

Medio-translatology and the Latest Development of Translation Studies in China



Qiyi Liao

Abstract Translation Studies in China during the 1990s were still dominated by a paradigm of mimesis centered around verbal transference and translation techniques. Through a constant interrogation and challenge of such an outmoded conception of translation, Medio-translatology is now accepted in China as an important academic field of translation studies with its scope and methodology. As such, Medio-translatology exerts a profound influence on many scholars and researchers with a keen interest in translation studies. Medio-translatology approaches translation studies through the lenses of comparative literature and cultural studies and attaches more importance to the cultural aspect of translation and the theoretical dimensions of translation studies, thus changing the face of translation studies in China in terms of its scope of research, the conception of translation and methodology. By introducing new concepts and methodologies to relevant researchers, Medio-translatology gives renewed impetus to translation studies in China and, to some extent, helps set its agenda.

Keywords Medio-translatology · Translation studies · Conception and methodology

After 1979, an important trend in the development of translation studies in China—the advancements from the sole intrinsic study in language to multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary—from words and sentences to social culture, and from physics to metaphysics. Reviewing the development of translation studies in the past few decades, it is believed that every scholar is influenced by the study of “Medio-translatology” (译介学). Tianzhen Xie was involved in translation studies through comparative literature. He questioned traditional translation concepts and research methods. This resulted in the creation of a theoretical system in Medio-translatology, which placed translated literature in a specific cultural time and space for investigation. Translation studies have since gone beyond the “in-place loop” (原地循环) research model (Shi 2011: 22), with Medio-translatology being an important

Q. Liao (✉)
Sichuan International Studies University, Chongqing, China
e-mail: qyliao888@163.com

driving and transformational force. Concurrently, Medio-translatology has changed the process and trend of translation studies in China.

1 The Historical Context When Medio-translatology Was Created

Around 1990, translation studies in China were either indulging in the interpretations and controversies of “Faithfulness, Expressiveness and Elegance” (信达雅) or wrangling over the translation of words and sentence pairs. Mainstream translation criticisms focused on text and translation techniques. The vast majority of the articles included in collections such as *Collection of Translation Theory* (1981) (翻译论集) edited by Liu Jingzhi, *Collection of Translation Theory and Translation Techniques* (1983) (翻译理论与翻译技巧文集) published by China Translation and Publishing Corporation, *Collection of Translation Research Paper* (1984) (翻译研究论文集) selected by the editorial department of *Translation Newsletter* (翻译通讯), *Collection of Translation Essays* edited by Luo Xinzhang, *A Hundred Schools of Modern Literary Translation* (1989) (当代文学翻译百家谈) edited by Wang Shoulan, and others, still focused on the translators’ hands-on experience and perceptual thinking in translation. Some scholars mentioned the need to observe translation and translation activities from the theories of linguistics, aesthetics, hermeneutics, philosophy, and cultural studies. However, after perusing, it is found that few articles genuinely go beyond the text and translation techniques, let alone having theoretical depth. This is few and far between the cultural and ideological aspects of translation studies.

In 1991, when Nanmu wrote a preface to Tan Zaixi’s *A Short History of Translation in the West* (西方翻译简史), he said, “I think that there is still room for discussion on whether translation has become an independent scientific discipline. The reason is as follows. Translation is similar to language and mathematics. It is neither subordinate to the economic structural base nor superstructures. It is neither natural science nor social science. Translation is a tool used by humans to exchange ideas and transmit information. Adding up all the marginal intersections of translation studies in various disciplines is not a sufficient reason to say that this subject, is an independent scientific discipline” (Nan 1991: 51). Nanmu’s view is quite encompassing. He denied the subject status of mathematics and translation, deemed translation as a “tool to exchange ideas and transmit information”, and did not distinguish between translation as a practical activity and translation research as a subject. With regards to some of the renowned translation concepts today, Nanmu also believes that there are “deficiencies” and pointed out that examples such as “language determines the thoughts and worldviews; the translation must not have additions, deletions, and modifications; viewpoints and metaphors such as the original author is the master, and the translator a servant; and the theory of ‘equal effect’ and ‘equal response’. All these are debatable” (Nan 1991: 52). The translation concepts mentioned above are, of course, debatable. However, the problem is that these opinions reflect the lack of

contact that China's translation field has with Western translation studies and that the Chinese's understanding is relatively superficial, limited to the level of traditional translation techniques.

