

Asia Pacific Translation and Intercultural Studies

Translating homosexuality into Chinese A case study of Pan Guangdan's translation of Havelock Ellis' Psychology of Sex A Manual for Students (1933) --Manuscript Draft--

Full Title:	Translating homosexuality into Chinese A case study of Pan Guangdan's translation of Havelock Ellis' Psychology of Sex A Manual for Students (1933)
Manuscript Number:	RTIS-2015-0019R1
Article Type:	Original Article
Keywords:	homosexuality; Translation; Chinese; history
Abstract:	<p>Before the translation of modern western works on sexology, China had created its own lexicon for sexuality, which was seen as either a temporary and changeable obsession or an expression of social status and taste, rather than an identity. This understanding was challenged when Western biologically based sexology was introduced. Centred on a case study of Pan Guangdan's (1946) translation of Havelock Ellis's Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students (1933), in particular Chapter Five "Homosexuality" and Appendices, this paper investigates how western sexological discourse was translated and deployed in Republican China's quest for social and cultural modernity. It analyses the strategies that Pan adopted to translate terms and concepts related to homosexuality into Chinese and the evidential approach that he applied to trace and write a history of Chinese homosexual culture in the paratexts of his translation. In addition to shedding new light on global histories of sexuality, it also illustrates the role of translators in the development and interaction of different knowledge and knowledge systems across languages and cultures.</p>

photo
[Click here to download Supplementary Material - not for review: Ting photo.png](#)



Ting Guo is Lecturer in the Department of Modern Languages, University of Exeter. Her research interests include translation and knowledge transfer, translation and history, translation, modernity and sexuality, Chinese cinema. She is the author of *Surviving Violent Conflict: Chinese Interpreters in the Second-Sino Japanese War (1931-45)* (forthcoming). She has published in journals such as *Literature Compass*, *Translation Studies* and *Translation Quarterly*.

**Translating homosexuality into Chinese:
A case study of Pan Guangdan's translation of Havelock Ellis' *Psychology
of Sex: A Manual for Students* (1933)**

Ting Guo

Department of Modern Languages, University of Exeter, UK
t.guo@exeter.ac.uk

**Translating homosexuality into Chinese:
A case study of Pan Guangdan's translation of Havelock Ellis'
Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students (1933)**

Ting Guo

Department of Modern Languages, University of Exeter, UK
t.guo@exeter.ac.uk

Translating homosexuality into Chinese: A case study of Pan Guangdan's translation of Havelock Ellis' *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students* (1933)

Abstract

Before the translation of modern western works on sexology, China had created its own lexicon for sexuality, which was seen as either a temporary and changeable obsession or an expression of social status and taste, rather than an identity. This understanding was challenged when Western biologically based sexology was introduced. Centred on a case study of Pan Guangdan's (1946) translation of Havelock Ellis's *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students* (1933), in particular Chapter Five "Homosexuality" and Appendices, this paper investigates how western sexological discourse was translated and deployed in Republican China's quest for social and cultural modernity. It analyses the strategies that Pan adopted to translate terms and concepts related to homosexuality into Chinese and the evidential approach that he applied to trace and write a history of Chinese homosexual culture in the paratexts of his translation. In addition to shedding new light on global histories of sexuality, it also illustrates the role of translators in the development and interaction of different knowledge and knowledge systems across languages and cultures.

Keywords: homosexuality, translation, Chinese, history

Translation, as an important tool and the frontier of cross-cultural communication, is a crucial site for researchers who are interested in the dissemination of sexual knowledge across languages and cultures. Recent scholarship by authors such as Harry Oosterhuis (2001) and Heike Bauer (2003; 2009) has engaged with the ways that sexological theories are shaped and reinterpreted across cultures and languages. For example, in her analysis of the English translation of Richard von Krafft-Ebing's *Psychopathia Sexualis* by Charles Gilbert Chaddock, Bauer (2003, 386-92) discusses how Krafft-Ebing's ideas were Anglicized through the translation to echo the prevailing evolutionary thinking in English society and the upholding of the British Empire. As Bauer (2003, 383) argues, "sexological theories themselves were products of translation" and the process of translation is a process of "trans- and cross-cultural negotiation and re-formulation of ideas, governed by socio-historical circumstances." Her emphasis on cultural negotiation and reformulation in the process of translation rather than evaluation of similarities and differences is also very important, given that many of the practices and concepts relating to sexuality are culture specific and therefore cannot be simply transferred across languages. Bauer's inquiry underscores the subtle issues unaddressed in the circulation of sexual knowledge and inspire us to go beyond the European context and reconsider questions related to the process of translation: for example, how do translators in the third world handle texts by western scientists with established authority in the field? How can the translation maintain its

logical coherence and also make sense to target audiences with different epistemological structures? And what kind of resources will translators exploit and generate in their translation practice?

Some of these questions have been touched upon by Leon Antonio Rocha's article "Xing: The Discourse of Sex and Human Nature in Modern China" (2010). Reviewing how the meaning of the character 性 (*xing*) has been amended, extended and associated with modern Chinese sexual discourse in translation, Rocha argues that a language of *xing* was constructed and circulated in Republican China. It eventually replaced the older Chinese lexicon for sex and was "institutionalized in dictionaries, glossaries and encyclopaedias, and entered public discourse" (Rocha 2010, 617). This process was, however, not straightforward and this "language of *xing*" was also never a completely new creation, free from the influence of old Chinese words for sex. Despite the consensus among Chinese intellectuals on the issue of importing western works in Republican era, their appropriation and deployment of western sexological knowledge had different directions and emphases. It is thus inappropriate to assume that the reception of western sexological discourse was homogenous and the translation of western sexology was simply a superficial transplantation of ideas. A compelling example of the process of negotiation is Pan Guangdan's translation of Henry Havelock Ellis' *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students* (1933). In this translation, Pan not only provided extraordinarily rich annotations about Chinese sexual culture alongside Ellis' text, but also included his own essay on Chinese homosexuality as an appendix, which documents textual evidence of traditional Chinese homosexual practices. The notes and appendix that he provided add up to nearly 100,000 words, accounting for almost one third of the whole volume. Focusing on his translation of Chapter five, "Homosexuality"¹, this paper will highlight the strategies that Pan adopted and argue that he intended to use his translation to provoke target readers' cultural memory through retracing and rereading "mirror texts" (Venuti 1998, 77) in the target culture and intervene in the prevalent westernized sexual discourse in urban China after the May Fourth Movement in 1910. In addition, it argues that the translation of western sexological knowledge in China is not only interwoven with the revaluation and reinvention of indigenous knowledge on sexuality, but also constitutes a crucial component in supporting and developing traditional Chinese scholarship.

