Intralingual Translation, Language Shifting, and the Rise of Vernaculars in East Asian Classical and Premodern Cultures

A Book Proposal

Presented by

Rainier Lanselle

Professor (Directeur d'études), Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris,
Chair "History and Philology of Classical China"

Director, Centre de Recherche sur les Civilisations de l'Asie Orientale
[Research Center in East Asian Civilizations] (www.crcao.fr), Paris

rainier.lanselle@ephe.sorbonne.fr

&

Barbara Bisetto

Associate-Professor, University of Milano-Bicocca, Chinese Language and Literature

barbara.bisetto@unimib.it

Contents

General Outline

The book addresses different issues regarding cultural, textual, and linguistic strategies related to the pluriglossic situation of the East Asian sphere in the classical and premodern eras. More precisely the book discusses *intralingual translation* as a key parameter for analyzing the history of linguistic phenomena and textual practices that developed in classical and premodern China and East Asia, facing the coexistence and intermingling of various linguistic realities, from classical Chinese and literary Sinitic varieties to the rise of written vernacular languages.

Scholars working in East Asian classical and premodern studies constantly come upon situations in which the very parameters of the language used in a given text are in themselves a key-feature of its meaning. Citation, commentary, rewriting, the genesis of textual traditions, the formation of narratives, and the circulation of themes across different genres, routinely involve discursive strategies in which the semiotics of the text is achieved not only through the explicit level of its contents, but also through the implicit dimension of the linguistic choices that were made in order to carry it. This is true, in particular, where authors show a consciousness of the diglossic nature of the written language, a linguistic situation which is widespread throughout the so-called "Sinographosphere" comprising China, Japan, Korea, Vietnam, and the Central Asian/Altaic spheres. In this set of contexts, the semiotics of a text is achieved not only through its explicit denotational contents but also through the implicit indexical dimension of the linguistic choices it makes. Intralingual translation appears here as a key concept. This can be both narrowly defined (translating from one variety of a given language into another) or more broadly understood (so as to include phenomena of rewording, rewriting, commenting, and continuous reinterpretation). But whatever the form it takes, intralingual translation represents a pervasive phenomenon that is central to the dynamics of textual production, reception, and circulation in the above-cited written traditions.

While being fully aware of these linguistic realities, scholars all too often take them as a given fact and do not question them as a specific issue, therefore overlooking the wealth of translational practices that crossed the history of East Asian textual cultures and literacies and their legacies. This is true, for example, in terms of knowledge transmission and knowledge sharing in diachronic and socio-cultural perspectives.

As upheld in the book, the concept of *translation* is fundamental in order to make sense and highlight the deep semiotic significance of these linguistic choices and discursive strategies.

The theoretical underpinning of the book draws on insights from the discipline of translation studies on aspects as the categorization of translation types and the position of translation in the system of texts and textual culture. On the matter of categorization, it relies, as stated, on the notion of *intralingual translation* (see Berk Albachten 2014; Davis 2014; Schmid 2008; Zethsen 2007, 2009), while from the perspectives of textual and literary systems, it turns to the notion of *metatext* and *metaliterature*, as firstly proposed by James Holmes (1970) and Anton Popovič (1975 [2006]) in the 1970s and further developed by Peeter Torop (1995 [2010]), which allows to broaden the scope of observation from the single verbal text derived from the process of translation to the various traces of the text in the receiving culture.

The current common definition of intralingual translation goes back to Jakobson's (1959) tripartite categorization of translational phenomena into intralingual, interlingual and intersemiotic processes. According to Jakobson, intralingual translation is a process of rewording: the interpretation of verbal signs by means of other verbal signs of the same language.

