

1964: “We Know Less Than Shakespeare”: World Literature in Contemporary Chinese Literature¹

◎ HONG Zicheng

Peking University

Abstract: In the first thirty years of contemporary Chinese literature, the approach to Western classical literature was complex. On the one hand, the translation and research of Western literary works before the 20th century saw significant progress. On the other hand, interpretation was marked by caution and high vigilance: there was a persistent focus on class and socio-historical criticism to identify the “limitations” of the times and class depicted in the works, in order to guard against the “negative factors” potentially hindering the cultivation of a new socialist people and new literature. In 1964, the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare’s birth was commemorated with events around the world. During the Cold War, different countries marked the occasion in various ways, and critics from different political and cultural backgrounds provided distinctly different interpretations of Shakespeare. This highlighted the close relationship between this global cultural event and the international and domestic political situations, as well as differing political ideologies.

Keywords: world literature, Shakespeare, contemporary Chinese literature

CLC: I206 **Document Code:** A **Article ID:** 2096-4374(2025)02-0080-16

DOI: 10.53397/hunnu.jflc.202502007

1964, the Shakespeare Year

William Shakespeare was born on April 23, 1564, in Stratford-upon-Avon, Warwickshire, England. The year 1964 marked the 400th anniversary of his birth, and many cultural circles around the world referred to it as the “Shakespeare Year.” In the article “The Shakespeare Year,” Thierry Maulnier² stated:

Undoubtedly, from Mexico to Japan, from Spain to the Soviet Union, from Australia to China, all countries in the world will celebrate his birthday. Perhaps in every city across the globe, wherever there is a hint of theatrical flavor, there will be a celebration for the anniversary that lights four hundred birthday candles. This honor transcends national borders, language, and ideological boundaries. (24)

In April of that year, many countries held various commemorative events. In Stratford-upon-Avon, Shakespeare's hometown, the Shakespeare Center was established next to his birthplace, funded by donations from multiple countries, and it soon became an important institution for Shakespeare studies. During the commemoration, theater companies from around the world performed Shakespeare's works continuously in Stratford and London. British newspapers also published related articles and research papers. According to Zhou Xuliang, three British literary journals—*British Literary Review*, *Essays and Studies* 1964, and the *Times Literary Supplement*—all released special issues featuring over thirty papers and book reviews (38–39). The Soviet literary community also showed great enthusiasm. Literary journals such as *Drama*, *Neva*, *Zvezda*, and *Literaturnaya Gazeta*, as well as the Soviet Central Committee's official newspaper *Pravda*, published a series of commemorative articles and scholarly papers.

Chinese literary and artistic circles were no exception in preparing to commemorate the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth. Since the early 1960s, related institutions began planning publications, performances, and research papers—continuing the emphasis on Shakespeare in Chinese literary and artistic circles that began after 1949. Following the founding of the People's Republic of China, although the literary community championed socialist realism in literature and art, particularly Russian and Soviet literature, it did not adopt a dismissive attitude towards the "classical" Western literary and artistic traditions predating the 20th century. On the contrary, "contemporary" efforts made greater strides with regard to the translation and research of foreign classical authors in the 1930s and 1940s. The translation and studies of Shakespeare were similarly advanced, to the extent that some researchers consider the period from 1949 to 1965 as the "Flourishing Period" of Shakespeare studies in China (Meng 30).³ During this period, in addition to the well-known twelve-volume *The Works of Shakespeare* translated by Zhu Shenghao in 1954, there were also quite a number of single-volume editions of Shakespeare's plays and poems. For example, there were translations of *Romeo and Juliet* by Cao Yu, *Much Ado About Nothing*, *The Merchant of Venice*, and *Henry V* by Fang Ping, *A Midsummer Night's Dream* by Lv Ying, *Hamlet* by Bian Zhilin, *Henry IV* by Wu Xinghua, *Richard III* by Fang Zhong, and eleven plays translated by Cao Weifeng: *Antony and Cleopatra*, *Julius Caesar*, *Romeo and Juliet*, *The Two Gentlemen of Verona*, *Othello*, *Macbeth*, *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, *The Comedy of Errors*, *As You Like It*, and *A Midsummer Night's Dream*. As for poetry, Fang Ping translated the long poem "Venus and Adonis," and Tu An translated *Shakespeare's Sonnets*. The number of papers published during this period was also considerable, with scholars such as Sun Dayu, Gu Shouchang, Fang Ping, Bian Zhilin, Li Funing, Chen Jia, Wu Xinghua, Fang Zhong, Wang Zuoliang, Yang Zhouhan, Dai Liuling, and Zhao Li having multiple papers published. As for stage performance, from 1954 to 1962, works like *Much Ado About Nothing*, *Hamlet*, *Twelfth Night*, and *Romeo and Juliet* appeared on the drama stages in Beijing and Shanghai. Film adaptations included *Hamlet* (UK, 1948), *Othello* (USA, Italy, France, Morocco, 1951), *Twelfth Night* (Soviet Union, 1955), *A Midsummer Night's Dream* (Czechoslovakia, 1959), *Richard III* (UK, 1955), and *Romeo and Juliet* (Italy, UK, 1954), among which *Hamlet* had the greatest impact.⁴ In 1954, on the 390th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth, China held a significant commemoration event, including the publication of the twelve-volume *The Works of Shakespeare* and articles by Cao Weifeng, Xiong Foxi, Mu Mutian, Fang Ping, and Shi Xianrong. Therefore, it was expected that there would be grand commemorations in 1964.

The Setback of the Commemorative Plans

Generally, commemorative projects for literary and artistic figures involve the translation and publication of works, memorial meetings, exhibitions, and the writing of research and critical articles. The planning for the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth mostly included these activities. The most important aspect was the publication of Shakespeare's complete works. Due to illness and poverty, Zhu Shenghao passed away in December 1944 before completing his translations of Shakespeare's plays. In 1961, translator Shi Xianrong,⁵ working in the Foreign Literature Editorial Office of People's Literature Publishing House, proposed that they use the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth as an opportunity to publish the complete works of Shakespeare (Zhou et al. 112). The publisher agreed and quickly implemented the plan, hiring Wu Xinghua, Fang Ping, and Fang Zhong to revise the 31 plays already translated by Zhu Shenghao and add six untranslated historical plays: Fang Zhong translated *Richard III*, Fang Ping translated *Henry V*, Zhang Yi translated *Henry VI*, and Yang Zhouhan translated *Henry VIII*. Besides the plays, People's Literature Publishing House also planned to include translated poetry, such as Zhang Ruogu's translation of "Venus and Adonis," Yang Deyu's translation of "The Rape of Lucrece," Liang Zongdai's translations of the sonnets, and Huang Yushi's translations of four miscellaneous poems (Ge, *Academic*; Zhu and Zhang 693).