The Influx of Western Sexology

Before discussing Pan's translation, it is important to briefly review the sex enlightenment movement in 1920s-30s' China in order to re-contextualize Pan's work and his scholarly positioning. For a long time, sex was not seen as a serious subject to be studied by Chinese scholars due to the dominance of Confucianism, which emphasized moral propriety and condemned carnal satisfaction.² However, after being

¹ This paper focuses on Pan's translation related to the topic of homosexuality; therefore, only chapter five is selected for a close analysis. However, Pan was fairly consistent in terms of his translational style in this translation, and his provision of detailed annotations on references and examples found in Chinese sources were permeated in every chapter.

² This of course does not mean that the topic of sex was eliminated from various forms of literature (for example, fictions, drama or poetry and belles-lettres). See *Homoeroticism in Imperial China: A*

defeated in wars by Britain and Japan in the early twentieth century, China saw a growing tendency among intellectuals to turn to Western science for methods of modernizing and strengthening China. During this period, many western sexology works were introduced and/or translated into Chinese, for example M. A. Bigelow's *Sex Education* (1916) was introduced and translated by Pan Gongzhan in 1920³; E. Carpenter's *The Intermediate Sex* (1908) by Shen Zemin in 1923; and T. W. Shannon's *Self Knowledge and Guide to Sex Instruction* (1913) by Qian Yishi and Du Zuozhou in 1939.

This fever for western sexology was not coincidental but related to the specific political and social context in China at that time. As Charles Leary points out, sexuality as a field of knowledge emerged at that time precisely because "China's social, institutional, and ideological circumstances allowed and facilitated it" (Leary 1994, 268). Along with the progress of social reforms, the topic of sex was recognized as a watershed in dismantling the old feudal system and increasing public awareness of democracy and science. *Xing* (性, sex) became "a new keyword, the point of anchorage for a sexual politics that regarded sex ... as cruelly repressed by a 'hypocritical', 'feudalist', even 'cannibalistic' sexual morality of the 'Old China'" (Rocha 2010, 603). As Howard Chiang argues, the translation of western sexual writings in early twentieth century China was greatly "politicised" and "imbricated with the larger and increasingly intensified cultural discourse of nationalism" (Chiang 2008, 405). Sexual knowledge was directly associated with the sustainability of the Chinese race and therefore the importation of Western works on sexology was an important strategy in China's self-strengthening efforts. For example, early modern reformers such as Kang Youwei and Liang Qichao 'had consistently explained national weakness as the result of an inadequate knowledge of human sexuality and reproduction' (Aresu 2009, 533). These connections between a healthy body, nation building and the issue of sexuality significantly motivated and conditioned the translation and reception of western sexological knowledge, in particular the concept of homosexuality, because homosexuality, as a non-procreative sexuality, was considered to be in the way of realizing the eugenic goal of China's sex education movement and its modernization. As Kang Wenqing (2009, 19-59) argued, the emphasis on the masculine image of Chinese men in China's pursuit of modernity led to the stigmatization and policing of male same-sex relationships in Chinese society, which echoed and reinforced the western critique of homosexuality at that time.

On the other hand, issues of gender and sexuality, particularly topics centring on free mate choice against arranged marriage, constituted a key site of debating, defining and articulating an individual's desire and rights in the newly established Republican China. Removing the old procreation-centred sex discourse thus became an approach used to deconstruct the old system from the bottom. As Tze-lan Deborah Sang (1999, 277) suggests, Chinese intellectuals' interests in western theories of homosexuality was also attributable to their promotion of free love between man and woman and the necessity of delineating its boundaries and discussing various normal and "abnormal" forms of desire and relationships after Confucian rituals and the

Sourcebook (2012) edited by Mark Stevenson and Wu Cuncun.

³ Pan Gongzhan's translation was published under the title "Bageluo de Liangxing Jiaoyu Guan" [Bigelow's view on sex education] in series in *The Journal of Education*, 12 (10-12).

feudal family structure were demolished. The translation of western works on eugenics and psychoanalysis therefore fostered and supported the "public articulation of the sexual person" in Republican China (Leary 1998, 268). As a result, "*tongxing ai*" (同性爱, Same-sex love), the Chinese translation of the word "homosexuality", became a conflation of the traditional idea of same-sex relationships and the western category of homosexuality as an identity in the sex enlightenment movement during the Republican era (1911-45).

Pan Guangdan is one of the leading figures in this movement and he is also a pivotal translator of Havelock Ellis' work. His unusual heavily-annotated translation of *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students* (1933) is one of his well-known translations and has been frequently mentioned in several works on the topic of gender and sexuality in modern China (see Chou 2000; Chiang 2010; Kang 2009; Rocha 2012; and Sang 1999, 2003). However, this scholarship often only briefly mentions that fact that Pan did this translation (focusing mainly on his classic essay about examples of Chinese homosexual culture included as an appendix) and seldom analyzes his actual translation in detail. This paper will take a close look at Pan's translation of chapter five, "Homosexuality", and examine how he used historical data to conduct a typical Chinese evidential research on Chinese homosexual culture within this translation.

Reviving a "Subjugated Knowledge" through Translation

Pan started his translation of *The Psychology of Sex* in Chongqing in 1939,⁴ an unquiet year, for China and the world. It was the third year since the Second Sino-Japanese war broke out. In this year, Wang Jingwei, one of the leftist political leaders in the Nationalist Party, left the Jiang Jieshi-led Nationalist government and established a Japanese-sponsored puppet government. In Europe, Nazi Germany invaded Poland and World War Two began. This domestic and international political and social unrest forced the Chinese Nationalist government to abandon its capital, Nanjing, and retreat to the Southwest. It also interrupted the endeavours of so-called "modernization" of the New Cultural Movement, including the sex enlightenment movement that Pan was involved in. It is, therefore, an interesting question why Pan chose this not very well-known work by Ellis to translate at this time, given the fact that five years previously in 1934, he had already translated "Sex and Society," the sixth volume of Ellis' influential work, *Studies in the Psychology of Sex*, published as two separate books, *The Education of Sex* and *The Morality of Sex*.

