Critical Terms and Their Resonances in Translation: The Case of *Feng* [1]

⊙ Yan Liu
Shenzhen University/Guangdong University of Foreign Studies

Abstract: Critical terms in Chinese poetics pose difficulties to those who expect clear definitions and scopes of reference since many such words are not "properly" defined in their first appearances. To make matters worse, they gain new meanings when they are used and re-used in different contexts. By tracing the origins and the further resonances of *feng* in Chinese poetics, this essay demonstrates the discrepancy between the varied meanings of the word in Chinese and those in the English translations.This essay argues that one should not use their preconceptions to judge other literatures and cultures but to respect this "otherness" by probing the other intellectual traditions to find out their particularities.

Keywords: critical term, *feng*, comparative poetics, translation, resonance

CLC: I1 **Document Code:** A **Article ID:** 2096-4374(2022)01-0113-10

Doi: 10.53397/hunnu.jflc.202201010

Introduction

Critical terms are the essence of literary theory, usually with complicated entanglements with the philosophical and ideological traditions in different cultures. The contents as well as the scopes of the usage of critical terms have undergone a long history of evolvement, internally as a result of the development of a language or culture, and externally as a result of the interactions between cultures. "Terms are the most concise way of cultural discourses with rich connotations. Usually constituted by common words/phrases (morphemes included) from a language, they are the products of cultural development and cultural exchanges" (Wang 298; my translation). However, because of the tremendous differences in languages, ways of thinking, and modes of representation, each culture may have developed a set of critical terms that cannot be found in other cultures. "The cultural differences between the Chinese and the Western traditions […] become manifest in a set of contrasts or dichotomies: Western fictionality versus Chinese factuality, Western creativity versus Chinese naturalness, Western concerns of the general versus Chinese concerns of the particular, Western metaphorical and transcendental meaning versus Chinese literal and historical sense, and so on and so forth" (Zhang 18). It is these complicated philosophical and intellectual traditions that have worked together to bring about disparate critical traditions.

Chinese literary criticism, as Wai-lim Yip observes, aims to *wu* ("awaken") by way of *dian*

(“touch”) (9), without probing into the literary texts too much. Seen in this light, Chinese critical discourse carries highly personal preferences in diction and attitude. As long as a critic believes that they “touch” upon an aspect of a literary text in their analysis which is sufficient to “awaken” others’ aesthetic understanding of the text, they will be satisfied with what they have been doing. Partly because of this individualized way of engaging texts in literary criticism, China has not developed the same theoretical paradigms as those in the West. Many critical terms in Chinese poetics do not have a clear definition; instead, they acquire meanings when they are used in different contexts. “Not only do these terms acquire meaning by their relation to one another, each term carries a history of prior usage in particular theoretical texts, and the efficacy of each term is continually reinforced by association with particular phenomena in literary texts; moreover, each term has a degree of latitude for variation and the possibility of idiosyncratic redefinition” (Owen 4-5). It is in the constant uses and re-uses that a term gains its rich connotations.

This essay focuses on one of these richly connoted terms in Chinese poetics, namely *feng* (风). By comparing different English translations, the essay will weigh the strengths and weaknesses in translating *feng* into either “wind” or “air.” Based on this analysis, it is observed that the lack of equivalency between *feng* and its English translations brings about further discrepancy when the word branches into compounds and is used in different contexts. It is this potential for Chinese critical terms to develop into many other related but varied terms that marks the alterity of the Chinese poetics.

Feng in Chinese Poetics

Donald A. Gibbs traces the pictograph of *feng* in ancient Chinese which is composed of a sail and a serpent, and by citing its explanation in *Shuo wen jie zi* (*The Origin of Chinese Characters*), defines *feng* as “a mover and as a transformer of things” and moreover, “an invisible, life-giving energy” (287). The basic connotation of the word has found its way into Chinese poetry and Chinese poetics. The earliest appearance of *feng* in Chinese poetic history is generally believed to be in *Shi Jing* (*Book of Songs*, 11th-6th century BC), a collection of more than 300 poems written during Western Zhou Dynasty and the Waring States Period. These poems are categorized into three sections, namely *feng* (Airs), ya (Elegantia), and song (Laud),[2] the first of which is believed to be collected from different parts of the country along the Yellow River. The section on *feng* records the local customs and regional traditions, as seen in compounds formed by adding *feng* to the names of places, such as *Qi feng* (齐风), *Wei feng* (魏风) and *Qin feng* (秦风), referring to the traditions of such different places/countries as Qi, Wei and Qin. These poems contain diverse subject matters and writing styles, selected and placed in the same collection in the hope of recording the daily experiences and local traditions of different places in order to reflect the heterogeneous components of the Chinese culture.