In 1964, Ge Baoquan announced in *World Literature* that a new edition of *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* would soon be published (143). However, due to political changes, this plan ultimately fell through—the complete works were not published until 1978, after the end of the Cultural Revolution.⁶ Most of the previously planned Shakespearean performances across the country were also canceled. At the end of 1962, Huang Zuolin, the director of Shanghai People's Art Theater, began rehearsing *Romeo and Juliet* as a commemorative program, but this was soon halted. Huang then devoted his efforts to *Marching Forward*, a modern drama created by Shanghai worker-writer Hu Wanchun that depicted the industrial development (Huang 188). On January 4, 1963, at a New Year's forum for literary and artistic circles, Xiong Foxi, the head of Shanghai Theater Academy, invited Ke Qingshi (the First Secretary of the Shanghai Municipal Committee of the CPC) to see a play at the academy but he refused, declaring: "You can perform fashionable, foreign, or ancient plays, but I won't watch." At this forum, Ke Qingshi introduced his famous theory: "write intensively about the thirteen years since the founding of the People's Republic of China" (*Annals* 124). By the end of 1963, the Shanghai Theater Academy's Party Committee decided to cancel the commemorative performance of *The Merchant of Venice* (126). The plan to stage a complete version of *Hamlet* by the Foreign Languages Department of Fudan University also failed. According to related sources, in April 1964, only the foreign language departments of Sun Yat-sen University and Nanjing University held internal performances of Shakespearean scenes and small exhibitions.⁷

Unlike the convention of commemorating cultural figures in the 1950s and early 1960s, there were no celebratory events for Shakespeare's birthday in April 1964. Except academic journals (such as *Literary Review* and university journals), major newspapers like *People's Daily* and *Literature and Art Newspaper* did not feature positive coverage or articles on Shakespearean commemorations. *People's Daily* and two internally circulated reference publications (*Digest of Foreign Social Sciences* and *Modern Literary Theory Translation Series*) included only criticism. In the eighth issue of *Digest of Foreign Social Sciences* for 1964, the editor's note accompanying the selection of two articles by British and French scholars read:

This year marks the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth. Western bourgeois newspapers have published a large number of "commemorative articles" ... These articles reveal that Western bourgeois literary critics, through their "study" of Shakespeare's works, are striving to promote various forms of reactionary literary theories of subjective idealism. For example, they advocate that literature is not a reflection of social reality but rather an expression of the author's emotions; they assert that the "true greatness" of Shakespeare's works lies in the "humanistic foundation" of his characters, and so on ... We have specifically translated and included two of these "commemorative articles" in this issue for readers to study and critique.⁸

The article "Shakespeare's Business" published in *People's Daily* on March 12, 1964, revealed how the bourgeoisie exploited commemorative activities for financial gain by using Shakespeare as a cash cow. After quoting the line "Then do we sin against our own estate / When we may profit meet, and come too late" from *Timon of Athens*, the article suggested that more than 300 years after Shakespeare's death, it was unexpected that in Britain, not in Athens, "those so-called 'Shakespeare enterprises' are preparing to profit immensely from the occasion of the great poet's 400th anniversary":

It is said that the primary "Shakespeare enterprise"—"Shakespeare Birthplace Trust" in Stratford—has a history of nearly a century. It first acquired the house where the poet was born and subsequently bought up the homes of the poet's father-in-law, son-in-law, and even his mother's grandfather, turning them into money-making assets. Another related enterprise is Harvard House, which purchased the poet's maternal grandfather's house to compete with this "Trust" by engaging in similar business. They employed various commercial tactics to attract tourists, with 170,000 visitors from abroad in 1961 alone. Around this "main business," other "Shakespeare enterprises" have sprung up in the poet's hometown and nearby areas, including inns, restaurants, grocery stores, and tailor shops, all capitalizing on Shakespeare as their revenue source. The total annual income of the "Shakespeare market" is quite substantial; according to *The Economist*, the foreign exchange earnings alone amount to £550,000.

[...]

The poet's birthday is highly "celebrated," while his works are neglected, which is not surprising in contemporary Britain [...] If Shakespeare were aware of this, what would he say? Another line from *Timon of Athens* seems as though the poet himself crafted it to rebuke those who now seek to "commemorate" his birthday with ulterior motives and profit-driven intentions. It goes: "Hence, pack [...] you came for gold, ye slaves."⁹

The End of the Anniversary Commemoration "System"

On the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth, China did not hold any commemorative events. According to the convention of the 1950s, a sizable conference should have been held. This "convention" can also be understood as an unwritten "system" established in the early 1950s: national departments organized commemorative events for the birth or death anniversaries of world-famous writers and artists. This system was formed to expand China's global influence through cultural exchanges and to enhance relationships with other nations. It was also related to the western

classical literacy of the literary leaders of the 1950s and 1960s, and directly connected to the cultural measures of the World Peace Council. Established in Helsinki, Finland, in 1950, the World Peace Council was a peripheral organization of the socialist camp. Although it was primarily controlled by the Soviet Communist Party, its goal was to broadly unite progressive and peace-loving people around the world. As a result, the organization had a certain level of inclusiveness and openness in its structure and work strategies. Since 1952, the World Peace Council has designated renowned cultural figures and scientists for that year's birth or death anniversary as "world cultural celebrities," with various national Peace Committees hosting commemorative activities. In the early 1950s, Hong Shen,¹⁰ a playwright who worked at the Bureau of International Exchange and Cooperation of the Ministry of Culture, provided the following information:

On November 7, 1951, the World Peace Council passed a resolution on "cultural relations, using the 1952 holiday for peace and great cultural anniversaries." Regarding anniversaries, the resolution "suggested commemorations for the 150th anniversary of Hugo's birth (proposed by Mao Dun), the 500th anniversary of Leonardo da Vinci's birth (proposed by Ehrenburg), the 100th anniversary of Gogol's death (proposed by Donini), and the 1000th anniversary of Avicenna's death (proposed by many doctors from various countries)." The resolution also stated, "With these measures, the Peace Committees of various countries will be able to ensure that all cultural figures and the broadest sectors of the public are concerned with the development of culture as a common wealth of humanity."¹¹

The series of commemorative events organized by the World Peace Council continued into the 1960s and 1970s. For Chinese literature, this played a role in shaping the openness to Western classical culture from the 1950s until before the Cultural Revolution, influencing the "contemporary" literary scene and benefiting writers and readers. Certain authors and artists, who might have been overlooked or ignored according to Chinese "contemporary" literary concepts, were unexpectedly highlighted, such as Dostoevsky and James Joyce.