Yang Zijian had a much clearer understanding of the status of translation studies during that period. "Looking at the two fields of language research and translation in our country, it can be said that there is an extensive history with an abundance of works. However, it is challenging to say which ones are more important theoretically. The tradition of underestimating theoretical research results in such a phenomenon. More precisely, the reluctance and inadequacy to conduct regular summaries and theoretical explanations of one's practice caused the difficulty in making major theoretical contributions" (Yang 1993: 12). He even cautioned translation researchers to "take some time to summarize and explore your actual work theoretically. Doing this can improve your theoretical thinking ability and make your actual work more effective" (ibid.).

Yang Zijian's criticisms foresighted the weak theoretical awareness in the Chinese translation field. It is undeniable that China's translation field's expectations and assumptions toward the translation discipline are relatively superficial, and the imitation paradigm essentially dominates the translation community. Translation is equated to skill and language conversion. The evaluation criteria are still constrained to the "Faithfulness, Coherence and Elegance" of the past century. Furthermore, most research results still focused on the faithful reproduction, style, and charm of the translated text, the translator's literacy and attitude, and other such tangible factors.

2 Broadening the Horizons of Chinese Translation Studies

It is in this academic environment that Medio-translatology began to enter the view of Chinese scholars. Tianzhen Xie enters from the marginalization of translated literature in modern literary history and questions the academic world's positioning and evaluation of translated literature. He, thereby, questions the traditional translation theoretical concepts. He believes that as early as the 1920s and 1930s, books such as Chen Zizhan's *The History of Chinese literature in the Last Thirty Years* (最近三十年中国文学史), Wang Zhefu's *The History of Chinese New Literature Movement* (中国新文学运动史), Guo Zhenyi's *A History of the Chinese Novel* (中国小说史) all regarded translated literature as "a part of Chinese literature to have a dedicated chapter". However, since 1949, translated literature no longer enjoys such status in various newly compiled works in the history of modern Chinese literature. It is only incidentally mentioned, and there is no in-depth discussion, and naturally, no dedicated chapter. Till today, there is no explanation for the ups and downs of translated literature in the history of modern Chinese literature. Individuals simply deny the existence of "translated literature", or never think that translated literature is a part of Chinese literature (Xie 1990: 56). At the same time, Tianzhen Xie began to question the nature of translation. He believes that "for a long time, people are biased against

literary translation. They always felt that translation is purely a technical skill of converting language symbols. Anyone can perform a literary translation so long as they can understand a foreign language and perform a search on a foreign language dictionary for unfamiliar vocabularies. This prejudice also affects people's view of literary translation and their translators. The former is seen as having no independent value while the latter is looked down upon as just 'a humble translation workman'" (Xie 1994: 176).

Tianzhen Xie feels that translated foreign literature should have an important and independent position in the Chinese literature system. Translated literature is "given a new form, thought or image", has an "independent existence that has an irreplaceable effect on the cultural life of humans" (Xie 1994: 178). Hence, the evaluation of translated literature rose to cultural significance. His unique ability of problem awareness and academic insights have given Medio-translatology an interdisciplinary research perspective right from the start. Medio-translatology goes beyond the narrow vision of the traditional translation field. Medio-translatology also proposed the cultural significance of translation that will only be accepted years later. Translated literature bestows literary work a refreshing perspective, allowing it to have a new literary exchange with an even broader audience range. Not only does it extend the life of a literary work, but also gives it a second chance in life (Xie 1994: 179–180). It is easy to discover that the nature of Medio-translatology is neither a mere conversion of a text nor a simple recreation of literary work. Instead, it concerns a type of literary or cultural research problem, such as the loss, deformation, addition, and extension of information in the original text's conversion process between native and foreign languages. As a form of practical activity of human cultural interaction, translation has a unique value and significance (Xie 1999: 1). This is a question that traditional translation scholars rarely ponder on and are unwilling to answer.