So far, intralingual translation has received little attention within the discipline of translation studies as well as in historiographical researches on translation in East Asia. In the field of translation studies, theoretical and empirical investigations have mainly been confined to interlingual aspects and practices to the detriment of a more thorough description of translational phenomena and a more inclusive definition of "translation" itself. Within the discipline of translation studies the debate on about how to handle a wide range of intralingual transformative phenomena is still ongoing, with a great variety of approaches based on very contrasted definitions (*i.e.*, from the most exclusive to the most inclusive) of the concept of translation itself, with a never-ending divide between "lumpers" and "splitters" (Chesterman 2016). It is the belief of the editors of this book that the classical and premodern East Asian case should be regarded as a decisive point in order to better grasp the validity of the concept. This is why, while primarily addressed to specialists of East-Asian specialists, the book also aims at impacting the broader context of translation study readership, as well as readers interested in the general field of semiotics.

The Jakobsonian definition cited above is rarely analyzed, as it should be, under the light of Jakobson's own preliminary remark, stating that he himself relies on Charles S. Peirce's theory of the linguistic sign. According to the latter, "a sign is not a sign", in the linguistic sense, unless it "translates itself into another sign in which it is more fully developed." (Peirce quoted by Dewey 1946, p. 91). This view is explicitly claimed, for example, by Jacques Lacan's language theories, according to which no language is ever capable to fully articulate itself, and always needs some other form of language to be "translated" into (which reflects in their emphasis on the metaphoric and metonymic functions). It further relates to the Bakthinian dialogic nature of language itself, whereby a (written) utterance always echoes, and reworks, a whole set of previous (written) utterances. Translation here, far from corresponding to the narrow, interlingual definition referred to above, should be taken in its broadest semiotic meaning of any form of "rewording" (Jakobson 1959), or in the way André Lefevere (1992) considers translation as being essentially a deed of "rewriting".

This aspect is closely related to the configuration of the process of *translation* as *metaliterature* and the definition of its product, whatever the textual unit considered (full text or partial text), as a *metatext*. When compared to the other widely accepted term used to denote the resulting product of the translation process, namely the notion of *target text*, the concept of *metatext* has the advantage to give prominence to the hypothetical (not normative) character of translation and its power to transform a closed text (the proto-text) into a (linguistically and culturally) open text.

From this perspective, the "other language" involved in the translation process can apply to a great variety of forms, like commentary, rewriting across different registers or genres in classical Chinese, or from any classical form (of any East Asian language) to any form of vernacular; it can also be conveyed through stylistic rather than purely linguistic qualities, for example when a given theme or message is affected by a change of enunciative position or a switch in the subject of utterance. To make an example from the Chinese tradition of vernacular fiction, when historical episodes were narrated into a story, they may or may not have been translated into contemporary vernacular, but it was paramount that they should be put into the mouth of a fictional narrator who was either a storyteller or a schoolmaster. Rewriting here implied shifts in narratology which appear as even more important than the intralingual translation process itself, even as the presence of the vernacularization paradigm was manifest in the whole rewriting agenda.

The general concept of "other language", of language shifting, as understood here (in a way akin to how David Lurie (2011), e.g., refers to "invisible vernacular texts" when analyzing *kundoku* practices), also gives the possibility not to rely too much on the difficult concepts of diglossia(e) or plurglossie(e), the validity of which have recently raised a series of objections by East Asia specialists, outside the linguistic space of China itself as well as within it. It does not shun, either, the highly problematic judgement by which the Sinographic sphere, owing to the common use of literary Sinitic, should be regarded as a "world without translation". Shouldn't the presence of any "other language", whatever its kind or form, be it besides, beyond, within, or underneath any given text, be considered the cursor at which to place the very definition of translation? In any case, however diverse the opinions on these issue, it is the belief of the editors of this project that the metatextual propensity referred to above is by no means triggered by the diglossic (or plurglossic) situation itself, if any, but rather may make use opportunistically of such a situation if it happens to serve its goals. In other words, this propensity should be regarded as foremost, and intrinsic to a great number of situations involving textual production, and, above all, textual *transmission*.