In *Mao Shi Xu* (*The Preface to Mao’s Odes*),[3] an authoritative study of *Book of Songs* which includes early Chinese critical theory, *feng* is explained as follows: “‘Air’ [*feng*] means ‘suasion’ [*feng*]; it means ‘teaching.’ Suasion is exerted in order to move [one’s prince?], and teaching aims to transform [the people]” (“风，风也，教也；风以动之，教以化之”; Van Zoeren 95). In this analysis, *feng* is a style of writing, a figure of speech that intends to teach through such devices as irony and euphemism. In this understanding, *feng* (with the first tone) is synonymous with *feng* (讽, with the third tone), literally meaning “irony” or “mock.” The rhetorical device,

known as *tongjia* (通假), is a common phenomenon in traditional Chinese, in which a character is used to replace another character with a similar pronunciation as a way of euphemism. Stephen Owen recognizes the interchangeability between these two words and thus highlights the objective of "moral education" (39) implied in *Book of Songs*. After explaining the purpose of poetry, *The Preface* further interprets *feng* as one of the six "arts" of poetry:

> 故诗有六义焉：一曰风，二曰赋，三曰比，四曰兴，五曰雅，六曰颂，上以风化下，下以风刺上，主文而谲谏，言之者无罪，闻之者足以戒，故曰风。
>
> So the Odes have Six Arts: The first is called "Air" [*feng*]. The second is called "recitation" [*fu*]. The third is called "analogy" [bi]. The fourth is called "stimulus" [xing]. The fifth is called "Elegantia [ya]. The sixth is called "Laud" [song]. Superiors use the Airs to transform those below. Those below use the Airs to spur their superiors on. They strive for delicacy and thus remonstrate obliquely: the speaker does not offend, and still the hearer takes warning. Thus they are called "Airs." (Van Zoeren 96)

Among these six "arts" of poetry,[4] *feng* ranks the first, which shows its prioritized position in poetry writing in ancient China. It is a major discourse strategy for both the superiors and the people from below to employ in poetic composition in order to achieve the purpose of moral teaching. As to how local customs and styles of writing can both be connoted by the same character, *feng*, Stephen Owen returns to its primary meaning, i.e. "wind": "By a dying and constantly revived metaphor of the way in which the wind sways the grass and plants, *feng* also refers to 'influence'" (39). It is the meaning of "influence" where the two seemingly divergent directions of reference merge into one: for one thing, *feng* carries the intention to teach, hence an exertion of influence over other people; for another, *feng* signifies "the way in which a particular community exerts social influence or the way in which social influence is exerted by higher authorities on a community" (Owen 39). If this interpretation in *The Preface* emphasizes *feng* as a rhetorical device, Owen's analysis highlights the possible effect of such a device. *Feng* is, first and foremost, a rhetorical device, parallel to other "arts," including *fu*, *bi* and *xing*. It then acquires new meanings along with interpretations by different critics across time.

However solid as Owen's explanation may sound, the connection between these varied meanings in one character may largely remain as an enigma. We can only appeal to other texts to obtain a clearer understanding of the word in different contexts. Another Chinese text of literary theory that further elucidates the meaning of *feng* and that hardly any researcher will neglect is *Wen Xin Diao Long* (*The Literary Mind and the Carving of Dragons*) by Liu Xie. In this landmark text, *feng* appears 114 or 116 times based on different annotated texts, including *feng* as both a singular word and compounds which is composed of *feng* and other words (Wu 152; Xie 58). The widely quoted Chapter on "*feng gu*" (风骨) begins with the following remarks:

> 《诗》总六义，风冠其首，斯乃化感之本源。志气之符契也。是以怊怅述情，必始乎风；沈吟铺辞，莫先于骨。故辞之待骨，如体之树骸；情之含风，犹形之包气。
>
> The *Book of Songs* encompasses "Six Principles," of which "wind" (*feng*, the "Airs" section) is the first. This is the original source of stirring (*kan*) and transformation (*hua*), and it is the counterpart of intent (*chih*) and *chi'i*. The transmission of the disconsolate feelings (*ch'ing*)