The creation of a theoretical system is first seen as questioning and criticizing traditional concepts. Tianzhen Xie's "On 'Creative Treason' in Literary Translation" (论文学翻译的创造性叛逆), "Enlightenment and Impact: On the Latest Development of Translation Studies and the Disciplinary Dilemma of Comparative Literature" (启迪与冲击——论翻译研究的最新进展与比较文学的学科困境), "On the Misconceptions in Translation Studies and Theories in Our Country" (国内翻译界在翻译研究和翻译理论认识上的误区), "How Do We View the Differences in Translation Studies by China and the West: The Academic Contention the Style of Study and Writing" (如何看待中西译论研究的差距——兼谈学术争鸣的学风和文风), "On the Modernisation of Translation Studies" (论译学观念现代化), and others, have all put forth a series of new concepts, thoughts and research approaches, which are recognized by many scholars. Fang Ping once spoke highly of the consciousness to "challenge social stereotypes" and a "broad academic vision" (Fang 1999: 9), and Zhu Hui said that *Medio-translatology* (译介学) has the practical significance of "criticizing traditional fallacies" (Zhu 2000: 59). Taiwanese scholars believe that one can easily "gain new concepts and even adjust the reading horizon" by reading Tianzhen Xie's *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* (Lu 1995: 216). Medio-translatology made a strong impact on traditional translation concepts,

changing China's translation field's long-standing fashion in interpreting "Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance". Medio-translatology also changes translation studies' direction from technical discussions to theoretical explorations, thereby starting a new phase in modern translation research studies.

3 Enhancing the Academic Connotations of Translation Studies

Due to the close relationship between translation and real-life practice, as well as the tradition of practical reason in China's translation field, translation studies always had a very prominent tendency to emphasize practicality and practice. There is nothing wrong with emphasizing the practicality of translation and its positive significance in the theoretical summary. However, China's translation field has a deeply rooted indifference to theories and tends to hold theoretical discussion and construction in contempt. Tianzhen Xie points out sharply that "for a long time, there is a trend in China's translation field to deem translation research as meaningless, and that real ability is only acknowledged when one produces good translation works. Hence, many translators in China's translation field are proud of producing good translation works even though they neither venture deep into translation studies nor understand translation theories. Moreover, those translators that have written many translation research papers, but little excellent translation works are often met with disapproval and sneer. In this standard practice, even well-respected translators are affected. For example, a renowned translator once said, real-life practice is the most valuable aspect of translation, and I have always suffered in being fastidious but incompetent. It is not easy to be both an excellent literary theorist and poet or novelist, likewise for translation. I have seen people who write translation theory very pertinently, but the opposite when they translate. I often take this as a warning" (Xie 2001: 2).

Tianzhen Xie clearly states that there are three misunderstandings in China's translation industry. The first misunderstanding is mistaking the study of "how to translate" for the entire translation study. The traditional translation theories in China have almost always revolved around "how to translate". This can be seen from "following the original purpose", "no addition of ornate language", "according to the truth", "Five Losses of Source Texts" (五失本), "Three Difficulties in Translation" (三不易) till "Faithfulness, Expressiveness, and Elegance", "Spiritual Resemblance" (神似说), and "sublimation" (化境说) (Xie 2001: 2-3). The research and discussion of translation techniques are undoubtedly important. However, the discussion of translation techniques and summaries of translation experience must be raised to a theoretical level, and the patterns to be discovered. In addition, theoretical research must go beyond the "narrow level of pure language conversion" and "examine and study translation from the cultural aspect" (Xie 2001: 3).

The second misunderstanding is the attitude toward pragmatism in translation theory, one-sidedly emphasizing the guiding role of theory in practice and believing

that all theories should be useful in guiding practice. Otherwise, these theories will be ridiculed as “detached from reality” and an impractical “empty theory” (Xie 2001: 3). With the development and maturity of the discipline, the division will inevitably be “increasingly refined”. The experts who are mainly engaged or specialized in theoretical research will emerge as well. We should encourage scholars, especially those that have the interest and aspiration to engage in purely translation theoretical research. James Holmes once said that translation studies could be classified as a field of pure research and a field of practical application. The function of translation theory is to describe the phenomena of translating and translation(s) as they manifest themselves in the world of our experience and to establish general principles by means of which these phenomena can be explained and predicted (Holmes 2000: 176).