The book calls for a profound shift in approaches towards translational phenomena in premodern East Asia. If it is true that the widespread use of classical Chinese in premodern East Asia produced a kind of "Sinographic cosmopolis" that could to some extent bypass the urgency of translation between different languages in the written sphere, at the same it gave rise to linguistic tools, discursive strategies and textual forms for negotiating the distance, and at the same time the relationship, between Classical Chinese language, literary Sinitic varieties and the rise of vernacular languages, in China as well as in the neighboring countries and cultural spheres.

The difficulty of the task regarding how to address the inevitably multifaceted issues implied by this matter was what triggered the strategy of the editors. It was our conviction that such questionings could not be conducted by a single expert of any given cultural area or textual category, but by the conjunction of specialists of a wide array of disciplinary fields, delivering highly specialized, state-of-the-art case-studies relying on a variety of subjects, cultural areas, texts, periods, and genres. Through these case-studies only could the complexities and richness of the matter be suitably exemplified and prove conceptually productive. The twenty contributions gathered here concern the whole "Sinographosphere": China, Korea, Japan, Vietnam, and the Altaic space. They are acutely concerned by questions of textual and linguistic strategies within the general realm of commentary and interpretation, e.g., through usages in exegesis, quasi-translations (semi-translations) or glossing, or the creation of different tools devised over the centuries in order to read and transmit ancient texts for new generations of readerships. They involve different genres: poetry, prose, canonical or recreational texts, texts of History or fiction, in classical and/or vernacular, as well as questions related to their making, often as echoing previous texts—be it full-fledged translation, rewriting, or amplification. They entail topics regarding the creation of repertoires of new textual categories marked by specific linguistic aspects intertwined with crucial interpretive, philosophical, as well as religious issues. They are also concerned by how *inter*lingual translations may occur in a context marked by (or *despite*) the common use of literary Sinitic, including questions of creolization of Chinese itself.

The twenty hand-picked specialists were gathered for the specific purpose of producing this book of contributions as a common endeavor. They had the opportunity to brainstorm together at a workshop held in Paris in January 2017 (see https://intraling-asia.sciencesconf.org).

The contributions collected in this book, while, as stated, providing case-studies in the general field of intralingual translation aspects, represent a node in a network of connections that taken together can shed light on a whole historical panorama, far exceeding the sum of its parts. The contributive effort, unprecedented on this scale on such a matter, will be introduced by a substantial introduction aiming not only at being a general presentation of the individual contributions, but at being a conceptual effort to put into evidence the interest of theorizing the notion of intralingual translation in the field of East Asian studies as well as bringing East-Asian classical and premodern issues in the mainstream of translation studies.

Selected Bibliography

Berk Albachten Özlem (2014). "Intralingual Translation: Discussion within Translation Studies and the Case of Turkey." In S. Bermann, C. Porter (eds), *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley-Blackwell, 573-585.

Chesterman Andrew (2016). "Moving conceptual boundaries: so what?". Keynote speech presented at the 8th Congress of the European Society for Translation Studies, Aarhus University, September 15th.

Davis K. (2014). "Intralingual Translation and the Making of a Language". In Bermann S., Porter C. (eds). *A Companion to Translation Studies*, Wiley Blackwell, 586-598.

Dewey John (1946). "Peirce's Theory of Linguistic Signs, Thought, and Meaning." *The Journal of Philosophy*, *43*(4), 85-95.

Jakobson Roman (1959). "On Linguistic Aspects of Translation." In R. A. Brower (ed.) *On Translation*. Harvard University Press, 232-239.

Holmes S. James (19070). "Forms of Verse Translation and the Translation of Verse Form". In: James S. Holmes (ed.) *The Nature of Translation. Essays on the Theory and Practice of Literary Translation*, The Hague-Paris: Mouton-De Gruyeter, 91-105.

Lefevere André (1992). *Translation, Rewriting and the Manipulation of Literary Fame*. London; New York: Routledge.

Lurie David (2011). *Realms of Literacy: Early Japan and the History of Writing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Asia Center.