> always begins with wind; but nothing has priority over bone's disposing the words (*tz'u*), as one intones them thoughtfully. The way in which the words depend upon bone is like the way in which the skeleton is set in the [human] form (*t'i*). And the quality of wind contained in the affections is like the way our shape holds *chi'i* within it. (Owen 219)

Liu Xie makes it clear that *feng* is the source of both *qing* ("emotions") and *zhi* ("aspiration"), the two major objectives of poetic composition.[5] He then brings in another concept, *gu* ("bone"),[6] to illustrate their importance to a composition of writing. Whereas *feng* carries feelings and emotions, *gu* constitutes the shape that holds them. These two terms form a complementary duality without either of which a text loses its color.

In so doing, Liu transcends the previous definitions of *feng* expounded in *The Preface to Mao's Odes* in two ways: firstly, he extends the meaning of *feng* from one style of writing (indirect criticism) to any writing that carries the writer's emotions and aspirations. In *The Preface*, *feng* is a strategy to avoid offense against those who are not in the same social class as the speaker. Even if one does not speak one's mind in a simple and direct way, the listener understands the speaker's intention and takes the advice accordingly. In comparison, however, in Liu's analysis, *feng* is the feelings and emotions that are carried in the writings. It takes effect regardless of the difference in social class on the part of the speaker or the listener. Secondly, *feng* is one of the six arts (principles) of poetic composition in *The Preface*, all working towards aesthetic objectives. However, Liu adds a complementary element, i.e. gu, to *feng* to explain how they function together. As a result, *feng* and *gu* become inseparable when discussing the writing styles and purposes of a piece of writing. They even form a compound later in history to refer to the style of a text. David Pollard further argues that the combined forces of *feng* and gu achieve the final effect of *ch'i* (气), the physiological vigor of a piece of writing (52-54). Liu's elucidation of the Chinese poetics is more fully developed than his predecessors in that he employs new terminologies to explain the aesthetic creation and interpretation processes, thus presenting a fuller picture of artistic criticism. The addition of *gu* to complement the function of *feng* further restricts the meaning of the latter to the scope of literary style.

Feng in English Translations

The word *feng* as a critical term in Chinese poetics has been translated into a few different words and phrases in English. Seen from studies in China that compare the different translations of key terms in *Wen xin diao long*, including *feng* and other terms, most translators transfer *feng* and *gu* literally into "wind" and "bone" respectively, as in Vincent Yu-chung Shih, Stephen Owen, and Yang Guobin (Xie 58; Wu 152-153; Dai and Gu 38).[7] Published in 1959 by Columbia University Press, Shih's was the earliest full-length translation of the book and remained as the only one for nearly four decades. Owen's selected translation was published by Harvard University Press in 1992 as part of *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. He was conscious of two kinds of target audience: "First, to scholars of Western literature who wish to understand something of a tradition of non-Western literary thought and second, to students beginning the study of traditional Chinese literature" (12). For such audiences, Owen tried to follow, as closely as he possibly could, the original wording and sentence structures in the Chinese. He was meticulous enough to add the Chinese phonetic expressions of all

key words in brackets after the English translations of these words. To complement such critical rigor, Owen provided further comments and explanations to each passage after the Chinese originals and his English translations. Yang's translation, published by Foreign Language Teaching and Research Press in 2003, is the latest. As a result, Yang was aware of the previous translations and said that he benefited a lot from Shih's version in particular (39). Here is how Yang translates the beginning of the Chapter on *feng gu*:

> The *Book of Poetry* has six divisions, the first being "airs," or "wind." "Wind" is the source of emotional influence, the manifestation of vitality. In expressing feelings of distress, "wind" comes first; in wording and diction, "bone". Language needs "bone" as the human body needs a skeleton; feeling is carried by "wind" as the physical form is supported by the vital breath. (399)

As illustrated in the above translation, Yang uses lucid English to transfer the complicated Chinese literary thought to the target language. In order to highlight critical terms, he chooses to place them in quotation marks to remind his readers that these Chinese terms may carry meanings that the English words do not have. This deliberate exoticization is a translation strategy adopted by the translator who tries to reduce the reading difficulties for his readers while remaining loyal to the original contribution of Chinese poetics.