The third misunderstanding is that China’s translation field is accustomed to emphasizing “China’s characteristics” or “self-forming system” while ignoring the “commonality” and “universal law”. Translation being a shared cultural interaction activity by humankind has its internal law. A more prominent trend of Western translation studies in recent years is to explore translational norms and translational universals, emphasizing the rise from individual to a whole, from the local to the global arena. To insist on “China’s characteristics” or “self-forming system” is to go against the development trend of translation studies in the academic community. Tianzhen Xie stated clearly that a one-sided emphasis on “China’s characteristics” or “self-forming system” may “result in the rejection and even repulsion to bring in, learn and draw on advanced translation theories from foreign translation academia. The blind arrogance and complacency under the pretext of “self-forming system” artificially elevate experiences to so-called theories, thus replacing the theoretical discussion in the strict sense” (Xie 2001: 4). Some scholars said that overstressing the characteristics will result in “getting caught in narrow nationalism” (Chang 2000: 224). Tianzhen Xie surpassed the “prevailing debates” then, (on whether the presence or meaning to translation theories), and the “dispute between Chinese and the Western powers”, (on whether the Western translation theory is universal and applicable to Chinese translation practice), making a breakthrough in the limitations of nationalism.

Tianzhen Xie feels that before the 1950s, no translation research in the world can be considered translation theories in the strict sense. From Barnes’ point of view, all the research done is “only applicable in the translation principles and practical history of literature” (Xie 2001: 5). This is what many translation theorists call the “pre-scientific” stage. Since then, Western translation theories have made considerable progress, and the field of research has also greatly expanded. Initiators of translation works, along with manipulators and recipients of texts, have become the objects of research. The theories discuss the fidelity and equivalence relationship between the texts, pay attention to the “spread and acceptance of translated works in the new cultural context, the ultimate purpose and effect of translation as a cross-cultural communication activity, and also the role translators play in this entire translation process” (Xie 2001: 4). “The focus of translation studies is on the results, functions, and systems of translation. Special attention is given to the restriction and

decision toward translation result and factors of translation acceptance, the relationship between translation and different genres of translated texts, the status and role of translation in the ethnic or country-specific literature, and the effect of interactions between translation and national literature” (Xie 2001: 4). The construction of translation theory and the development of translation studies require some scholars to “get rid of the ‘craftsman’s view’ as soon as possible” and become the “architect master” in translation studies (Xie 2003: 256). Tianzhen Xie’s discussion of the relationship between the “skill” and “learning” is incredibly rousing, and the changing of criticizing culture to find talk and discourse is undoubtedly targeted and of strong relevance.

4 Opening a New Concept of Chinese Translation

In 2004, the *Chinese Translators Journal* published an editor’s note, stating that the dilemma facing Chinese translation studies is both “narrow” and “thin”. “Narrow” mainly refers to “the narrow research path, which is reflected in the lack of consciousness for innovation, going down the same road, lack of theoretical framework and breakthrough in the system” (Editor 2004: 1). On the other hand, “thin” refers to “the weak theoretical foundation, extreme lack in interdisciplinary knowledge”, and emphasizes the need for “new perspective, methods, and breakthroughs”. The editor’s comment states that “academic innovation requires a sense of exploration and courage. Suppose there is no courage and innovation in selecting a topic, staying in the comfort zone. In that case, it is impossible to have academic achievements”. (Editor 2004: 6) The first article published after the editor’s comment was Tianzhen Xie’s “On the Modernisation of Translation Studies” (Xie 2004: 7). The article demonstrates the development of translation studies in terms of research concepts. Also, it highlights Tianzhen Xie’s academic awareness of interdisciplinary and theoretical construction. More importantly, it is a response to academic innovation. Tianzhen Xie believes that “the cultural context of translation and the content of translation studies has changed. However, our translation studies concept remains unchanged, and our translation studies team does not have any substantial changes. Many of us still hold on to translation concept from decades, or even hundred years ago” (Xie 2004: 7–8) This means that translation is no longer seen as a simple act of conversion between two languages, but as a unique political, cultural, and literary activities in the target language society. The translated text results from the translator’s role in the society of the target language, and it plays an important role in the political, cultural and daily life of the target language society” (Xie 2004: 8). Tianzhen Xie also believes that the cultural context of translation has already moved on from the phase of oral communication and text translation to today’s phase of cultural translation. These changes profoundly affect and change the direction of translation studies. China’s translation theoretical and disciplinary construction will undoubtedly reach a “bottleneck”, as well as “stopping the further development of China’s translation studies”, if one does not understand the trends and developments

of translation studies worldwide, and “does not quickly modernize the translation concepts”. Thus, this will adversely affect our entire translation business (ibid.). This is a positive inspiration for translation studies.