Popovič Anton (1975). *Teória emeleckého prekladu*. Bratislava: Tatran (it trans. (2006), *La scienza della traduzione*, Milano; Hoepli).

Schimd Wolfgang (2008). "A duck in rabbit's clothing. Integrating intralingual translation". In Kaiser-Cooke (Hrsg.), *Das Entenprinzip. Translation aus neuen Perspektiven*, 19-80.

Torop Peeter (1995). *Total'nyj perevod*. Tartu: Tartu University Press (it trans. (2010), *La traduzione totale*, Milano; Hoepli).

Zethsen Karen Korning (2007). "Beyond Translation Proper – Extending the Field of Translation Studies." *TTR* 20, 1, 281-308.

Zethsen Karen Korning (2009). "Intralingual Translation: An Attempt at Description." *Meta* 54, 4, 795-812.

List of Participants

(By Alphabetical Order)

Sarah M Allen - Associate Professor, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA

Attilio Andreini - Associate Professor, Ca' Foscari University, Venice, Italy

Wolfgang Behr - Professor, Universität Zürich AOI Asien-Orient-Institut, Switzerland

Barbara Bisetto - Associate Professor, University of Milano-Bicocca, Milan, Italy

Vibeke Børdahl - NIAS, Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, University of Copenhagen, Denmark

Rebekah Clements - Lecturer, Durham University, UK

Marion Eggert - Professor, Ruhr-Universität Bochum, Germany

Stéphane Feuillas - Professor, Université Paris Diderot, Paris, France

Matthew Fraleigh - Associate Professor, Brandeis University, USA

Funada Yoshiyuki - Associate Professor, Hiroshima University, Department of History, Graduate School of Letters, Hiroshima, Japan

Imre Galambos - Lecturer, University of Cambridge, UK

Ross King - Professor, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

Peter Kornicki - Professor, University of Cambridge, UK

Rainier Lanselle - Professor (Directeur d'études), Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris, France

Pierre Marsone - Professor (Directeur d'études), Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, Paris, France

John D. Phan - Visiting Assistant Professor, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ, USA

Jean-Noël Robert - Professor, Collège de France, Paris, France

Haun Saussy - Professor, The University of Chicago, USA

Maria Franca Sibau - Assistant Professor, Emory University, Atlanta, GA, USA

Viatcheslav Vetrov - Associate Professor, University of Heidelberg, Germany

Table of Contents

(☞ Note: This is not necessarily the final order. The present order is by cultural area, and could be rearranged thematically)

Cultural Area: East Asia

Peter Kornicki (Professor, University of Cambridge, UK)

Vernacularization and the evolution of writing systems in East Asia

Cultural Area: China

Sarah M. Allen (Associate Professor, Wellesley College, Wellesley, MA, USA)

Translating History: Gou Daoxing's Soushen ji

Attilio Andreini (Associate Professor, Ca' Foscari University, Venice, Italy)

Intralingual Translation and Early Exegetical Traditions of the Laozi 老子

Wolfgang Behr

Resounding the gloss: on the origins of paronomasia as an intralingual argumentative device

Barbara Bisetto

Intralingual translation and the making of the *yanyi* textual category

Vibeke Børdahl

The Interplay of the Oral and the Written in *Jin Ping Mei cihua*

Stéphane Feuillas

Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574-648) as a translator of the Chinese Classics

Rainier Lanselle

Language and discourse in the formation of late Ming and early Qing vernacular short story

Haun Saussy

A Neglected Feature of Translation: The Intertext

Maria Franca Sibau

Vernacular Rewriting and the Art of Enlivement: Intralingual translation in *Xingshi yan* (1632)

Viatcheslav Vetrov

Chinese Language Varieties as Competing Semiotical Models: Reflections on the Language Use in Wang Yangming's Philosophy

Cultural Area: Korea

Marion Eggert

Translation, Transcoding, Code Switching: Diglossia in Chosŏn Korean Poetry

Ross King

Inscriptional repertoires and the problem of intra- vs. interlingual translation in traditional Korea