The poem that Pan presented at the beginning of this translation reveals some answers to the question: "欲挽狂澜应有术，先从性理觅高深 (Halting this deteriorating situation a method is needed, proceeding from *xingli* (the principles of nature) what is fundamental will be revealed.)" In other words, the translator saw his translation as a method of seeking information to intervene in the deteriorating domestic situation. In the translator's preface, Pan also explains that he chose to translate this book because it not only reviews new research findings on the psychology of sex, but also is more accessible (in terms of length and vocabulary) for

⁴ It took Pan three years to finish this translation and it didn't go to press until 1946, a year after the Second Sino-Japanese war came to an end.

common readers compared with other works by Ellis. In other words, rather than only targeting scholars and researchers, he intended to include common readers as his target readership. This dual readership that the translator emphasized deserves some attention here. Translating for both experts and general readers is usually very tricky, in particular in scientific translation, because there might be concepts that the target culture does not have and it is hard to translate them for the public without introducing or creating new terms. Or there might exist seemingly similar expressions, but they have different historical and cultural connotations. It is very hard for translators to maintain the rigor of the source text for scholars and cater to the general public's reading habits at the same time. Pan's goal of reaching a dual readership here seems to be not only difficult to realize, but also risky.

In addition, Pan proclaimed in the preface that personally he didn't like the so-called *ouhua yuti* (欧化语体 Europeanized Chinese language) used by some translators (Pan 2000, 209). For him, the best translations were those that readers didn't feel were translations but texts read as if originally written in Chinese. Usually there are two motivations for translators to pursue fluency in their translations: to protect the features and conventions of the target language (Hatim & Mason 1997: 145-6) or to promote the source text's acceptability in the target culture (Venuti 1998: 126-7). Both were true for Pan, but there are additional reasons behind it. Despite his advocacy of domesticating translation, Pan also showed no intention of erasing the presence of the translator in this translation. On the contrary, he made his presence parallel to the author via his paratexts, reminding Chinese readers that they are reading a translation and that rich information on this topic exists in the target culture. All this suggests Pan might have an agenda other than merely transferring Ellis' ideas in this translation. To find out what his other agenda was, let us look at one annotation by the translator in the body of translation:

The translator believes that merely introducing western culture and science might be preliminary but definitely inadequate given the reality in China. Instead, we should enable communication and establish complementary relationships between things that we want to introduce and similar ones that China has already. These are the tasks of translators. Translating is the same as planting: bringing a seed and putting it in the soil is not the end of the work.⁵(Pan 2000, 621)

Here Pan differentiates translation from wholesale westernization and contends that ideas from outside should both be nurtured in and nurture the domestic environment. Translators, therefore, should initiate dialogues between the source and target cultures to provoke the development of the target culture. In other words, what Pan aimed at in this translation is not to produce a Chinese version of Ellis' work, but to use this opportunity to stimulate and nurture indigenous discourse on the basis of Ellis'. This emphasis on the dynamic relationship between source and target culture and the use of imported western science explains why Pan heavily loaded his translation with translator's notes and an appendix on the target culture (nearly 100,000 words in total, accounting for almost one third of the whole volume).

Apart from adding paratexts, Pan also frequently substitutes Western terms in the

⁵ Unless otherwise noted, all translations from Chinese into English are my own.

source text with poetic expressions associated with traditional Chinese sexual discourse. For example, the word “fellatio” in the source text is rendered to two phrases at the same time, “*za yang*” (咂阳, sucking-off male sexual organ) and “*pin xiao*” (品箫 flute-tasting); while “cunnilingus” is translated into “*za yin*” (咂阴⁶, sucking female sexual organ) and “*pin yu*” (品玉, Jade-tasting) (Pan 2000, 495). In other words, each Latin term is translated into two separate Chinese phrases, direct and literary, at the same time. These literary phrases are euphemisms with rich historical allusions specific to Chinese culture. Rather than just providing literal translations of these Latin terms or even phonetic translations with the source text in brackets, as he does in other places of his translation, the translator uses this kind of double translation to incorporate domestic cultural elements into the target text. In particular, since both flute and jade are associated with skills and hobbies that were popular among Chinese literati in traditional Chinese society, these expressions not only mirror the literary aspects of Chinese sexual culture, but also reflect the inclination to see sexual practice as a kind of *pi* (癖, obsession or addiction), which can be something changeable and taste-related, thus highlighting the blurred distinction between heterosexuality and homosexuality in traditional Chinese society. However, one may find Pan's choice of these literary expressions very odd. Since the influx of western sexology in the early twentieth century, these old terms referring to non-reproductive behaviours were considered obsolete and associated with obscenity and degeneracy.⁷ It is indeed a bit surprising that Pan, as a western-trained eugenicist as well as one of the leading members in the previous sex enlightenment movement, did not adopt a more "scientific" language underpinned by western biology or psychology, but used old, oblique literary expressions associated with same-sex relationships in the target culture. This is especially noteworthy, given that he made a slightly differently choice in a previous chapter of the translation. Rather than presenting both versions of Chinese translation of "cunnilingus" and "fellatio" in the target text, Pan uses an empty bracket with only an endnote to explain there are also other alternative translations (Pan 2000, 261). According to him, "*pinyu*" and "*pinxiao*" are euphemisms often used in Chinese erotic literature, but he found them too affective to be used in this translation. Clearly, Pan changed his mind in the example discussed above. This inconsistency of his decisions indicates the translator began to think differently as he progressed with his translation work. His decision to include these literary expressions in the target text rather than in his notes suggests 1) he acknowledged the connection between literature and same-sex culture in China, in particular Chinese literati's interest in male same-sex relationships in imperial China; 2) he saw the necessity of presenting these traditional literary phrases along with translated "scientific" texts.