It should be pointed out that the dissemination and influence of *Medio-translatology* drive the theoretical construction and innovation in the school of thoughts of translation studies. The conceptual system of *Medio-translatology* theory, translated literature, and the history of translated literature extensively and profoundly influenced mainland China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and other countries. Jia Zhifang positively affirmed Tianzhen Xie’s *Medio-translatology*, saying that it “has both theoretical height and a vast number of examples. It analyses and reviews translated literature as the object of literary and cultural studies, and in turn, derives an important conclusion directly related to the compilation of literary history and the interaction between Chinese and foreign culture... a new front of translation research from the perspective of comparative literature and culture is unveiled, opening a new field in China’s translation studies” (Jia 1999: 4). Hence, in China’s translation field, saying that *Medio-translatology* has originality is not a compliment by any means.

If we analyze Holmes’s epoch-making document “The Name and Nature of Translation Studies” from the perspective of the development of modern translation studies, we will discover that the dissemination, acceptance, and influence of translation works do not seem to occupy their due place. Of course, we cannot demand that Holmes foresaw the development of translation studies today more than thirty years ago. Nevertheless, to date, the lack of a corresponding English term for “*Medio-translatology*” leaves Tianzhen Xie awkward when coining the term *Medio-translatology*. In the West, there are still no systematic and complete monographs related to *Medio-translatology*. From one aspect, this shows the difficulty in creating a new academic field, constructing a new school of thought or theory.

In the newly published *Introduction to Medio-Translatology* (译介学导论), Tianzhen Xie elaborated on the “major theoretical and practical value” of *Medio-translatology* for translation studies. (Xie 2007: 8) First, *Medio-translatology* expands and deepens the understanding of translation and translation studies. Second, the study of “Creative Treason” affirms and elevates the value of literary translation as well as the status of literary translators. Third, the argument for the attribution of translated literature. Fourth, the consideration of *Medio-translatology* on the compilation of translated literature history shows a vast academic space. (Xie 2007: 13–14) We will find that these statements are factual when looking at the topic selection of translation studies made by China’s scholars. Many scholars are inspired by terminology systems such as “Creative Treason” and “cultural misunderstanding”. These terminologies have become one of the most widely circulated and frequently used in the translation industry. Among those, *Medio-translatology* has become the most references Chinese document in China’s translation studies. According to the statistics compiled by some scholars, “*Medio-translatology* has been printed four times since its publication in 1999... the citation rate is among the top few in the domestic field of translation and comparative literature”. Also, “the number of citations by CSSCI publications exceeds 18 times per year”. The National Social Science Program Project Guide (国家社科项目课题指南), National 11th Five-Year Plan Philosophy

(国家“十一五”哲学), and Social Science Planning (社会科学规划) (2006–2010) also listed Medio-translatology as one of the key research topics. (Cai 2011: 575).

5 Expanding the Field of Translation Studies

After more than 20 years of continuous refinement, Medio-translatology gradually became an important analytical tool and theoretical guidance for translation studies. It has been continuously applied to the translation community's new research fields: the compilation of translation history and foreign cultural classics.

Firstly, Medio-translatology was successfully applied to the compilation of literary translation history. Some scholars pointed out that Tianzhen Xie “analyzed the nature, belonging and status of translated literature” for the first time, and “discussed the methodological issues of writing the ‘history of translated literature’ theoretically” (Zha 2000: 127). It is common knowledge that China has published many books on the history of translated literature or literary translation. Just in 2005 alone, four books on translation history and three translator monographs were published. However, overall, “the study of translation history is limited to the significance of documents and historical data” (Liao 2008: 51). This is also a universal issue in the compilation of translation history. Editors either lack the macro-theoretical framework, hence unable to discover or summarize the context and patterns of translation development from the vast historical materials, or lack the theoretical in-depth to comb through the historical materials involved. Some translation history has almost become a running account of translation events. Tianzhen Xie believes that “the history of translated literature”, which focuses on narrating literary translation events, is not strictly a history of translated literature, but a history of literary translation. The core of literary translation history is key translation events, and the history of literary translation focuses on the diachronic clues of translation events and historical processes. It pays attention to diachronic translation activities. It also pays attention to the cultural space in which translation events occur, the literary and cultural purpose of the translator's translation behavior, and the foreign writers and their works that entered the view of Chinese literature. The history of translated literature examines the translated literature in a specific era of cultural space, explains the cultural purpose of literary translation, the different translation forms, translation processes to achieve a particular cultural purpose, and the translation effects. It also discussed the relation and meaning of translated literature and national literature in a specific era. (Xie 2007: 162–163).