Cultural Area: Japan

Rebekah Clements

Intralingual translation and the creation of eighteenth century Japanese prose

Matthew Fraleigh

Intralingual and Interlingual Glossing of Sinitic Poetry in Early Modern Japan

Jean-Noël Robert

Japanese Buddhist Poetry and Bilingualism

Cultural Area: Vietnam

John D. Phan

Aestheticizing the Vernacular in early modern Sino-Vietnamese translation

Cultural Area: Central Asian/Altaic Spheres

Funada Yoshiyuki

Did Mongolian Language Affect Chinese Language? Focusing on the "Literal Translation Style" Used in Translating Mongolian Documents into Chinese under Mongol Rule

Imre Galambos

Manuscripts of Chinese educational texts among China's north-western neighbours

Pierre Marsone

Written and Oral Language in the Memorandum on the Matrimonial Unions of the Great King (*Dawang ji jieqin shi* 大王記結親事)

Contributions Summary

Peter Kornicki

Vernacularization and the evolution of writing systems in East Asia

> This essay considers the impact that the development and invention of writing systems did and did not have on vernacularization in East Asia. It seeks to answer the following questions. Why did each society develop a distinctive script and why was the Chinese script the only common script? What explains the rapidity with which the Tanguts and Tibetans developed independent scripts and the tardiness with which scripts emerged in Japan, Korea and Vietnam? How was it possible to present vernacular versions of Sinitic texts without a vernacular script?

Cultural Area: China

Sarah M. Allen

Translating History: Gou Daoxing's *Soushen ji*

> The Dunhuang text entitled *Soushen ji* 搜神記, attributed to Gou Daoxing 句道興, is frequently classed (in modern terminology) as a Tang *zhiguai* 志怪 or *biji* 筆記 collection. However, its contents mark it as quite different from the typical Tang collection in its focus on incidents that are also recorded in earlier texts, ranging from early histories such as the *Zuo zhuan* 左傳 and early philosophical texts such as the *Han Feizi* 韓非子, to Gan Bao's 干寶 much more famous fourth-century *Soushen ji* and early medieval miracle tale collections. The narratives of these events found in the Dunhuang text are never identical to those in the earlier sources, either in wording or (in many cases) in detail, but they remain close enough to be easily recognizable as versions of the same story. Moreover though the text often gestures to a source, the citation given often reads simply "historical records" 史記. The eclectic content of the Dunhuang *Soushen ji*, its juxtaposition of material more familiarly associated with a wide range of earlier sources, and the Dunhuang versions' frequent divergence from those more familiar narratives raise a number of questions about the types of sources Gou Daoxing used and the intended purpose of his compilation. This essay uses this intriguing text as a starting point to explore how canonical material was "translated" into new mediums and contexts during the medieval period.

Attilio Andreini

Intralingual Translation and Early Exegetical Traditions of the *Laozi* 老子

This essays examines to what extent the early exegetical tradition of the *Laozi* 老子 offers additional information on the relationship between commentarial literature on "Classics", or "Canons" (*jing* 經) and intralingual translation.

More precisely, through an investigation on the commentaries attached to the *Yan Zun* 嚴遵 version, the *Heshanggong* 河上公 version, the *Wang Bi* 王弼 version and the *Xiang'er* 想爾 version of the *Laozi*, it verifies if the exegetical methods contemplate procedures of intralingual translation in order to re-contextualize a Canon through its commentary (by reducing the temporal distance that separates them) and to mediate between their linguistic and hermeneutic differences.

The essay examines in particular the different interpretations developed by the commentators on the meaning of *yi* 一 ("One", "Unity", "Conformity with the Absolute") in the *Laozi* . By focusing on a specific topic, the essay shows clearly how each exegetical tradition has built its critical system to meet different explanatory purposes and therefore it further considers whether each of these exegetical purposes implies a distinct approach of re-shaping the canonical text.