Another interesting example that Pan made in this chapter is his translation of the phrase, “homosexual prostitution” as “‘象姑’业或‘相公’业的发达” (“the

⁶ A more commonly used translation in Chinese is "*shi yin*" (舐阴, Licking-in female organ), with the verb "*shi*" (舐) emphasizing the exclusive action of tongue. However, for some reason Pan chose to use the verb "*za*" (咂 suck) following the structure of "*za yang*", which matches with the verb of the latin word "fellatio" (I suck),

⁷ Before Pan's translation, Ellis' book had been previously translated into Chinese by Feng Mingzhang in 1944. In his translation, Feng adopted a more direct approach and did not use or mention any of these literary euphemisms.

prevalence of ‘*xianggu*’⁸ or ‘*xianggong*’⁹). Pan’s selection of these two Chinese phrases, “*xianggu*” (象姑) and “*xianggong*” (相公), is again a “domestication” of the source text, as these two phrases refer to a specific group of people in the Chinese society and have their cultural and historical connotations. More importantly, these two phrases in fact refer to the same group, with similar pronunciations but different forms in writing. Therefore, Pan’s translation narrows down the meaning of “homosexual prostitution” to “male prostitution”. Admittedly, female homosexual prostitution is not a usual thing to be found around the world. Pan’s translation, however, provides a concrete example of homosexual prostitution in Chinese context, although it might also reinforce the traditional male gaze on sexual practices in traditional Chinese society. In addition, the translator provided many notes on the meaning, origin and textual evidence of “*xianggu*” (象姑) or “*xianggong*” (相公) with references, ranging from entertaining newspaper anecdotes to the translator’s own research and literary observations. Apart from this, in note 5 in the translation, Pan also introduced another expression “*lingren*” (伶人, actors) and explores its unique connection between “*xianggu*” (象姑) or “*xianggong*” (相公) in Chinese society. He pointed out that in the late Qing dynasty, a majority of *xianggu* or *xianggong* in Beijing were young *lingren*, some of whom might take prostitution as their second or even first career. When Ellis use the example of the Chevalier d'Eon de Beaumont (1782-1810) and Abbé de Choisy (1644-1724) to explain the condition of eonism (cross-dressing) in the source text, Pan, in note 44, provided evidences of similar examples of eonism found Chinese literature, and suggested that there might be more examples to be found in *xianggu* or *xianggong* industry and among some Chinese “*lingren*” who played the role of females in Peking Opera. In the same note, with the example of dramatist Yu Lianquan (1900-1967) in Qing Dynasty (1644-1911), Pan further commented that some Chinese male actors who played the role of females in Peking Opera also liked to imitate females’ action in their daily life and their actions do not seem to be unnatural in others’ eyes; therefore, “*lingren*” might be a good career option for those with the condition of eonism.

From the above two examples, it is clear that Pan took an unusual and also risky path when translating Ellis’ work. Putting aside the question of whether his translation is faithful to the source text or not, the fact that the translator frequently appropriated the author’s voice and talked about the target culture in the translation is already very odd. No wonder scholars such as Sang (2003) find this mixture of Chinese and Western discourses problematic. In her book, *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-sex Desire in Modern China*, Sang (2003, 20) particularly criticized Pan’s use of same-sex desire to discuss historical cases of homosexuality in Chinese society such as *baixiangzhi* (拜相知, women taking a vow to become bosom friends) and *guizhongmiyou* (闺中密友, intimate friends in the inner chambers). She argues that this move and the translation between discourses is based on an illusion that “there existed equivalencies instead of sheer incommensurability” between the two (Sang 2003, 20). Sang’s criticism is not unreasonable, particularly when we consider translation merely as a process of transferring ideas. From all the evidence mentioned

⁸ Phonetically “*xiang gu*” is very similar to “*xiang gong*”, but intently chosen words clearly indicate that it is a man who behaves like a woman.

⁹ “*Xianggong*” is a common address to a husband by his wife in medieval Chinese society. But according to Pan’s research, it is also the name for male dramatists playing female roles.

above, in particular his extended annotations on the phenomenon of homosexuality in the target culture, it is very unlikely that pursuing equivalence between Chinese and Western categories of homosexuality is Pan's ultimate goal in this translation. Rather than following the source text passively, Pan tried to attract the target reader's attention and divert it to the indigenous discourse on sexuality. To some extent, his method of annotating his translation is similar to the strategy of "thick translation" proposed by Kwame Anthony Appiah (1993, 427), which "locate[s] the text in a rich cultural and linguistic context" through annotations and accompanying glosses. Unlike Appiah, Pan used annotations to resituate traditional terms and expressions for homosexuality in the target culture instead of terms in the source culture. Yet their practices have similar political implications. For Appiah, this type of translation can enhance a "thick, situated" understanding of the text and challenge the assumption of the cultural superiority in the West (1993, 428). For Pan, his deliberately domesticated translation is an intervention in the westernized scientific discourse on sexuality in Chinese society at that time. His frequent substitutions of western sexological terms with old Chinese terms remind his readers of the existence of the "subjugated knowledge", in Michel Foucault's words (2003, 7)¹⁰, on homosexuality in China, and his annotations about the social practices in which these terms are embedded indicate his goal of transcending the boundaries between different knowledge systems and revalidating the local knowledge that has been disqualified by the influx and prevalence of western sciences in Republican China.

This argument about exploring indigenous knowledge and relating it to knowledge imported from other cultures repeatedly appears in Pan's works. For example, in "The Problem of the Cultural Hybrid" (1928), originally written in English, Pan criticized wholesale westernization and emphasized the importance of selective assimilation of Western culture and adopting "a proper attitude towards Western standards in institutions, such as religion, the family, relation between the sexes, the different scale of social worth, theoretical and actual, and the like." (250). For Pan, the above mentioned "institutions" are where the "individuality" of Chinese culture lies in and should not follow Western patterns (1928: 249) unlike scientific and technical knowledge. This idea of keeping the "individuality" of Chinese culture was also reiterated in Pan's response, "*Tan 'Zhongguo Benwei Lun'*" [On 'Chinese-based'], (1935), to the well-known debate over "Chinese-based" and "wholesale Westernization" among Chinese literati in 1935 after the "Manifesto for Culture Construction Based on Chinese Culture"¹¹ was jointly published by ten Chinese professors in January that year. In this paper, Pan stressed that China has its own history and culture, and it is impossible and inappropriate to deny and erase its experience and history of the past (1935, 35). He considered ideas and knowledge from other cultures in the world as 'the Variables' and China as 'the Constant' and stressed that it is important to be selective and cautious in adopting 'the Variables' so that one won't doubt, misunderstand and forget the 'Constant' (ibid.). For Pan, the