According to this guiding ideology, the *History of Modern Chinese Translation Literature* (1898–1949) (中国现代翻译文学史[1898–1949]) edited by Tianzhen Xie and Zha Mingjian possesses great significance (Xie and Zha 2004). There are a few reasons for it. First, the compilation of the history of translated literature is a historic attempt on the Medio-translatology theoretical system, clarifying the difference between “translated literature” and “literary translation”, analyzing the relationship between translated literature and foreign and local literature, the relationship

between translated literature and the diverse system of local culture. It also answers basic questions such as the nature, disciplinary status, and constituent elements of the history of translated literature. Second, this book successfully applied the combination layout of the ‘line’ and ‘surface’ to objectively describe the development clues of translated literature events, while emphasizing the spread, acceptance, and influence of translated literature in the Chinese literary system. Third, the recognition and affirmation of translators’ dominant status, literary societies, and “foreign writers clothed in China’s outer garment”. Fourth, the history of translated literature “is seen as a book on the history of cross-cultural literary exchange, literary relations and literary influence” (Geng 2007: 86). This attempt displays Tianzhen Xie’s “unique hermeneutic consciousness” and “theoretical foresight of historians” (Geng 2007: 85), and more importantly, changes the academic world’s understanding, evaluation, and positioning of translated literature, and established a new paradigm for the compilation of translation history.

In the current upsurge of “Chinese literary culture going global”, Mediotranslatology has become theoretical guidance and ideological weapon in the translation industry. As early as 2008, Tianzhen Xie began to pay attention to and publish articles related to Chinese literature and culture going global. Through these works, Tianzhen Xie applied the basic principles of Mediotranslatology to the foreign translation of Chinese cultural classics. He also systematically and comprehensively explained and demonstrated the nature, significance, approaches, characteristics, methods, and misunderstandings of the foreign translation of classics. Tianzhen Xie believes that the globalization of Chinese literature and culture is a cross-cultural project. We “must break out of the simple conversion between two languages and must examine and think through the problem of translation under the cultural and social background of different nationalities. Only then is it possible to “deeply understand the intricate and subtle relationship between the many factors behind translation and language conversion, grasp the essence of the question ‘how Chinese literature and culture go global’, and identify the crucial part of the problem” (Xie 2013: 47). At the same time, we must be aware of the difference between translating “in” and “out” and should not perceive taking “the reading habits and aesthetic tastes of the receiving group” into consideration as “fawning upon the Western readers”. It is necessary to understand the basic patterns of translation from mainstream to non-mainstream cultures and place importance on the “time difference” and “language difference” in cultural communication (Xie 2014: 5–8).

By combing through the history of Buddhist scripture translation, Tianzhen Xie emphasizes the need to “abandon the ‘self-centered’ thinking”, recognize the role of “adaptation” and “identification” in cross-cultural communication (Xie 2014: 8). He also emphasizes the need to “find common ground between the cultures of the source and target country, constructing the kinship between the two different cultures” (Xie 2014: 10), and “to allow Chinese experts, scholars, and translators to participate in the translation and introduction of Chinese literature and culture in English-speaking countries” (Xie 2014: 8). It can be said that based on the principles of Mediotranslatology, Tianzhen Xie not only keenly discovers the biases and limitations of Chinese literature and culture in the current foreign translation, but

also analyses the reasons for the errors theoretically, and put forward constructive opinions and concrete and feasible translations strategies.