As a second objective, this essay discusses whether the source text, paraphrased or restructured according to each commentator's tenets, may be seen as the aim of a "proper" translation. Starting from the attempt of Zethsen (2009) to set-up alternative criteria to define the process of translation compatible with a wide range of translational phenomena - among which that of intralingual translation - the investigation proceeds one more step in order to determine if, on case-by-case basis, source text, transfer and intertextual relationships produce "forms" of translation and whether these translations are eligible to be labeled as intralingual, interlingual or "inter-genres".

The latter typology, in particular, addresses the need to explore in greater depth the relationship between *jing* "Canon" and *zhuan* 傳 "commentary" (or *zhu* 注 "interlinear commentary"), which is a tight relationship of mutual dependence, because neither of them has meaning without the other. According to the words of Wang Chong 王充 (27–c. 100 CE, who argued that "the Sages make the *jing*; the Worthies created *zhuan* for them: they transmit the ideas of those who made them, and adopt the fixed intent of the Sages. Therefore, the *jing* need the *zhuan*") it can be seen that any text could assume the status of *jing* through the addition of a *zhuan*: such addition certified a "Canon" as a constant, normative paradigm which, thanks to its commentary, reveals hidden meanings and produces a fecund application to many different situations. The case of *Laozi* is no exception, since among the Beijing University corpus of bamboo texts (Beida Hanjian 北大漢簡) which should be dated to the second half of the reign of Emperor Wu 武 of Han 漢 (141-87 BCE)

there is a nearly complete version of the *Laozi* (Beida Laozi 北大 老子) divided into two sections, which are entitled *Laozi shang jing* 老子.上經 (*Laozi, First Section of the Canon*) and *Laozi xia jing* 老子.下經 (*Laozi, Second section of the Canon*). This specific feature not only indicates that the *status* of "Canonical Scripture" (*jing*) was already accorded to the text during the Western Han period, but it may also reinforce the traditional claim that the *Laozi* achieved such a prestigious recognition during the reign of Emperor Jing 景 of Han (156-141 BCE).

Wolfgang Behr

Resounding the gloss: on the origins of paronomasia as an intralingual argumentative device

Paronomastics, although known as an embellishment since the earliest stages of Chines poetry, reemerges as a massively deployed glossing strategy during the Pre-Imperial/Imperial transition period. Against the background shift from what has been called "nominalism" (Makeham 1991, 1994) in Early Chinese philosophy, *i.e.*, the abandonment of the previously widespread acceptance of merely conventional ties between extralinguistic referents and their linguistic representations (Ptak 1986-7, Djamouri 1993), a move towards forms of "essentialism" set in during the Early Empire, necessitating new motivations of the linguistic sign, whether oral or written. Trying to escape from the abyss of the *arbitraire du signe* by concocting invented traditions of nomothetic saints, the Han Ruists attempted to anchor the gloss in fashionable correlative cosmologies, and, at the same time, the signifié in its intrinsic ontology. Along with an increasing awareness of language change (Behr 2005), internal and external linguistic diversity (Behr 2004), a new articulation of philosophical arguments thus emerged, which depended on the harnessing of synchronic homophonies and the construction of wild intralingual paretymologies, through which the core terms of the Chinese philosophical lexicon could be paronomastically reappropriated.

After tracing the earliest reflexes of a vernacular-*yǎyán* 雅言 (Behr 2016) divide in excavated texts, and sketching the rampant loss of Old Chinese derivational morphology under conditions of heavy language contact and its consequences for the emergence of a recalibrated relationship between writing and language, this essays focuses on paronomasia as a synchronic intralingual practice (cf., e.g., Huang Lili 1995, Zhao Zhongfang 2003, Geaney 2010, 2016, Zhang Guoliang 2011, Meng Xin 2014, Suter 2015, 2016). Aimed at creating powerful philosophical propositions, this practice played an important role in the establishment of what would eventually be construed as a "classical" canon of Chinese texts and a corresponding normative language (*tōngyǔ* 通語), effectively disguising the less presentable aspects of its quasi-creolized linguistic pedigree.