The directory of national-level anniversary commemorations of foreign "world cultural celebrities" (mainly determined by the World Peace Council, but not limited to this)¹² held by the Chinese cultural community from 1952 to 1963 was as follows:

1952: Hugo (150th anniversary of birth), Leonardo da Vinci (500th anniversary of birth), Gogol (100th anniversary of death).

1953: Gorky (85th anniversary of birth), Stanislavsky (15th anniversary of death), Copernicus (410th anniversary of death), Rabelais (400th anniversary of death), José Martí (100th anniversary of birth).¹³

1954: Dvořák (50th anniversary of death), Henry Fielding (200th anniversary of death), Aristophanes (2400th anniversary of birth), Chekhov (50th anniversary of death), Shakespeare (390th anniversary of birth), Ostrovsky (50th anniversary of birth).

1955: Whitman's *Leaves of Grass* (100th anniversary of publication), Cervantes's *Don Quixote* (350th anniversary of publication), Schiller (150th anniversary of death), Mickiewicz (100th anniversary of death), Montesquieu (200th anniversary of death), Andersen (150th anniversary of birth), Mayakovsky (25th anniversary of death).

1956: Saltykov-Shchedrin (130th anniversary of birth), Sesshū Tōyō (400th anniversary of death), Franklin (200th anniversary of birth), Dostoevsky (150th anniversary of birth), Kālidāsa

(fl. 4th–5th century), Heine (100th anniversary of death), Mozart (200th anniversary of birth), Rembrandt (350th anniversary of death), George Bernard Shaw (100th anniversary of birth), Ibsen (50th anniversary of death), Franco (Ukrainian poet, 100th anniversary of death).

1957: Glinka (100th anniversary of death), Blake (100th anniversary of birth), Longfellow (150th anniversary of birth), Goldoni (250th anniversary of birth), Gorky (20th anniversary of death).

1958: Gorky (90th anniversary of birth), Yavorov (Bulgarian poet, 80th anniversary of birth), Migjeni (Albanian poet, 20th anniversary of death), Byron (190th anniversary of birth), Saadi (Iranian poet, 750th anniversary of birth), Milton (350th anniversary of birth), Ogata Kōrin (Japanese painter, 300th anniversary of birth).

1959: Mussorgsky (120th anniversary of birth), Handel (200th anniversary of death), Burns (200th anniversary of birth), Darwin (150th anniversary of birth), Słowacki (Polish poet, 150th anniversary of birth), Euclides da Cunha (Brazilian writer, 50th anniversary of death), Schiller (200th anniversary of birth), Sholem Aleichem (100th anniversary of birth), Vaptsarov (Bulgarian poet, 50th anniversary of birth), Gogol (150th anniversary of birth).

1960: Chekhov (100th anniversary of birth), Bjørnson (Norwegian dramatist, 50th anniversary of death), Mark Twain (50th anniversary of death), Tolstoy (50th anniversary of death), Defoe (300th anniversary of birth), Musset (150th anniversary of birth).

1961: Bacon (400th anniversary of birth), Shevchenko (100th anniversary of death), Domingo Sarmiento (150th anniversary of birth), Pak Illo (Korean poet, 400th anniversary of birth).

1962: Herzen (150th anniversary of birth), Joyce (100th anniversary of birth), Lope de Vega (400th anniversary of birth).

1963: Zeami (Japanese dramatist, 600th anniversary of birth), Mayakovsky (70th anniversary of birth).

Between 1964 and the end of the Cultural Revolution, China did not hold anniversary commemorations for foreign writers and artists. The “contemporary” anniversary commemoration “system” came to an end. The reason was not complicated: the emphasis on class struggle and the initiation of a widespread socialist education movement starting in 1963. In December 1963 and June 1964, Mao Zedong issued two directives. The December 1963 directive stated:

Problems abound in all forms of art such as the drama, ballads, music, the fine arts, the dance, the cinema, poetry and literature, and the people involved are numerous; in many departments very little has been achieved so far in socialist transformation and they are still dominated by “dead” forces [...] Isn’t it absurd that many Communists are enthusiastic about promoting feudal and capitalist art, but not socialist art?¹⁴

The cultural rectification movement that began in 1964 included, among other things, the clearing and reviewing of the enthusiastic promotion of “feudal and capitalist art.”

The “Absurd” Shakespeare

The article “Shakespeare’s Business” published in *People’s Daily* criticized Britain for capitalizing on anniversary celebrations without regard for the works themselves (publication, performance, research). This is not accurate. According to Liang Shiqiu’s *Shakespeare’s 400th*

Birthday Commemorative Collection, many countries not only performed Shakespeare's plays domestically but also sent troupes to perform for several months at the commemorative theaters in Shakespeare's hometown. UNESCO also held a commemorative event in Paris, with Argentine writer Jorge Luis Borges as the keynote speaker (Liang 1–7). The number of research papers published in Britain was also substantial. The three British literary journals mentioned above—*British Literary Review*, *Essays and Studies* 1964 sponsored by British Academy, and the *Times Literary Supplement*—all released special issues with over thirty papers and book reviews covering topics such as Shakespeare's biography, editions, dissemination, stage design, and performance language, as well as the impact of early typesetters and proofreaders on the surviving texts. In his article "Shakespeare Performances Today," William Gaskill, director of the new National Theater, specifically mentioned Brecht's contributions to innovations in performance. The *Times Literary Supplement* also published an article by Georg Lukács, "Theater and Environment," which addressed stage design in Shakespearean performances (Zhou, "Three" 39).