6 Conclusion

Tianzhen Xie has been studying comparative literature and translation since the 1980s. He published ‘Creative Treason’ in Literary Translation” in *Journal of Foreign Languages* in 1992, *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* (1994) (比较文学与翻译研究) in Taiwan in 1994, *Medio-translatology* (1999), and *Introduction to Medio-Translatology* (2007). In recent years, he published *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* (2011), *New Vision of Translation Studies* (2014) (翻译研究新视野), *Invisibility and Appearance: From Traditional Translation Theory to Modern Translation Theory* (2014) (隐身与现身——从传统译论到现代译论), *A Translation Study Beyond Translation* (2014) (超越文本 超越翻译) and other monographs and essays collections. These published works further enriched the theory of Medio-translatology. Medio-translatology has become a vital theoretical resource for domestic translation studies and comparative literature studies. An interesting phenomenon is that the French “Creative Treason” and other Medio-translatology-related thoughts were introduced into Japan earlier than China. However, these concepts “did not flourish and there are no ‘scientific names’ so far. The core concept of ‘Creative Treason’ has not been effectively popularized as well” (Gao 2016: 142). In China, Medio-translatology “takes roots and flourished rapidly”, becoming “an integral part of contemporary Chinese translology, attracting the attention of the entire humanities circle” (ibid.). The reason is that some scholars believe, “Japan lacks people like Tianzhen Xie who are dedicated to Medio-translatology research” (ibid.), which should reflect the truth. In the past 20 years or so, the concept of Medio-translatology caused many controversies. Some gave high affirmation and support, but others questioned or even opposed it. There are still different interpretations and understandings toward it (Wang 2017: 62–69). Tianzhen Xie responded to these challenges more systematically, pointing out some misunderstandings toward Medio-translatology (Xie 2012: 34–36). It is undeniable that Medio-translatology and the various controversies it sparks off have changed the academic circles’ understanding and definition of numerous core translation concepts, expanded the field of translation studies, and promoted the theoretical improvement of translation studies. Due to Tianzhen Xie’s multiple academic identities as a comparative literature scholar, translator, translation theorist, translation educator, planner, organizer, and builder of translation disciplines, his influence is far beyond that of a pure translator. He directed the attention of translation research and criticism “to the reality of translation, paying attention to the status, communication, role, influence, and meaning of translation in the context of the target language”, “highlighting and affirming the labor value of literary translators”, and “shifts the focus from the culture of the original language to the culture of the target language” (Xie 2012: 38–39). It can be said that Medio-translatology not only influences the thinking and methods of

many translation scholars but also changes the process and development direction of contemporary Chinese translation studies.