Two English versions that do not translate *feng* into "wind" are provided by Steven Van Zoeren in his *Poetry and Personality* (1991), and a full-length translation of *Wen Xin Diao Long*, i.e., *The Book of Literary Design* (1999), co-translated by Siu-kit Wong, Allan Chunghang Lo and Kwong-tai Lam.[8] Van Zoeren chooses "airs" to describe the style of poetry collected from different regions in *Book of Songs*. This way of transference is shared by Stephen Owen who uses "airs" to refer to the same section in *Book of Songs* but who uses "wind" to transfer the meaning of *feng* as a critical term. In the collaborated translation of Wong, Lo and Lam, *feng* and *gu* are translated respectively into "the affective air" and "the literary bones" (Dai and Gu 38), a rather descriptive way of dealing with these two critical terms. The attributive "affective" to modify "air" demonstrates the transmission of emotions whereas "literary" as a modifier makes "bones" a figurative expression. This descriptive way of translating these two critical terms, although lacking the precision and brevity of the original terms, may appear friendly to readers who are able to concretize the terms in relation to the aim (the writer's emotions) and the form (literary structure) of a piece of writing. However, the readers in the English language may not recognize them as critical terms and will find it clumsy to use them in literary criticism.

The multiple interpretations of *feng* come from the loose grammatical regulation in ancient Chinese language. In Chinese, "风，风也," the same word, i.e. *feng*, is repeated but with different meanings in each appearance. However, in English, different words must be used to demonstrate such difference: "'Air' [*feng*] means 'suasion' [*feng*]." In "风以动之，教以化之," the word *zhi* (之) is a functional word that can refer to any object, man or thing alike; but in English, clear objects of the verbs (*dong*, meaning "to move" and *hua* meaning "to transform") must be clarified. The translators have to specify the objects of the verbs based on their understanding of the expressions in the contexts, as Van Zoeren does by placing the possible objects in square brackets: "Suasion is exerted in order to move [one's prince?], and teaching aims to transform [the people]" (95). This is the result of the differences in the

two languages: in comparison with English which is regulated precisely and logically by grammatical rules, the Chinese language is flexible in grammar and will create "vague" expressions. In many cases, it is just this vagueness that creates the beauty in poetry. However, English readers tend to look forward to precise expression in literary criticism since "the quest for definition has been one of the deepest and most enduring projects of Western literary thought" (Owen 5). To these readers, the vagueness in critical terms in Chinese poetics creates difficulty: "The Great Preface," in the eyes of Steven Van Zoeren, is "a text that may frustrate even a sympathetic reader" since it is "[c]haracterized by a choppy and allusive argument that moves abruptly from one subject to another and punctuated by connectives at precisely those points where connections seem weakest" (97).

The problem of untranslatability across cultures has been discussed by many, and it is an increasingly problematic issue in dealing with critical terms. Not only do the differences in languages make it impossible for a translator to find equivalent expressions for critical terms in another language, the complex historical, social, cultural, philosophical, and intellectual traditions in which critical terms appear are so divergent that many conceptions may sound totally strange to people from other cultures. Whether *feng* becomes "wind" or "airs," confusion still falls on the reader since neither "wind" nor "airs" is used in similar ways in English. In *Webster's Dictionary*, a closest meaning of "wind" to that in Chinese poetics, apart from its primary reference to "air in natural motion," is "any influential force or trend" as in "strong winds of public opinion" (1635). In the same dictionary, "air" is defined as "the general character or complexion of anything" as in "[h]is early work bore an air of freshness and originality" (31). Neither connotation matches perfectly with the meanings of *feng* in Chinese poetics. Thus, the literal translation strategy strengthens the exotic nature of critical terms: on the one hand, the readers in the target language recognizes the foreignness of the terms and will remain alert to their connotations; on the other, they may also find it difficult to use them since accurate definitions of these terms are badly needed before they can be put to further application. This difficulty reveals the differences not only between two languages and cultures, but also between two intellectual traditions.