¹⁰ By "subjugated knowledge", Foucault means: "a whole series of knowledges that have been disqualified as non conceptual knowledges, as insufficiently elaborated knowledge, knowledges that are below the required level of erudition or scientificity." (2003, 7)

¹¹ The centre of this debate was about a document entitled "Manifesto for Culture Construction Based on Chinese Culture" published by ten Chinese professors. For more information on this debate, see "没有了中国：20世纪30年代中国思想界的反思" [Without China: Chinese intellectuals' reflections in the 1930s] by Zhang Taiyuan (2011).

ultimate goal of importing western sciences was to nurture the indigenous culture. In order to modernize, one had to recognize and respect the continuity of history and culture which is the base for developing the new. With these arguments in view, it is not difficult to understand why Pan tried to reinvent traditional Chinese discourse on sexuality in his translation of Ellis' work. His substitution of western biological and psychological terms with Chinese oblique literary expressions not only resurrects the local knowledge through the authoritative framework of Western sexology, but also added another cultural and historical layer to the understanding of homosexuality in the Chinese context. It allowed his readers to reflect on the existence, diversity and tolerance of homosexual practice in Chinese society and underscored the humanistic tradition in local knowledge and experience of gender relationship.

History Matters: Pan's *kaozheng* (evidential study) of Chinese Homosexual Culture

As discussed above, one of the reasons that Pan chose to translate this book by Ellis is because it uses comparatively fewer technical terms and its readability for Chinese readers. It is thus not the translator's intention at all to lecture his readers on Western biology or psychology in his translation. Except for brief references to the names of people and their works mentioned in the source text, the majority of Pan's annotations and the appendices are devoted to the retracing of the corresponding domestic sexual discourse within the framework of Ellis' arguments. And over seventy percent of them were information he collected from various Chinese documents or observed in the past or recent social lives, with his appendix on Chinese homosexuality alone totalling 19,000 words (Pan 2000, 210).

Surprisingly, this heavily loaded translation does not seem to discourage Chinese readers, but turned out to be highly valued (see Lü 2006). Even more than half a century after its publication, this translation is still often referred by scholars who are interested in the history of Chinese sexology, especially the topic of homosexuality. In the 2000 edition of this translation, Pan, as the translator, is clearly presented as the focus of the book rather than the author: its cover shows two pictures of the translator instead of those of Ellis; a poem by the translator is put ahead of the Table of Contents; and even at the end of the book what is included is the memorial article on the translator by Fei Xiaotong, one of the translator's disciples. All this indicates the recognition of the translator's contribution to the indigenous study of China's sexual culture in this translation.

However, this recognition often stays at a very superficial level. While Pan's effort in seeking and presenting the many examples of homosexuality in Chinese culture is widely admired, his methodology and goal have also been challenged. For example, Sang, without directly mentioning Pan's name, pointed out that the search for the history of homosexuality in China by some Chinese intellectuals "revealed an inherent belief in the unique value of the national homosexual past and, ironically, also fulfilled an ahistorical desire to project the Chinese onto the world map of universal sexuality" (2003, 37). While admiring Pan's mastery of both Chinese 'official' sources and 'wild' or 'unofficial' histories, Rocha (2012) questions the consistency of his standard for scholarship by pointing out that Pan's selective use of historical examples and "'scientific' argumentation constructed around highly

selective citations of Anglo-American literature" in many of his writings is no different from those "sloppy and superficial thinkers that he dismisses". These criticisms are probably valid in retrospect, particularly when we evaluate Pan's research using western standards in the 21st century. However, if we take into account the indigenous intellectual traditions and the historical, social context that Pan was situated in, these shortcomings are more understandable. In the following paragraphs, I will argue that despite its defects, Pan's research on the history of homosexuality in China is a continuation and development of the research methodology widely used in the field of *Kaozhengxue* (evidential scholarship or empirical school of scholarship)¹², an influential school and approach to research in China during the Qing dynasty (1644-1911). On the basis of Ellis' text, Pan not only uses *kaozheng* to collect and systemize local knowledge related to homosexuality, but also innovatively connects traditional Chinese humanistic scholarship and western scientific discourse.

Chinese scholars in the school of *kaozheng xue* used to apply philological techniques to compare different texts and react against the Neo-Confucianism which had arisen in Song Dynasty (960-1279). *Kaozheng xue* became an exegetical study of ancient classics and text and reached its peak during the rule of Qianlong (1736-95) and Jiaqing (1796-1820) Emperors of the Qing dynasty. Although this trend of evidential research ended in the middle of 19th century due to the frequent political and social upheavals, in particular the influence of Taiping Rebellion (1850-1864) (Elman 2001, 287), it signified a fundamental shift from the subjective, abstract Song-Ming rationalism to a more skeptical empiricism. Although their ultimate goal is not scientific, the empirical approach to knowledge that Qing evidential scholars advocated "placed proof and verification at the heart of organization and analysis of the classical tradition" (Elman 2011, 7) and has had a long-lasting impact on the Chinese intellectual sphere, even during the Republican Era. Scholars such as Liang Qichao (1920) and Hu Shi (1921a/1981), both of whom are pivotal figures in Chinese New Cultural Movement, saw the meticulous textual analysis that Qing evidential scholars developed as scientific in nature. With these scholars' advocacy, it is not surprising to see that *kaozheng xue* became one of the main research methods in the well-known *zhenglignogu* (reorganizing national treasures) movement led by Hu Shi and Gu Jiegang in the 1920s. In this movement, Hu emphasized the significance of re-evaluating China's past and cultural heritage with western scientific methods and related *kaozheng xue* to the method of modern historical research. Hu argued that the two key components in Qing evidential scholars' research method is: 1) dare to formulate bold hypotheses; 2) carefully search for evidence (1921a). For Hu, history is the starting point of the study of any subject, and the method to reorganize national treasure is to re-organize the history of the past with a modern historical view and method (1921b). In Hu's view, *kaozheng xue*'s emphasis on evidence thus provides a familiar and 'scientific' way for Chinese scholars to conduct a 'scientific' research on the past of the nation (ibid.).