References

- Cai, Yunyun. 2011. Tianzhen Xie's Translation Studies and Its Academic Influence (谢天振教授的翻译研究对中国译学的影响). *Science & Technology Information* 8: 575.
- Chang, Nam Fung. 2000. Specificity and Commonness: On the Relationship Between Chinese Translatology and Translation (特性与共性——论中国翻译学与翻译学的关系). In: *Theoretical Construction of Translation from a Cultural Perspective* (翻译的理论建构与文化透视), ed. Tianzhen Xie, 223–235. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Editors. 2004. Editors' Words (编者按语). *Chinese Translation Journal* 1.
- Fang, Ping. 1999. *Preface Two* (序二). Tianzhen Xie. *Medio-translatology*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Gao, Ning. 2016. Translation Studies in Modern Japan in Comparison with That in China (“学”与“论”之间的日本近现代翻译研究——兼与我国译学研究做简要对比). *Comparative Literature in China* 4: 129–145.
- Geng, Qiang. 2007. Theoretical Conception of History and the Composition of the History of Translated Literature: On A History of Translated Literature in Modern China (1898–1949) Edited by Tianzhen Xie and Zha Mingjian (史学观念与翻译文学史写作——兼评谢天振、查明建主编的《中国现代翻译文学史[1898–1949]》). *Comparative Literature in China* 2: 80–93.
- Holmes, James. 2000. The Name and Nature of Translation Studies. In *The Translation Studies Reader*, ed. Lawrence Venuti, 172–185. London: Routledge.
- Jia, Zhifang. 1999. *Preface One* (序一). Tianzhen Xie. *Medio-translatology*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Liao, Qiyi. 2008. On Professor Tianzhen Xie's Viewpoint on Translation Studies (论谢天振教授的翻译研究观). *Journal of Bohai University (Philosophy & Social Science Edition)* 2: 47–52.
- Lu, Kanghua. 1995. A Review of *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* (一步一步脚印——谢天振《比较文学与翻译研究》). *Comparative Literature in China* 2: 211–217.
- Nan, Mu. 1991. A Breakthrough in the Study of Western Translation History (大胆的尝试, 可贵的创举). *Chinese Translators Journal* 2: 50–52.
- Shi, Guoqiang. 2011. Tianzhen Xie's Viewpoint on Translated Literature (谢天振的翻译文学思想). *Contemporary Writers Review* 3: 22–28.
- Wang, Xiangyuan. 2017. The Original Meaning, Context and Applicability of 'Creative Treason': With a Discussion on the Appropriation and Transformation of 'Creative Treason' in Medio-Translatology (“创造性叛逆”的原意、语境与适用性——并论译介学对“创造性叛逆”的挪用与转换). *Contemporary Writers Review* 3: 62–69.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 1990. Translated Literature: Literature for Recognition (翻译文学——争取承认的文学). *Exploration and Free Views* 6: 56–60.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 1994. *Comparative Literature and Translation Studies* (比较文学与翻译研究). Taipei: Taiwan Yeqiang Press.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 1999. *Medio-translatology* (译介学). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2001. On the Misconceptions in Translation Studies and Theories in Our Country (国内翻译界在翻译研究和翻译理论认识上的误区). *Chinese Translators Journal* 4: 2–5.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2003. *New Perspectives in Translation Studies* (翻译研究新视野). Qingdao: Qingdao Publishing House.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2004. On the Modernization of the Concept of Translation Studies (论译学观念的现代化). *Chinese Translators Journal* 1: 7–11.

- Xie, Tianzhen. 2007. *Introduction to Medio-translatology* (译介学导论). Beijing: Peking University Press.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2012. Creative Treason: Its Interpretations, Essence and Significance (创造性叛逆: 争论、实质与意义). *Comparative Literature in China* 2.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2013. Translating and Disseminating Chinese Literature and Culture: Its Theory and Practice (中国文学、文化走出去: 理论与实践). *Soochow Academic* 2 (44–54): 161.
- Xie, Tianzhen. 2014. The Translation and Dissemination of Chinese Literature: Problems and Essence (中国文学走出去: 问题与实质). *Comparative Literature in China* 1: 1–10.
- Xie, Tianzhen, and Zha, Mingjian. 2004. *A History of Translated Literature in Modern China (1898–1949)* (中国现代翻译文学史[1898–1949]). Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.
- Yang, Zijian. 1993. Studies on Translation Theories in China in Recent Ten Years (1983–1992) (我国近十年来的翻译理论研究[1983–1992]). *Chinese Translators Journal* 6.
- Zhu, Hui. 2000. A Book Review on Tianzhen Xie's *Medio-translatology* (具开拓意义的翻译文学研究新著——评谢天振著《译介学》). *Chinese Translators Journal* 1: 59–60.
- Zha, Mingjian. 2000. Approaching Translation Studies from Comparative Literature: A Critical Review of Tianzhen Xie's Research on Medio-translatology (比较学者的学术视野与学术个性——谢天振教授的比较文学学科意识及其译介学研究). *Comparative Literature in China* 1: 115–128.

Qiyi Liao is Professor of Translation Studies at Center for Translation Studies, Sichuan International Studies University, Chongqing, P.R. China. His main research interests are Translation Studies in Modern China, Translation Criticism and Translation as Cultural Construction. He was visiting scholar at Eastern Mennonite University, Goshen College USA and University of Edinburgh UK. His publications include *Approaches to Contemporary Translation Theories in the Western World* (2000), *On Translation Studies in UK* (2001), *On Hu Shi's Poetry Translation* (2006), *On Literary Translation Norms During the May 4th Period* (2010), *Translation Studies: From Text, Context to Cultural Construction* (2014), *On Translation in Chongqing During the Period of Anti-Japanese War* (Co-authored with Quanhong Yang, Tian Luo and Wei Gao, 2015) and *Chinese Discourses of Translation Criticism in the Twentieth Century* (2020). The research project under study is *National Values and Translation in Modern China*.