The Resonances of *Feng*

As mentioned above, Stephen Owen uses different English words to transfer the different meanings of *feng* in different contexts: when it appears in the section title of *Book of Songs* to refer to the poems collected from different regions, he uses "airs," a word that he believes to represent the diverse styles from each region. When it is used as a critical term to refer to the feelings and emotions carried in poetry, he chooses "wind," a literal translation of the Chinese word. His accommodation of the same term *feng* in different situations clearly shows the flexibility of the Chinese characters in their parts of speech and functions in expressions. Owen observes that "the significance of key words is stabilized by their use in texts that everyone knows" (5). His observation suggests that the meanings of the key words in Chinese literary theory are shaped and decided in contexts. He further argues, "In the Western tradition there has always been a tension between the desire for precise definition on the one hand, and on the other hand, a desire for 'resonance' in literary terms (their application to various frames of reference, which inevitably works against precise definition). In the Chinese tradition only 'resonance' was a value" (Owen 5). The differences between the two traditions of literary theory as Owen observes create further difficulties concerning the use and re-use of critical terms in new contexts.

In ancient times, many Chinese characters are used singularly, but they are developed into compounds later together with another word that bears similar or related meanings. For example, *you* (忧) and *chou* (愁), meaning "to worry" and "be anxious" respectively, later form a compound of *youchou*, combining the related connotations of the two words in one. In other cases, the meaning of the new compound retains the meaning of only one of the constituent word. When *ji* (肌) and *rou* (肉), meaning "muscle" and "flesh" respectively, combine to form a compound *jirou*, the new word only keeps the meaning of *ji*. In similar ways, the two independent characters, *feng* and *gu*, when developed into a compound *fenggu*, begin to signify only the general style and aesthetic power of a piece of writing. The nuances between the two constituent characters were gradually lost in time. Because of this dynamic word formation ability, *feng*, apart from forming a compound with *gu*, has formed dozens of other compounds, or "semantic clusters" in Martha P. Y. Cheung's phrase (397), extending its original meanings in other contexts:

feng: wind	*feng*: writing style	*feng*: people (or place)	*feng*: emotions
*feng*chen（风尘）, wind and dust; turbulent journey	*feng*ge（风格）, style	*feng*chen（风尘）, prostitute	*feng*qing（风情）, amorous feelings
*feng*li（风力）, wind force	*feng*liu（风流）, aesthetic charm	*feng*du（风度）, manner	*feng*yue（风月）, wind and moon; an all-too-short love affair
*feng*qing（风清）, light wind	*feng*qing（风清）, fresh style in writing	*feng*liu（风流）, romantic; talented dandy	
*feng*shi（风势）, the way the wind blows	*feng*qu（风趣）, humorous; witty	*feng*qi（风气）, atmosphere; fashion	
*feng*su（风速）, wind speed	*feng*sao（风骚）, coquettish; flowery writing style	*feng*qu（风趣）, humorous; witty	
*feng*yun（风云）, wind and cloud; turbulent situation	*feng*ya（风雅）, grace; elegance	*feng*su（风俗）, customs	
wan*feng*（晚风）, evening wind	*feng*yun（风韵）, graceful style	*feng*ya（风雅）, grace; elegance	
	wen*feng*（文风）, writing style	*feng*yun（风韵）, graceful bearing	
	yu*feng*（余风）, influence left by previous men of letters	*feng*zi（风姿）, composure	

As seen in the above categories, some compounds still carry the original meaning of *feng*, i.e. "wind"; many expressions are related to styles of writing, or furthermore, people's demeanor; very few

still keep the meaning of "emotions." These "resonances" of the same word in different contexts may pose extra difficulties for translators or readers in another language, but it is just this vigorous ability for a Chinese character to grow into countless new words and develop new meanings that marks one of the unique features of the Chinese language. Also seen in the above categories, some compounds can refer to both writing styles and people's composure although with slightly different connotations. For example, *fengqu* can describe the humorous and witty quality of a piece of writing as well as that of a person. The compound *fengliu*, however, is used to describe the aesthetic charm of a literary text but is used metaphorically to describe the qualities of a dandy.