In fact, on the 400th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth, there was no shortage of papers published in China, the Soviet Union, or Western countries like Britain. However, due to differences in cultural, academic traditions, and ideologies, researchers from different countries had significant divergences in their focus and interpretations of Shakespeare. Maulnier believed that love and respect for Shakespeare transcended national, linguistic, and ideological boundaries. It should be noted that this love and respect inevitably left its marks on language, culture, and ideology. In 1964, the deep imprints of the Cold War and the split in the international communist movement were evident, and the richness and complexity of Shakespeare's dramas and poems provided fertile ground for scholars with various philosophical views and political positions. As Zhao Yiheng mentioned in "The 'Absurd' Shakespeare: In Mr. Dühring's View, Any Contradiction is Absurd," "Herder used him [Shakespeare] to invoke 'Sturm und Drang' in Germany, Hugo used him to duel with classicism in France, Coleridge used him to advocate for Romanticism in Britain, Pushkin used him to settle accounts with his former mentor Byron in Russia, and Belinsky used him to provide an example for realism" (125). Despite this, Zhao Yiheng quoted Herder's words: Shakespeare "seated high atop some craggy eminence, whirlwinds, tempest, and the roaring sea at his feet, but with the flashing skies about his head [...] below him, at the very base of his rocky throne, there murmur the multitudes who explain, defend, condemn, excuse, worship, slander, translate, and traduce him—and all of whom he cannot hear!" (125).

In "The Shakespeare Year," Maulnier describes Shakespeare's status and the "contradictions" in his works as follows:

His works encompass poetry and prose, comedy and tragedy, psychology and conspiracy, metaphysics and politics. They include the murder and lamentation found in popular tragedy, as well as the most transcendent and secretive reflections on the possible and inscrutable meanings of life and action. They explore vitality and decay, mediocrity and beauty, fiery passion and angelic purity, commoners and aristocrats, novels and mythological dramas, affectation and ruggedness, the incredible and the rational, ambition, revenge, compassion, adoration, the most brutal self-affirmation and the most gentle self-denial, human will and the cosmic fatalism from earth and night, the ancient legend of the serpent tempting Eve and the latest intellectual temptations, the richness of life and the destructive mockery, as well as "the all" and "nothingness." (24)

This view echoes Hugo's speech delivered on the 300th anniversary of Shakespeare's birth: "Shakespeare encompasses tragedy, comedy, fairyland, hymns, farce, divine mirth, terror and horror [...] He reaches both poles; he belongs to the Olympian gods as well as to the theater on the market. He lacks no possibility" (407).

So, in 1964, according to Herder, what would various groups "for a cause or a particular truth" pick from the rich and diverse Shakespeare, and how would they "unite him, enlist him, mobilize him to join their ranks"?

How Would Various Groups "Unite" and "Enlist" Shakespeare in 1964?

In 1964, British scholar Helen Gardner attempted to review the major trends in 20th-century Shakespearean studies. In "Shakespeare in the Age of Eliot," she described how Shakespearean scholarship since the 300th anniversary of Shakespeare's death in 1916 had been overshadowed by T. S. Eliot's literary criticism. Gardner noted that while research during this era was diverse and varied, it was also marked by a particular "academic and literary climate." Influenced by Eliot's 1917 essay "Tradition and the Individual Talent," Shakespearean criticism developed two tendencies: one focused on textual analysis rather than the playwright, employing a "spatial method" to search for "imagistic patterns" beneath characters and plots; the other was devoted to psychological and spiritual analysis. Gardner added that critics in this era tended to judge drama by the standards of Symbolist poetry, the highest literary achievement of the time, which "treats characters merely as masks or objective symbols of the poet's emotions." Such an approach is "precisely the farthest from understanding drama":

One of the most prominent features of the Shakespearean criticism dominated by Mr. Eliot is its neglect or underestimation of a quality that any ordinary person of any century, including this one, would recognize as Shakespeare's greatest talent: his ability to endow his characters with independent life. His imagination is so boundlessly generous and compassionate that even the most base, ridiculous, or weak characters that populate his imaginative world are given the right to express themselves and speak from their own positions. (21)

These critical descriptions reveal Gardner's dissatisfaction with the once-popular New Criticism that sought internal unity within the text and express his anticipation for exploring the giant Shakespeare from a broader "cultural" perspective.

In 1964, as a French "right-wing scholar," Maulnier insisted on explaining Shakespeare's value from the perspective of human nature. Regarding the "Eastern" view of Shakespeare as a "social critic," he sarcastically remarked that if this were the case, "people might as well be content with Brecht's plays, since they are easier to stage." Maulnier argued that "he [Shakespeare] is a street playwright, and also Goldoni; he is Calderón and Molière; he is a realist and a romantic; he is Aeschylus and Musset; he is Pirandello and Beckett":

However, Shakespeare's true greatness lies not in the richness of his works' content, nor in his ambiguous language and endless contradictions, nor in the way his characters, through a modern lens, observe the intense scenes and emotions in his immortal plays. His true greatness lies in how each of his major characters is profoundly connected to the foundations of human

nature. The love of Romeo and Juliet is the noble passion of a pair of amiable youths, but from its almost scandalous nature and its absolute universality, it is primarily an original impulse of mutual attraction between the sexes. King Lear's grief over his deceased daughter Cordelia represents the most solemn state of human suffering, but it is also akin to a beast's lament over its slain young. Similarly, Othello, Macbeth, in their final moments, and Hamlet, facing the moment of avenging his father's death, invoke cosmic justice. (25)

Maulnier believes that Shakespeare's greatness lies in depicting the "human nature" of animal physiological instincts, which is undoubtedly a blasphemy to those who find Shakespeare's greatness in humanism.

In 1964, the Soviet Union portrayed Shakespeare as a pacifist and humanitarian engaged in modern political debate. This is evident from the titles of commemorative articles in newspapers and magazines like *Pravda*, *Zvezda*, *Drama*, *Neva*, and *Literaturnaya Gazeta*: "Optimistic Humanitarianism," "Forever a Contemporary," "Immortal Shakespeare," "Great Source of Peace," and "Human Dignity." In an article titled "Optimistic Humanitarianism" published in *Pravda* on April 23, 1964, Anisimov argued that Shakespeare's plays reflected the depth and richness of real life, particularly the humanitarian spirit: whether it is Othello, Desdemona, Romeo, Juliet, Hamlet, or other perfect creations, they "all embody this humanitarian concept about humanity." An article published in the fourth issue of *Drama* in 1964 stated that Shakespeare was an "envoy" sent by the "things of the past" to speak about contemporary issues.¹⁵ For "us," who "place human interests above all else," he is a spiritual resource nurturing the spirit of philanthropy and social humanitarianism, transcending both time and national and class boundaries:

Regardless of what our creative people are engaged in, the social tasks they handle, the issues Soviet people consider, or the social phenomena marking changes in the era, Shakespeare's plays offer examples, analogies, satire, foresight, associations, genius's guesses, encouragement, and spiritual support. They provide fraternal support to those on the path of humanitarianism and progress, and express anger towards those diverging from the paths of people, nation, unity, philanthropy, and peace. Time flies, social structures change, and wars rumble in the background [...] but people continue to talk passionately about *Romeo and Juliet*. (Editorial Department of the *Drama*)

"However," Followed by "Limitations"

In 1964, Chinese critics certainly could not agree with the views of their Soviet counterparts: humanitarianism, peaceful coexistence, fraternity, and brotherhood—these concepts had already faced intense criticism since the late 1950s. Most commemorative activities in 1964 were shelved, but a group of articles by scholars such as Bian Zhilin, Wang Zuoliang, Zhao Li, Chen Jia, Dai Liuling, and Ge Baoquan were published.¹⁶ These works extended the theories and methods established in the 1950s for the criticism of foreign classical literature: employing historical materialism and class theory to explore the social context in which Shakespeare's works were produced, the class conflicts and social relations reflected in them, and the political, historical, religious, and ethical views expressed in them too. While affirming Shakespeare's promotion

of humanistic ideas and his critique of the dark essence of medieval feudalism and bourgeois society, these articles also highlighted the limitations of his era and class. Among the "limitations" and potential negative impacts on socialist readers were abstract and essentially bourgeois humanitarianism, the supremacy of love, vague theories of class reconciliation, and pessimistic fatalism. Contemporary Chinese Shakespearean scholars have offered impressive and insightful discussions in this regard. For instance, Wang Zuoliang compared the portrayal of Helen of Troy in Shakespeare's *Troilus and Cressida* with that in Marlowe's *The Tragical History of Doctor Faustus*. Marlowe writes of Helen:

Was this the face that launch'd a thousand ships,
And burnt the topless towers of Ilium?

Shakespeare's portrayal, on the other hand, is:

Why, she is a pearl,
Whose price hath launch'd above a thousand ships,
And turn'd crown'd kings to merchants.

Wang Zuoliang noted that while Marlowe, also adhering to humanistic ideals, was filled with admiration for the "heroic age" of ancient Greek culture, Shakespeare, by employing an "anti-heroic spirit," reworked these lines. This "betrayed" the tendencies of the English bourgeoisie around 1600: to merchants and adventurers concerned with overseas trade, piracy, and colonial expansion, Helen was merely a "high-priced" pearl—and this showed Shakespeare's sensitivity even to subtle contemporary information (22).

In 1964, Shakespearean research in China continued to follow the path of class and social analysis, but significant changes were also evident. First, Shakespeare's works were further simplified and reduced to "central themes"; critics increasingly disliked complexity, noise, and contradictions, and did not acknowledge the existence of the mysterious or the unknowable. Second, there was an increased emphasis and exaggeration of the "limitations." When addressing literary heritage or works by non-proletarian writers, contemporary criticism referred to "limitations" not as general shortcomings or defects of the works, but as fundamental artistic and ideological flaws resulting from an inability to grasp the laws of historical development and to perceive the "essence" of things. This flaw, due to the inescapable constraints of the times and class, was deemed inevitable, regardless of how great the artist was, whether named Shakespeare or Tolstoy.

During this period, Zhao Zhongyuan's book *Shakespeare* could be considered a typical example for observing the characteristics of Shakespearean studies in China. Zhao Zhongyuan was the pen name used by Zhao Li when he wrote this book.¹⁷ This small booklet, with just over 20,000 words, was the only Shakespeare biography compiled by a Chinese scholar between the 1950s and 1970s and part of the *Foreign History Series* that began publication in 1962.¹⁸ Although it was a popular reader, all contributors to this series were accomplished scholars in the field. This book reflects two characteristics of Shakespearean research during this time: the "central theme" approach and an emphasis on limitations. The narrative "grammar" of the book is essentially formed by sentences constructed with the conjunctive word "but":

Shakespeare lived over three hundred years ago and was a writer of the English Renaissance. The *central idea* of his works is bourgeois humanism (i.e., humanitarianism). This idea reflected the consciousness and demands of the emerging bourgeoisie at the time and played a progressive role in the struggle against feudalism. His works also provided a depiction of the struggle against feudal systems, medieval theocracy, and feudal morality, which had a significant impact on later European literature. His artistic techniques still offer valuable lessons today.

But the humanistic ideas in his works have obvious temporal and class limitations. The essence of this idea is bourgeois individualism. Therefore, we must analyze these works from a Marxist-Leninist perspective [...] Today, such a writer cannot avoid having a negative impact on readers and viewers in our socialist era; improper evaluation could also have harmful effects. Regarding his artistic techniques, one should first have a correct estimation of the ideological content of the works; discussing artistic techniques alone, without considering the ideological content, is incorrect. (Zhao, *Shakespeare* 5–6; emphasis added)

Subsequently, the book continues in this manner, pointing out that Shakespeare is the “main representative of English humanism,” and that “the ‘human’ admired by humanists refers only to the bourgeoisie and its individuals. *But* they do not admit this themselves and instead describe ‘human’ as all of humanity to win hearts” (11; emphasis added). When discussing *Romeo and Juliet*, the book states: “The entire play is passionate and poetic. Therefore, this play was especially well received by audiences when it first appeared and continues to be frequently performed on stages worldwide. *But* we must point out that the conflicts revealed by the playwright in this play are meaningful only in the context of the contemporary anti-feudal struggle [...] The playwright advocates the supremacy of love [...] This is, of course, the thought of bourgeois individualism” (18; emphasis added). The evaluation of *Henry V* is: “The author chose Henry V to embody his humanistic ideals, creating an ‘ideal monarch,’ *but* in order to meet artistic requirements, it was necessary to sacrifice historical authenticity to some extent, as such a monarch did not exist in reality” (23; emphasis added). Regarding *Hamlet*, the book suggests that this character “sees and despises the sins of the society of his time, bravely resisting and having the determination and confidence to change the situation. *But* in the face of a sinful society, his ideals are ultimately powerless [...] Although he is close to the people and loved by them [...] *But* he only sees the role of the individual and wishes to use individual power to eliminate the enemy, eventually dying alone in battle.” For *Othello*, the book’s assessment is: “Later he committed suicide. *But* this is merely a form of moral ‘self-fulfillment’ by an individualist, intended to gain social sympathy and forgiveness” (31–34; emphasis added). Regarding *The Tempest*, Zhao Zhongyuan argues that this play “has not entirely lost its exposure and criticism of reality, still maintaining humanistic ideals and placing hope in the innocent and lovely young male and female characters. *But* moral improvement is ultimately the core of his thoughts ... This idea of reconciling contradictions and eliminating struggles is exactly opposite to Marxist-Leninist doctrines on class and class struggle” (40; emphasis added).