Although Pan was not actively involved in this *zhenglignogu* movement in

¹² *Kaozheng* (literally means "search for evidence"). Paul S. Ropp (1981, 43) defines it as "careful textual studies based on minute analysis of the language of various extant Confucian texts. The goal of this textual research was to clarify and strengthen the classical Confucian heritage by sifting out the true from the false and determining the true message of the ancient sages, untainted by interpolations and distortions of later periods."

person¹³, his use of *kaozheng xue* in researching the history of homosexuality in his translation is indeed a good example of the historical study advocated by Hu Shi. In fact, as early as in 1921, the year after Hu Shi published his article on the method of reorganizing studying national treasures, Pan had applied the *kaozheng* approach in his paper on Feng Xiaoqing (1595-1613), an example of narcissistic psychology in Ming Dynasty, "Feng Xiaoqing Kao" [An evidential study of Feng Xiaoqing] (1922). This paper not only traces the records of Feng's life and her suicide in various literary and historical documents, but also analyzes her narcissistic behaviour by applying Freudian psychoanalysis.¹⁴ When Pan decided to translate *Psychology of Sex* by Ellis in 1939, he adopted a similar genetic approach and interweaved his research on Chinese homosexual culture into Ellis' text. Unlike Qing evidential scholars, who used various sources to search for new truth in ancient classic texts, Pan took a slightly different route, that is, to trace and analyze various Chinese historical and literary sources in order to 1) find examples and practices in Chinese culture that might echo or challenge western sexology and thus present a knowledge applicable to Chinese context; and 2) underscore the existing traditions and practices of homosexual culture in Chinese society. Admittedly, unlike Qing evidential scholars, Pan did not limit his research objects to different versions of Confucian classic texts, but follows Hu's proposal to seek evidence from a wide range of sources, no matter whether they are from official or unofficial history. In retrospect, Pan's approach, particularly his selection and use of examples, might be problematic if constructing a history of Chinese homosexual culture was indeed his goal, which was even criticized by himself when other scholars applied this sort of cherry-picking of examples to "present complex social research as entirely self-evident" (Rocha 2012). However, it is also important to acknowledge the intersection of different scholarships across cultures brought by the translator. In addition, presented along with Ellis' text, this knowledge of the past that the translator unearthed and re-organized again conditions readers' understanding and perception of the source text.

Pan's discussion of the question whether sexual inversion is congenital or acquired can be used as an example to illustrate how he motivated different systems of knowledge and conducted indigenous evidential research in his translation. This research consists of two aspects. On the one hand, Pan tries to echo Ellis' argument on congenital sexual inversion with Chinese examples and prove its applicability in the Chinese context. Notes 5, 6, 21, 22, 28, 31, 32, 44, 45, 46 and 55 in Chapter Five all belong to this category. In these notes, the translator presented the evidence that he collected from materials such as medieval anecdotes, literary prose and poems, social and regional customs as well as his own observations and then directed readers' attention to his more systematic studies on this topic in the appendix. In Notes 21 and 22, for example, Pan uses two Chinese idioms: "少成若天性 (things acquired in one's early life must be related to his congenital personality) and "习惯成自然 (Habitual practice eventually becomes [ingrained like])" to endorse Ellis' argument. He further extends the application of the first idiom to "delayed homosexuality" and concludes that homosexual inclinations are inseparable from one's nature. In the source text,

¹³ From 1922 to 1926, Pan was studying in Dartmouth College and Columbia University in the United States.

¹⁴ It was initially written as his assignment for a course in Chinese history taught by Liang Qichao at Tsinghua University in 1922. It was published in *Funü zazhi* [Ladies' Journal] 1924, 10 (11):1706-1717. Three years later, Pan revised and expanded this paper and published it as a book (Shanghai: Xinyue she, 1927).

Ellis continues to argue that psychoanalysts supporting the concept of “acquired sex inversion” also recognize its constitutional feature, therefore the line between these two schools is actually blurred and unimportant. Following Ellis’ argument, Pan reviews contemporary debates over this topic among Chinese scholars. He points out that Ji Yun (1724-1805), had argued that the homosexual inclinations of *luan tong* (婬童, catamite) were usually "acquired" due to outside seductions. However, Pan then points out, at the same time Ji Yun also argued that the actor, Fang Junguan’s doomed homosexuality represented the spirit of Karma in Chinese Buddhism, which echoes the view of congenital sexual inversion held by Yuan Mei (1716–1797). Pan argues at the end that although Chinese scholars’ concept of karma differs widely from that of Western genetics, the emphasis on pre-determination in sex inversion is shared.

On the other hand, Pan also tried to unearth more evidence from Chinese historical and literary texts to supplement or challenge Ellis' arguments. For example, in the section of “The Diagnosis of Sexual Inversion,” Ellis denied the popularity of homosexuality among young people in schools by saying that:

Many of us are unable to recall from the memories of school life and early associations any clear evidence of the existence of homosexual attractions, such rare sexual attractions as existed being exclusively towards the opposite sex (1933, 235).

In note 36, Pan (2000, 523) recognizes the validity of Ellis’ argument in the European context, but questions its direct application in Chinese context. To prove his point, Pan points out there is also an early but temporary inclination towards homosexual love among girls in not only early but also modern Chinese schools. In the section of “Eonism (Transvestism or Sexo-Aesthetic Inversion)”, Ellis discusses the Abbé de Choisy, a male example of sexo-aesthetic inversion. To respond to Ellis, Pan documents several Chinese examples from Six Dynasties (222-589), Song Dynasty (960-1279) and Ming Dynasty (1368-1644) in note 44. With an analysis of an example from Qing Dynasty (1644-1911), a family with the surname of Dian in Sichuan province had at least three continuous generations with the sexo-aesthetic inversion, Pan argues that there is a possibility of genetic factors in the sexo-aesthetic inversion that Ellis might overlook. When Ellis again states in his book that sexual inversion is not a “human mutation” but only “a variation” as colour-blindness is (1933, 245), Pan (2000, 523) directly challenges his argument on the basis of evolutionists’ distinction of three kinds of variations in the biological world as well as geneticists’ definitions on colour-blindness and albinism. He suggests that if sexual inversion is a variation and has genetic factors as Ellis tries to prove in this book, this inversion belongs to the first category of those three variations: that is, it is caused by the change of germ plasm. Therefore, Pan concludes, sexual inversion must have its biological base for mutation; and since as most geneticists agree, both colour-blindness and albinism are actually mutations, there is no reason why sex inversion should be excluded from mutations, too (Pan 2000, 523).