However, these "resonances" of *feng* cannot be found in the English cultural tradition. In other words, neither "wind" nor "air" carries so many associations as *feng* in Chinese. Typhoeus, the god of the winds, is "a devious god" with "a hundred snake heads" and "an infinite number of vocal variations" (Schafer 21-22). He occasionally creates obstacles for sailors on the sea, as he does for Odysseus on his way back home from the Trojan War. Thus seen, wind is perceived as a dangerous and destructive force in Greek mythology. At the same time, while English poems with "wind" as the central image abound, they hardly relate to styles of writing or people's virtues. In "Ode to the West Wind," Percy B. Shelley eulogizes the strength of the wind in sweeping away the rotten and the decayed and in heralding in the spring blossoms. In "The Wind," the poet Christina Rossetti announces the passing of wind through the hanging leaves and the bending trees. In both cases, the wind carries its primary referent to the motion in the air although Shelley's "West Wind" can be interpreted metaphorically to mean the force to wipe out the old. In the Western intellectual tradition, "air" is one of the four elements that constitute matter, together with earth, water and fire. This conception can be traced back to ancient Greek and Roman times when Galen used four kinds of "humors" to describe four different personalities, namely black bile, phlegm, blood and choler.[9] In the Renaissance, "[a] n even mixture of the elements, with none dominating, is a common image of inner equilibrium, or noble temperament" (Hebron 49), as seen in how Anthony compliments Julius Caesar upon their first meeting: "His life was gentle, and the elements / So mixed in him, that Nature might stand up / And say to all the world, 'This was a man!'" (qtd. in Hebron 49). In this example, Anthony praises the noble quality of Julius Caesar for his balanced character since the latter possesses all four elements. This conception concerning how matter (or even the earth) is constituted dominated the Western thinking until the 17th century when Robert Boyle revealed that there were many more than four elements, but nonetheless, the ideology of the four elements still "keep[s] their hold on the modern imagination" (Gillie 498).

The above comparisons show that the Chinese *feng* and the English "wind" or "air" have different origins, meanings and cultural associations. A clear understanding of *feng* as a critical term for English readers can only be achieved by explaining its primary meaning in the first place and then placing it in different contexts as illustrative examples of its application.

Critical terms such as *feng* in Chinese poetics cannot find equivalent expressions in the English language as a result of the differences in the two languages and cultures as well as the differences in the two philosophical and intellectual traditions. To understand the meaning of *feng* and many other such terms in Chinese literary theory, one has to find the origins of its first appearances and to follow its varied meanings in different contexts, especially when it branches into different compounds. Many

key words in Chinese poetics cannot be used in similar ways as those in the Western critical theories since there is a totally different critical tradition in China. In fact, *lilun*, meaning “theory” in Chinese, is a borrowed word from Japanese (Cheung 393). A native speaker of English, expecting a critical term in Chinese poetics to work in the same way as those in their familiar cultural tradition will soon be thrown into desperation, especially upon meeting dozens of compounds that critical terms form with other words. To admit the untranslatability of critical terms is the first step toward recognizing the difference of the Chinese poetics. Any attempt to seek universalization and generalization of critical conceptions across cultures will, more often than not, end in futility. Thus, it is crucial to recognize the differences and to respect them accordingly since “it is actually the alterity of Chinese literature, its ‘otherness,’ which makes it of most interest” (Fisk 87). The “otherness” of the Chinese poetics seen in the eyes of the people from other cultural traditions may not necessarily lead to its objectification. It is the mutual responsibility of the Chinese and the non-Chinese scholars to trace the origins of critical terms and the routes of development along with their uses and re-uses in different contexts. It is equally important not to judge Chinese poetics against the Western standards but to return to the Chinese tradition and to find its particularities. Only by doing so can the “otherness” be respected without being annihilated in the attempt to seek universalization.