The relationship between contemporary critics and Shakespeare seems to have reversed the situation described by Herder: seated high atop some craggy eminence is no longer Shakespeare, who is bound by inevitable “limitations,” but the critics who are well-versed in the laws of history. However, this may be a superficial impression. Scholars such as Bian Zhilin, Wang Zuoliang, Yang Zhouhan, Li Funing, Fang Ping, Zhang Junchuan, Chen Jia, Sun Jiaxiu, Sun Dayu, and Zhao Li, who

have received education in English and American literature from prestigious British and American universities and possessed profound academic backgrounds, may not internally acknowledge this point. They also lacked sufficient confidence. However, the grammar of "but" revealed their views on the relationship between the trivial and the significant, the external and the internal. Reverence (and in some cases, even worship) was the "base color" on their painted canvas; the colors following "but" were not stable and could easily fade, peel off, and vanish with the wind. This has been proven by facts. Shortly after the end of the Cultural Revolution, their evaluations changed significantly. When the book *Shakespeare* was reissued in 1983, the title was prefixed with the commendation "The Great British Dramatist" (Zhao, *Great British Dramatist* 2) and a new section on "Achievements and Influence" was added, while most of the text discussing "limitations" was removed. At the beginning of the book, instead of the discussion on "limitations," a quotation from Thomas Carlyle's *On Heroes, Hero-Worship, and the Heroic in History* about the choice, between giving up "your Indian Empire or your Shakespeare" was introduced (2). In the literary "new era" of the 1980s, the words of Cao Yu, then president of the Shakespeare Society of China, should express the sentiments of many: Shakespeare is a literary giant "standing on a high peak," who teaches us to "understand ourselves, broaden our horizons, enrich our impoverished lives, gain wisdom, achieve happiness, enjoy life, [and] understand the value, dignity, and power of being 'human'" (1).

"We Know Less Than He Does?"

In 1964, Arnold Kettle offered a different perspective. Kettle, a member of the Central Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain and a senior lecturer in English literature at Leeds University, wrote a commemorative piece on Shakespeare titled "The Master of Our Language," published in the April 18 issue of the British Communist paper *Daily Worker*.¹⁹ He discussed how Shakespeare's evaluation and reputation have changed due to various factors, such as the interpreter's era, beliefs, and aesthetic tastes, with language and cultural traditions also playing significant roles. He noted that while Shakespeare has always been recognized as a "very great figure," the assessment of this greatness was not consistent. For instance, "although he has a considerable number of admirers in France, Italy, and Spain, as a whole, Germanic and Slavic speakers have rated him higher than those who speak 'Latin' languages, at least over the past 150 years." Kettle attributed this partly to language differences: "English poetry seems easier to translate into German or Russian than into French or Italian." Among the various factors affecting Shakespeare's evaluation, "cultural attitudes" were more important. The French may find Shakespeare moving yet somewhat rough, reflecting the 18th-century British classical perspective. French critics considered Shakespeare's works as those of a talented person who unfortunately did not live in a cultured environment. However, significant historical events could potentially alter attitudes towards classics. Kettle used *King Lear* as an example, noting that the terrifying scene where the Earl of Gloucester was blinded in public was often omitted in performances during the Victorian era and early 20th century due to its distressing nature. Today, however, "a conscientious contemporary director would never think of cutting this scene. This, one might say, is connected with what people actually experienced or engaged in at Auschwitz and Buchenwald."²⁰

Like many Shakespearean interpreters, Kettle summarizes an important feature of Shakespeare's plays as "richness." He wrote, "In paying tribute to our great writer, I believe it is necessary to point out [...] that it is precisely because he is so much greater than all of us that we sometimes fail to

understand him.” He discussed a passage from Shakespeare’s late play *The Tempest*, where Prospero, in Act IV, uses magic to summon spirits to bless the love of Miranda and Ferdinand but suddenly interrupts this “performance” in a fit of anger. He says to his daughter Miranda:

Our revels now are ended. These our actors,
As I foretold you, were all spirits and
Are melted into air, into thin air:
And, like the baseless fabric of this vision,
The cloud-capp’d towers, the gorgeous palaces,
The solemn temples, the great globe itself,
Ye all which it inherit, shall dissolve
And, like this insubstantial pageant faded,
Leave not a rack behind. We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep.²¹

Kettle asked in confusion, “What does Prospero mean by these words?” He did not attempt to explain but aimed to illustrate: “When we say that Shakespeare is the greatest master of our language, what we really mean is that he is deeper than anyone else, and we know less than he does. He conveyed through language what no one else has conveyed. We will forever be grateful to him.” In Kettle’s words, is there also an underlying implication that the giants of the Renaissance, in their wholeness, embraced conflicting ideas, emotions, and languages, expressed eternal human feelings such as love and hate, jealousy and fear, sorrow and rage, compassion and cruelty, fantasy and faith? And that since the 19th century, people have become fragmented and neurotic, unable to comprehend the seamless and vital existence in earlier times?

This is naturally only conjecture; whether it is true or not can be set aside for now. Return to Kettle’s remark that “we know less than he does,” and we would see that coming from the mouth of a British Communist, a vanguard of the proletariat, and published in the official organ of the proletarian party, it undoubtedly would cause controversy. Indeed, from April 22, *Daily Worker* began to publish criticism and reviews. According to materials provided by the editors of *Modern Literary Theory Translation Series* (no. 4, 1964), criticisms and rebuttals of Kettle’s denigration of modern proletarian awareness and understanding include the following:

“Kettle, at the end of his essay on Shakespeare, fell into Shakespearean worship.”

“Four hundred years later, ‘we know less than he does’—this is nonsense!”

“Shakespeare only found high tragedy among the rich and aristocrats [...] and he had boundless enthusiasm only for them.”

[The British ruling class is eager to preserve his plays,] “without a doubt, because Shakespeare viewed the world through the lens of emerging imperialist perspectives, and what could be better than wrapping the pill of imperialism in the language of exquisite poetry!” (Kettle, *Editor’s Note*)

Such debates are "universal" and not unfamiliar to Chinese readers.