If all the above mentioned analysis and arguments that Pan made in his annotations to Ellis' text is only the prelude, Pan's appendix about examples of Chinese homosexuality is then the main theme of his evidential research on the history of Chinese homosexual culture. This appendix comprises five sections, namely: tracing the source, examples in official historical records, examples in

unofficial historical documents, homosexuality as a social custom and an exploration of underlying reasons for homosexuality in China. With evidence collected from historical and literary texts, Pan analyzed the poetic language in Chinese erotic culture used to refer to male homosexuality, including the early “*wantong*” (naughty boys) in *Shangshu* [The book of historical documents] and “*jiaotong*” (cunning boys) in *Shijing* [Book of Odes] and reviews the historical origins of expressions such as *Fentao* (Sharing a Peach), *Duanxiu* (Cut Sleeve) and *Longyangzhihao* (Love of Longyang) and “*Xiao Shi*” (young page, catamite) (2000: 716-22). He examined some key characters with possible homosexual connotations. For example, he traced the origin of the word “*ru*” (孺, child) to the names of gay partners of the Gao and Hui Emperors in Han Dynasty (206BC-220AD) and reviewed the different literary meanings of this word in various resources in the span of history. According to Pan, this word originally was only used to refer to officials’ wives, but then to commoners’ wives and children, and finally to young boys and men who play the role as women (2000, 724-5). With evidence drawn from modern biology and sexual physiology, he argued that the reason that women and young boys could share the same word in traditional Chinese sexual discourse is because women’s situation, in some sense, is close to children’s infantilism in terms of their high-pitch voice, hairlessness as well as the retarding period after their short-lasting growing stage, and that men with passive homosexual inclinations will usually resemble women physically and psychologically (2000, 724-5).

While noting that nearly every Han Emperor had his homosexual partners, Pan further associated homosexual inclination with the eunuch system in courts in many dynasties and classified well-known cases found in historical documents into four categories: non-eunuch with less homosexual tendency, non-eunuch with obvious homosexual tendency, eunuch with less homosexual tendency and eunuch with obvious homosexual tendency. He then draws readers’ attention to the debate on the connection between eunuchoidism and homosexuality among Western sexologists as well as biologists’ experiments and observations on animals, and concludes that men after castration are likely to become more feminized, therefore usually end up as the subjects of male homosexuality. With this conclusion, Pan goes back to explain why eunuch with less homosexual tendency, such as Emperor Wen’s partner Zhao Tan, Beigong Bozi and Emperor Yuan’s Hong Gong and Shi Xian, can seduce these emperors. This process of using examples of Chinese same-sex relationship to test the applicability of western sexology and then again applying to cases found in Chinese context exemplifies Pan’s joint application of induction (*guina*) and deduction (*yanyi*) in *kaozheng* scholarship and demonstrates his efforts to build connections between different forms of knowledge and traditions through his translation.

In the conclusion, Pan briefly summarized various causes of homosexuality mentioned in Chinese erotic culture and divided them into two main groups: acquired (being forced or being seduced) and inherited (Karma or metempsychosis). This conclusion is crucial, as it not only distinguishes Pan’s argument from Ellis’ argument on genetic homosexuality, but also delineate two different understandings of homosexuality embedded in Chinese historical and literary discourses. His research might not provide a perfect answer to the question whether homosexuality was seen as an identity of individuals and/or an obsession in ancient Chinese society; however,

the examples and evidences that he collected and analyzed in chronological order provide an outline of the history of Chinese homosexual culture. Presented in parallel with Ellis' text, this history not only reminds his readers of the existence of local knowledge and traditions, but also directly conditions their understanding of "homosexuality" in the sense of what Ellis intends to describe and argue in the source text. Unlike other scholars such as Hu Shi, Gu Jiegang and Fu Sinian who advocated *kaozheng* scholarship in historical studies in China, that is, using Chinese materials to directly write Chinese history, Pan tracked down evidence in Chinese culture to connect and contest the knowledge of another culture and construct a history of Chinese homosexual culture relevant to the one of the other culture. This again shows that the introduction and reception of Western sexology is not a simple transfer of ideas in one direction, but intersects with indigenous discourse on sexuality as well as intellectual traditions and research method.

Pan's substitution of western sexological terms with old Chinese literary expressions and historical references might not be appropriate if we insist the "golden principles" of fidelity and accuracy in translation, but it had its own political implications and served its purpose of resisting the wholesale westernization in study of homosexuality in China in the early twentieth century. His emphasis and deployment of historical materials reflect the continuing influence from the *zhengliguogu* movement on Chinese scholars' perception and consumption of new knowledge from other cultures at that time. His pioneering research on the history of Chinese same-sex relationships in this translation also constitutes a good example of how new knowledge is produced and connected through translation by scientists and scholars. Once listed as one of the hundred translations that had an impact on modern Chinese society by Zou Zhenhuan (1996), this translation by Pan was not only seen as an outstanding translation of Ellis' work, but also an exceptional work in the study of Chinese sexuality (Zou 1996: 425-6). He was surely not the only translator who appropriated the source text and added paratexts to a translation at that time or in the thousand years' history of translation in China. However, he was one of the few translators who did not stop at translating others' words, but were able to initiate dialogues and contest assimilation between two cultures and two traditions. This dialogue advocated by Pan in his translation has significant implications for the translation of sexology in the Republican period as well as the development of indigenous studies of sexuality in China. In addition, the fact that Pan returned to and developed the empirical approach created by Qing evidential scholars in his translation of Ellis' works and own research on the history of Chinese homosexuality reveals that the circulation of western knowledge on sexuality not only encountered challenges from local discourses and knowledge, but was also affected by indigenous intellectual traditions and research methods. As Foucault (1972, 191) emphasizes, although "a general transformation of relations has occurred", it does not necessarily mean all the elements have changed and disappeared; instead "one can, on the basis of these new rules, describe and analyse phenomena of continuity, return and repetition". Pan's translation fully demonstrates the collision and intersection between old and new knowledge and systems of knowledge across languages and cultures, and highlights the role of translator in contesting and connecting local and foreign knowledge.

