relations of the Sino-Japanese joint venture between The Commercial Press and the Japanese publishing house Kinkōdō, the fire that affected the former during the Shanghai War of 1932, the
financial records of the company, and the establishment of the "Collection of fiction" (Shou bu congka) where most of Lin Shu's works were published.

Also within the society, the study of Chinese translations of The Arabian Nights has resulted in the publication of the volume Collected Essays on the Chinese Translations of The Arabian Nights (Kan'ya ku Arabian Naito ronshū) by Tarumoto (2006a). This classical collection of stories was translated in 1900 by Zhou Guisheng. Although these translations were renowned, the original sources were unknown and research on the Chinese Arabian Nights was limited. This change after Tarumoto started publishing his results in 2002 in the pages of the journal Late Qing Fiction Communication (Issues 65-82), identifying the original English texts of the different editions. The aforementioned collection of essays is the result of his research.

Translations of detective stories caused an important impression at the end of the nineteenth century through novel ideas of science and reason (Hung 1998, 118-19). Despite early enthusiasm, detective novels were neglected in post-1949 Chinese studies because of government policies against "bourgeois literature," perceived as harmful and forming a reactionary countercurrent (Tarumoto 2006a, 7). Pioneering work was published in the 1970s by Nakamura Tadayuki, mentor of Tarumoto Teruo, in the form of three articles under the general title "History of Late Qing Detective Fiction" (Shi shu hai yao xian kai). Further research by Hirayama Toshi (b. 1963) and Tarumoto (2006a) has focused on the translations of Arthur Conan Doyle's Sherlock Holmes, now included by Yoshio Murooka in The Shimatsu shobo osoto (1978-1980).

22. They were published in the Shimatsu shobo 2-4 (1978-1980).
Japanese scholarship on late Qing fiction has undergone rapid changes in the past decades. It started as a vicar of mainland’s scholarship, inheriting merits and shortcomings but “giving a cold shoulder to late Qing fiction” 冷遇されていた清代小說 (Tarumoto 2006a, 4). A second generation expanded their horizons focusing on 1930s literature, but remained limited by their politically-centered interests. Both generations understood literature as a tool to modernize Japan. Finally, a third generation emerged in the 1970s with a less politically-oriented scholarship. Japanese studies have since contributed to the decentering of the “May Fourth paradigm” by addressing the problem of “credibility” of the source materials and the “cases of false accusation” discovered during the May Fourth Movement. They opened new ways, addressed neglected authors, and showed that “without late Qing fiction, May Fourth literature could not have been established” 沒有清代小說，不能成立五四文學.23 Whereas Western scholarship has directed its attention to analytical discussions on modernity, Japanese authors focused on philological issues. Each approach complements the other because analytical research and comparative translation rely on empirical data and cultural contexts: the value of translations within the linguistic framework of “faithfulness to the original” or the subjectivity of the translator are dependent on our knowledge of the original editions employed by the translators, but also on our correct understanding of

23 See the advertisement of Shinmatsu shibetsu kudans in the back cover of Shinmatsu shibetsu kenbun, December, 1983 (Chinese edition, standalone issue).
their ideas within a wider cultural frame beyond the limits established by the May Fourth Movement (Yang 2013, 27-30; Li 2007). The revitalization of forgotten authors’ interpretative perspectives for the analytical discussions in English language.

This brings us to one of the major shortcomings of Japanese-language studies: because they are restrictively written in Japanese language and, because Japanese scholars rarely engage in international symposiums and conferences—they may also because of the language barrier—their achievements and amendments remain largely unknown to other specialists. The author truly desires that the information presented in this essay will help readers gain a better understanding of this important research and its contributions.
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