Translated by WEN Yiwen

Notes

1. This paper was originally published in Chinese in *Literature and Art Studies*, no. 11, 2021, pp. 64–77.
2. Thierry Maulnier worked for *Le Figaro* in the 1960s. At that time, "Shakespeare Year" was likely a common term; for example, in the *Shakespeare's 400th Birthday Commemorative Collection* edited by Liang Shiqiu, there is an article titled "Observations on Celebrations of the Shakespeare Year in Britain."
3. In his book, Meng Xianqiang divides Shakespeare Studies in China from 1856 to the 1990s into the following periods: "Initiation Period (1856–1920)," "Exploration Period (1921–1936)," "Struggle Period (1936–1948)," "Flourishing Period (1949–1965)," "Rise Period (1978–1988)," and "Transition Period (1989–)."
4. Based on Bian Zhilin's "translation and adaptation" of *Hamlet*, the film *Hamlet* was dubbed by the Shanghai Film Translation Factory in 1958, and the voice actor for Hamlet was Sun Daolin. The film was re-released in the early 1980s, and according to Bian Zhilin, the audience reached over 100 million people (this number likely included TV viewers as well). See Bian Zhilin, 《哈姆雷特》的汉语翻译及其改编电影的配音 ["The Chinese Translation of *Hamlet* and the Dubbing of Its Adapted Film"], 莎士比亚研究: 创刊号 [*Shakespeare Studies: The Inaugural Issue*], Zhejiang People's Publishing House, 1983, p. 7.
5. Shi Xianrong was a translator and scholar of English and American literature. After graduating from the Department of Western Languages at Peking University in 1953, he worked in the Foreign Literature Editorial Office of People's Literature Publishing House. In 1981, he joined the Institute of Foreign Literature at the Chinese Academy of Social Sciences, where he served as the director of the American Literature Research Office. His works include *Shakespeare and His Plays*, *A Brief History of American Literature* (co-authored), and *West Wind and Weeds: Essays on Contemporary English and American Literature*. He also translated works such as *On the Road*, *The Catcher in the Rye*, and *Waiting for Godot*. In the 1960s, he led the editing and publication of the *Complete Works of Shakespeare* at People's Literature Publishing House.
6. In 1964, Liang Shiqiu edited *Shakespeare's 400th Birthday Commemorative Collection*, which included articles and translations by Liang Shiqiu, Li Qichun, Liu Xibing, Li Mangui, Wu Xizhen, Chen Jiying, Hu Baihua, and others, as well as "A Bibliography of Important Shakespeare Studies" compiled by Jin Kaixin. Liang Shiqiu's translation of *The Complete Works of Shakespeare* in forty volumes was published by Far East Book Company (Taipei City) from 1967 to 1968.
7. See 外语系举行报告会和展览会纪念莎士比亚诞生四百周年 ["The Foreign Language Department Held a Lecture and Exhibition to Commemorate the 400th Anniversary of Shakespeare's Birth"]. 中山大学学报 [*Journal of Sun Yat-sen University*], no. 2, 1964.
8. 编者按 ["Editor's Note"]. 现代外国哲学社会科学文摘 [*Digest of Foreign Social Sciences*], no. 8, 1964, p.18.
9. Yuan Xianlu, 莎士比亚的生意经 ["Shakespeare's Business"], 人民日报 [*People's Daily*], March 12, 1964. The author served as an editor in the Supplementary Pages, Readers' Letters Department, and International News Department of *People's Daily*, and was the chief editor of both the International Department and the Overseas Edition of *People's Daily*.
10. Hong Shen was a dramatist, director, and social activist. A member of the South China Society, he joined the Association of Chinese Left-Wing Writers in the 1930s and worked as a director and screenwriter at Mingxing Film Company. He spent thirty years teaching in the foreign language departments at Fudan University, Jinan University, Shandong University, Sun Yat-sen University, and Xiamen University. In the early 1950s, he served as a professor at Beijing Normal University and as the director of the Foreign Liaison Bureau of the Ministry of Culture.
11. See Hong Shen, 纪念雨果诞辰一百五十周年 ["Commemorating the 150th Anniversary of Hugo's Birth"],

人民日报 [*People's Daily*], 27 Feb. 1952.

12. These commemorative events were usually organized by the Chinese Committee for the Defense of World Peace, the Chinese People's Association for Friendship with Foreign Countries, the China Federation of Literary and Art Circles, the Chinese Writers Association, and relevant artist associations. For instance, on September 27, 1953, a commemorative meeting for Qu Yuan, Copernicus, Rabelais, and José Martí was held at Huairan Hall in Zhongnanhai. Over 1,200 participants, including Guo Moruo, Mao Dun, Zhou Yang, Chu Tunan, Chen Shutong, Shao Lizi, Luo Longji, Jiao Juyin, Xia Yan, Xiao San, Cao Yu, Zheng Zhenduo, and Tian Han, attended, with Guo Moruo delivering a speech.
13. In 1961, at the height of the Cuban Revolution, China held another commemorative event for José Martí.
14. Mao Zedong's two directives were not publicly released at the time and were only communicated internally. When the *Red Flag* reprinted "Talks at the Yan'an Forum on Literature and Art" in issue 9 of 1966, the added note "A Compass for the Proletarian Cultural Revolution" made these two directives public for the first time.
15. The original quotation from the article is: "The things of the past have gained a voice, and sent their envoy—the artist—into the future."
16. For example, Wang Zuoliang's "English Poetic Drama and Shakespeare" (*Literary Review*, no. 1, 1964), Bian Zhilin's "The Development of Shakespearean Drama" (*Literary Review*, no. 4, 1964), Dai Liuling's "Macbeth and the Atmosphere of the Supernatural" (*Journal of Sun Yat-sen University*, no. 4, 1964), Chen Jia's "An Evaluation of Shakespeare from *Othello* and *Hamlet*" (*Journal of Nanjing University*, no. 2, 1964), and Zhao Li's "A Brief Discussion on the Ideological Tendencies in Shakespearean Drama" (*Guangming Daily*, November 5, 1964). Additionally, Volume 9 of the *Classical Literary Theory Translation Series* published by People's Literature Publishing House in 1964 is a Shakespeare special, featuring a collection of articles by foreign classical authors on Shakespeare, including British writers Morgann and Hazlitt, German scholars Herder, F. Schlegel, and Heine, and French critics Madame de Staël and Chateaubriand.
17. Zhao Li, also known by pen names Zhao Zhongyuan or Xiao Yuan, was a scholar of comparative literature, British and American literature. He graduated from the Department of Foreign Languages at Central University in Chongqing in 1942 and completed his studies in English at the University of Washington in 1950 before returning to China. He served as the head of the English translation and editing team for *Selected Works of Mao Zedong* at the Publicity Department of the CPC and later taught at Sichuan University, Capital Normal University, and Renmin University of China.
18. The *Foreign History Series* was published by the Commercial Press from 1962 to 1965, comprising 59 volumes, all written by accomplished scholars in the field. During the 1960s, the chief editor was Wu Han, with Qi Sihe as the deputy editor and the editorial board including Chen Hansheng, Zhou Gucheng, Yang Renpian, Wu Yuqin, Cheng Qiuyuan, Liu Zongxu, Luo Rongqu, Zhang Zhilian, and Chen Hanbo, among others. The series faced criticism during the Cultural Revolution but was reinstated in 1979 with Chen Hansheng as the chief editor. By the 1990s, over 500 volumes had been published.
19. The *Daily Worker*, founded in the UK in 1930, was renamed *Morning Star* in 1966.
20. According to the editors of the series, after its publication, the *Worker's Weekly* of the American Communist Party reprinted the entire article on April 28, with the title changed to "Four Hundred Years Later on the World Stage, Shakespeare's Joy Still Remains Unspoken."
21. The translation here is based on the 1954 edition of *The Works of Shakespeare* translated by Zhu Shenghao, published by People's Literature Publishing House.