The author wishes to thank Kate Sturge for her encouragement and feedback on this project at its inceptive stage and Regenia Gagnier for her insightful comments on an earlier version of this article. This article has also benefited from the workshop, "Gender, Sexuality, and the Making of the Human Subject in Modern China" organized by Howard Hsueh-Han Chiang in London in July 2015. The author wishes to thank participants, particularly Leon Antonio Rocha, for their feedback.

References

- Appiah, Kwame Anthony. 1993 (2000). "Thick Translation." In *Translation Studies Reader*, edited by Lawrence Venuti, 417–29. Reprint. London: Routledge.
- Aresu, Alessandra. 2009. "Sex Education in Modern and Contemporary China: Interrupted Debates Across the Last Century." *International Journal of Educational Development* 29: 532–41.
- Bauer, Heike. 2003. "Not A Translation But A mutilation: The Limits of Translation and the Discipline of Sexology." *The Yale Journal of Criticism* 16 (2): 381–405.
- Bauer, Heike. 2009. *English Literary Sexology: Translations of Inversion, 1860–1930*. Basingstoke, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Chiang, Howard Hsueh-Han. 2008. "The Conceptual Contours of Sex in the Chinese Life Sciences: Zhu Xi (1899-1862), Hermaphroditism, and the Biological Discourse of *Ci* and *Xiong*, 1920-1950." *East Asian Science* 2: 401–30.
- Chiang, Howard Hsueh-Han. 2010. "Epistemic Modernity and the Emergence of Homosexuality in China." *Gender and History* 22 (3): 629–57.
- Chou, Wah-shan. 2000. *Tongzhi: Politics of Same-Sex Eroticism in Chinese Societies*. New York: The Haworth Press.
- Elman, Benjamin A. 2001. *From Philosophy to Philology: Intellectual and Social Aspects of Change in Late Imperial China*. 2nd ed. Los Angeles, UCLA: UCLA Press.
- Elman, Benjamin A. 2011. "Early Modern or Late Imperial Philology? The Crisis of Classical Learning in Eighteenth Century China." *Front History China* 6 (1): 3–25.
- Ellis, Havelock M. D. 1933. *Psychology of Sex: A Manual for Students*. New York: A Harvest/HBJ Book.
- Foucault, Michel. 2003. *Society Must be Defended*. Translated by David Macey.

London: Penguin Books.

Foucault, Michel. 1972. *Archaeology of Knowledge*. Translated by A.M. Sheridan Smith. New York: Pantheon Books

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Hu, Shi. (1921a) 1981. "Qingdai xuezhe de zhixue fangfa." [The Research Methods of Qing Scholars] In Vol.1 of *Hu Shi Zhexue Sixiang Ziliaoxuan* [Selected Sources on Hu Shi's Philosophical Ideas], edited by Ge Maochun and Li Xingzhi, 184–211. Shanghai: Huadong Normal University Press.

Hu, Shi. 1921b. "Yanjiuguogu de fangfa." [The Methods of Studying National Treasures] *DongfangZazhi* [Oriental Journal] 18 (16).

Hatim, Basil and Ian Mason. 1997. *The Translator as Communicator*. London and New York: Routledge.

Kang, Wenqing. 2009. *Obsession: Male Same-Sex Relations in China, 1900-1950*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Leary, Charles. 1994. "Sexual Modernism in China: Zhang Jingsheng and 1920s Urban Culture." PhD diss., Cornell University.

Liang, Qichao. (1920) 1959. *Intellectual Trends in the Ch'ing Period*. Translated by Immanuel C. Y. Hus. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lü, Wenhao. 2006. *Pan Guangdan Tuzhuan*. Wuhan: Hubei People's Publishing House.

Mark, Steveson and Wu Cuncun. 2012. *Homoeroticism in Imperial China: A Sourcebook*. London and New York: Routledge.

Oosterhuis, Harry. 2000. *Stephchildren of Nature: Krafft-Ebing, Psychiatry and the Making of Sexual Identity*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Pan, Guangdan. 1935. "Tan 'Zhongguo Benwei Lun'" [On 'Chinese-based'], *Nianhua* 4 (3): 44-6.

Pan, Guangdan. 2000. *Pan Guangdan Wen Ji* [The Anthology of Pan Guangdan]. Vol.12. Beijing, Beijing University Press.

Pan, Quentin. 1928. "The Problem of the Cultural Hybrid." *The China Critic* 1: 248–51.

Rocha, Leon Antonio. 2010. "Xing: The Discourse of Sex and Human Nature in Modern China." *Gender and History* 22 (3): 603–28.

Rocha, Leon Antonio. 2012. "Quentin Pan in *the China Critic*." *China Heritage*

Quarterly No. 30/31. Accessed May 24th 2015.
http://www.chinaheritagequarterly.org/features.php?searchterm=030_rocha.inc&issue=030.

Ropp, Paul S. 1981. *Dissent in Early Modern China: Rulin Waishi and Ch'ing Social Criticism*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Sang, Tze-lan Deborah. 1999. "Translating Homosexuality: The Discourse of Tongxing'ai in Republican China (1912-1949)." In *Tokens of Exchange: the Problem of Translation in Global Circulations*, edited by Liu, Lydia H., 276–304. Durham [N.C.]: Duke University Press.

Sang, Tze-lan Deborah. 2003. *The Emerging Lesbian: Female Same-Sex Desire in Modern China*. Chicago and London: The University of Chicago Press.

Venuti, Lawrence. 1998. *The Scandals of Translation: Towards an Ethics of Difference*. London: Routledge.

Zhang, Taiyuan. 2011. "Meiyou le Zhongguo: Ershi Shiji Sanshi Niandai Zhongguo Sixiangjie de Fansi." [Without China: Chinese Intellectuals' Reflections in the 1930s] *Jindaishi Yanjiu* [Studies of Chinese Modern History] 3: 104-122. Accessed June 7th, 2015. <http://jds.cass.cn/UploadFiles/upload/201110040118398378.pdf>.

Zou, Zhenhuan. 1996. *Yingxiang Zhongguo Jindai Shehui de Yibaizhong Yizuo* [One hundred translations that had an impact on modern Chinese society]. Beijing: China Translation & Publishing Corporation.