Notes

1. The writer of this essay would like to express her gratitude to Professor Luo Xuanmin from Guangxi University for inviting her to attend “The 2nd Summit Forum on Translation, Rhetoric and Global Communication” held at Guilin University of Electronic Technology on December 19, 2020. This essay is elaborated from a talk delivered at the forum.
2. Among the many translations of these terms, the writer of this essay adopts that of Steven Van Zoeren (范佐伦). Whereas “Airs” appears in its plural form in his translation to emphasize the diversified styles from different regions, “Elegantia” and “Laud” are used in singular form for abstract concepts. When Stephen Owen (宇文所安) translates “*feng*” into “Airs of the States” (39), he bears in mind the plural quality of the term as well.
3. *The Preface to Mao’s Odes* is composed of “The Great Preface” and “The Minor Prefaces” (or Lesser Prefaces), the former is the general preface to *Book of Songs* whereas the latter the introduction to each poem in the collection.
4. Pauline Yu believes that the three arts of *feng*, *ya* and s*ong* “correspond roughly to our notion of poetic subgenres” whereas the arts of *fu*, *bi* and *xing* could be viewed as “modes or techniques” (213-214). However, Stephen Owen does not regard *xing* as a rhetorical device (46).
5. For *qing* and *zhi*, different translators use varied English words as equivalent expressions: Steven Van Zoeren uses “emotion” and “aim” (95); Stephen Owen uses “feelings” and “intent” (219).
6. For the different meanings of *gu* in Chinese literature and culture, see Aibin Yao, “On the Significance of ‘Bone’ and the Unique Connotation of Liu Xie’s Concept of ‘Wind and Bone’” (Chi.), *Theoretical Studies in Literature and Art*, no. 1, 2016, pp. 128-139.
7. See Vincent Yu-chung Shih, *The Literary Mind and the Craving of Dragons: A Study of Thought and Pattern in Chinese Literature*, Columbia UP, 1959; Stephen Owen, *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*; Guobin Yang, *Dragon Carving and the Literary Mind*.
8. See Steven Van Zoeren, *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China*, pp. 95-97; Siu-kit Wong, Allan Chunghang Lo, and Kwong-tai Lam, The Book of Literary Design, Hong Kong UP, 1999.
9. See Michael Boylan, “Galen (130—200 C. E.),” *Internet Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, iep.utm.edu/galen/.

Works Cited

Cheung, Martha P. Y. "From 'Theory' to 'Discourse': The Making of a Translation Anthology." *Bulletin of SOAS*, vol. 66, no. 3, 2003, pp. 390-401.

Dai, Wenjing, and Mingdong Gu. "Misreading and Enlightened Reading in English Translations of Key Words in *Wenxin Diaolong*." (Chi.) *Journal of Xiamen University (Arts and Social Sciences)*, no. 3, 2019, pp. 37-45.

Fisk, Craig. "The Alterity of Chinese Literature in Its Critical Contexts." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews*, vol. 2, no. 1, Jan. 1980, pp. 87-99.

Gibbs, Donald A. "Notes on the Wind: The Term '*feng*' in Chinese Literary Criticism." *Transition and Permanence: Chinese History and Culture*, edited by David C. Buxbaum and Frederick W. Mote, Cathay, 1972, pp. 285-293.

Gillie, Christopher. *Longman Companion to English Literature*. Longman, 1977.

Hebron, Malcolm. *Key Concepts in Renaissance Literature*. Shanghai Foreign Language Education, 2008.

Owen, Stephen. *Readings in Chinese Literary Thought*. Harvard UP, 1992.

Pollard, David. "*Ch'i* in Chinese Literary Theory." *Chinese Approaches to Literature from Confucius to Liang Ch'i-ch'ao*, edited by Adele Austin Rickett, Princeton UP, 1978, pp. 43-66.

Schafer, R. Murray. *The Soundscape: Our Sonic Environment and the Tuning of the World*. Destiny Books, 1977.

Van Zoeren, Steven. *Poetry and Personality: Reading, Exegesis, and Hermeneutics in Traditional China*. Stanford UP, 1991.

Wang, Xiaolu. *Chinese Literary Theory in the West*. (Chi.) Bashu Books, 2003.

Webster's Encyclopedic Unabridged Dictionary of the English Language. New revised ed. Gramercy Books, 1994.

Wu, Ling. "On the Overinterpretation of the Translation of Chinese Classics: With Stephen Owen's Translation of Key Terms of *Wen Hsin Tiao Lung* as an Example." (Chi.) *Foreign Language Research*, no. 6, 2014, pp. 149-153.

Xie, Xuelin. "A Focus on Cultural Factors and Oriented Horizons of Interpretation: A Hermeneutic Comparative Study of '*feng*' and '*gu*.'" (Chi.) *Journal of Jining Normal University*, no. 1, 2013, pp. 56-63.

Yang, Guobin. *Dragon-Carving and the Literary Mind*. Vol. 2. Foreign Language Teaching and Research, 2003.

Yip, Wai-lim. *Chinese Poetics* (Chi.). SDX Joint Publishing Company, 1996.

Yu, Pauline. "Metaphor and Chinese Poetry." *Chinese Literature: Essays, Articles, Reviews*, vol. 3, no. 2, July 1981, pp. 205-224.

Zhang, Longxi. "What Is Wen and Why Is It Made So Terribly Strange?" *College English*, vol. 23, no. 1, Feb. 1996, pp. 15-35.