Works Cited

- Anisimov. 乐观的人道主义 ["Optimistic Humanitarianism"]. Translated by Zhen Li, 现代文艺理论译丛 [*Modern Literary Theory Translation Series*], no. 4, 1964, pp. 123–127.
- Annals: Major Events at Shanghai Theater Academy 1945–2015*, compiled by the *Annals* Editing Group, Shanghai

Academy of Social Sciences Press, 2015.

Cao, Yu. 发刊词 ["Preface"]. 莎士比亚研究: 创刊号 [*Shakespeare Studies: The Inaugural Issue*], Zhejiang People's Publishing House, 1983, pp. 1–5.

Editorial Department of the *Drama*. 永远是同时代人 ["Forever a Contemporary"]. Translated by Zhen Li, 现代文艺理论译丛 [*Modern Literary Theory Translation Series*], no. 4, 1964, pp. 128–135.

Gardner, Helen. 艾略特时代的莎士比亚 ["Shakespeare in the Age of Eliot"]. Translated by Xuliang Zhou, 现代外国哲学社会科学文摘 [*Digest of Foreign Social Sciences*], no. 8, 1964, pp. 18–23.

Ge, Baoquan. 莎士比亚的作品在中国 ["Shakespeare's Works in China"]. 世界文学 [*World Literature*], no. 5, 1964, pp. 136–143.

Ge, Guilu. 中国外国文学研究的学术历程, 第5卷, 英国文学研究的学术历程 [*The Academic Development of Chinese Foreign Literature Studies, Vol. 5, The Academic Development of English Literature Studies*]. Edited by Jianhua Chen, Chongqing Press, 2016.

Herder, Johann Gottfried. 莎士比亚 ["Shakespeare"]. Translated by Dewang Tian, 古典文艺理论译丛 [*Classical Literary Theory Translation Series*], no. 9, People's Literature Publishing House, 1964, pp. 69–91.

Huang, Zuolin. 导演的话 [*Director's Words*]. Shanghai Literature and Art Publishing House, 1979.

Hugo, Victor. 莎士比亚的天才 ["The Genius of Shakespeare"]. 莎士比亚评论汇编 [*Shakespeare Review Compilation*], vol. 1, edited by Zhouhan Yang, China Social Sciences Publishing House, 1979, pp. 407–424.

Kettle, Arnold. 我们语言的大师 ["The Master of Our Language"]. Translated by Qiufu Gao, 现代文艺理论译丛 [*Modern Literary Theory Translation Series*], no. 4, 1964, pp. 150–156.

Liang, Shiqiu. 莎士比亚诞辰四百周年纪念 ["Commemoration of the 400th Anniversary of Shakespeare's Birth"]. 莎士比亚诞辰四百周年纪念集 [*Shakespeare's 400th Birthday Commemorative Collection*], edited by Shiqiu Liang, Chungwha Book Company, 1966, pp. 1–7.

Maulnier, Thierry. 莎士比亚年 ["The Shakespeare Year"]. Translated by Yonghui Zheng, 现代外国哲学社会科学文摘 [*Digest of Foreign Social Sciences*], no. 8, 1964, pp. 24–25.

Meng, Xianqiang. 中国莎学简史 [*Shakespeare in China: A Brief History*]. Northeast Normal UP, 1994.

Wang, Zuoliang. 英国诗剧与莎士比亚 ["English Poetic Drama and Shakespeare"]. 文学评论 [*Literary Review*], no. 1, 1964, pp. 1–25.

Zhao, Yiheng. “荒谬”的莎士比亚——在杜林先生看来, 任何矛盾都是荒谬 ["The 'Absurd' Shakespeare: In Mr. Dühring's View, Any Contradiction Is Absurd"]. 社会科学辑刊 [*Social Science Journal*], no. 5, 1984, pp. 125–134.

Zhao, Zhongyuan. 英国伟大戏剧家莎士比亚 [*The Great British Dramatist Shakespeare*]. Commercial Press, 1983.
——. 莎士比亚 [*Shakespeare*]. Commercial Press, 1965.

Zhou, Faxiang, et al. 二十世纪中国翻译文学史: 十七年及“文革”卷 [*A History of 20th Century Literature Translated into Chinese: The Seventeen Years and the Cultural Revolution*]. Baihua Literature and Art Publishing House, 2009.

Zhou, Xuliang. 英国三文学杂志为纪念莎士比亚诞生四百年出版专辑 ["Three British Literary Journals Published Special Issues to Commemorate the 400th Anniversary of Shakespeare's Birth"]. 现代外国哲学社会科学文摘 [*Digest of Foreign Social Sciences*], no. 8, 1964, pp. 38–39.

Zhu, Wen, and Junchuan Zhang. 莎士比亚词典 [*Shakespeare Dictionary*]. Anhui Literature and Art Publishing House, 1992.