Barbara Bisetto

Intralingual translation and the making of the *yanyi* textual category

The textual category of *yanyi* 演義 (lit. elaboration on the meaning) has been mainly discussed in relation to the rich production of vernacular narratives based on historical and pseudo-historical records which were published during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries within the context of the late imperial print culture.

The narrative outgrowth of this textual category, however, marked the point of convergence and transformation of some key elements germinated in earlier centuries in the first occurrences of this category within the context of the commentarial tradition. Particularly relevant among these features are the use of amplification in the hermeneutical practice, the impact of printing and the flourishing of pedagogically focused commentaries, as well as the prominent role assigned in these commentaries to practices of rephrasing to help the reading and learning of canonical and non-canonical texts.

This essay discusses the earlier stage of *yanyi* in the commentarial tradition through the analyses of selected textual examples from two fourteenth century works: the anthology *Du lü yanyi* (Explanations of Du Fu's codified poetry) by Zhang Xing, and the commentary *Shi yanyi* (Explanations on the *Odes,* preface 1383) by Liang Yin (1303-1390). It examines what kind of interpretive practices and what kind of attitudes toward language do these texts envision, particularly from the perspective of intralingual translation, in order to define what kind of social needs they were addressing and what kind of social action they were meant to accomplish in the context of their production. As a result, the analysis places the textual category of *yanyi* at the heart of a process of mediation and interaction between levels of culture, whose discursive practices belong to the sphere of translation.

Vibeke Børdahl

The Interplay of the Oral and the Written in *Jin Ping Mei cihua*

On the basis of the author's previous studies of the so-called 'storyteller's manner, *shuoshu ti* 說書体, in Chinese popular oral and written entertainment literature, this essay proposes a study of the 'manner' as found in the novel, *Jin Ping Mei cihua* 金瓶梅詞話(1617). What is the function of the 'storyteller's manner' in anonymous literary work of *Jin Ping Mei cihua*? How far can we relate the function and form of the 'manner' to oral professional storytelling, as we know it from present day performance practice of storytelling in China, such as Yangzhou storytelling, *Yangzhou pinghua* 揚州評話, and other oral genres of China?

This essay discusses selected findings concerning the narrator's meta-narrative phrases, the so-called 'storyteller's stock-phrases', together with some thoughts on the novel's connection to oral storytelling.

Stéphane Feuillas

Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574-648) as a translator of the Chinese Classics

The enormous set of commmentaries commissioned by the Tang Emperor Taizong 唐太宗 (r. 598-649) and mostly written by Kong Yingda 孔穎達 (574-648), still widely used by modern scholars, *The Correct Meaning of the Five Classics* (*Wujing zhengyi* 五經正義), has until the middle of the eleventh century constituted the basis of the scholar's curriculum and one of the essential books on the mastery of knowledge required for the examinations. Taking the form of a sub-commentary (*shu* 疏), it brings together the various commentaries of the dynasties of the Han (or for the *Classic of Change* those of Wang Bi 王弼 (226-149) and Han Kangbo 韓康伯 (332-380). Nevertheless, this work has often been devalued in the history of Chinese thought, modern interpreters noting that the contribution of Kong Yingda and his team were often marginal, and claiming that its interpretative choices were few and above all lacking any originality.

This essay proposes another way to look at the work and its related practices. It shows that the bulk of Kong's work consists in a real intralingual translation of the text of the Classics on the one hand, and of the Han and Six Dynasties' commentators on the other hand. For the sake of clarity, the analysis is limited to examples taken from the commentary on the *Records on Rites* (*Liji* 禮記) and it demonstrates through a careful reading of the textual tools used by Kong Yingda (for instance the use of dissyllabic words instead of the monosyllabic words of the classics, or the addition of grammatical empty words) that the nature of those commentaries is close to a translation.

On a second level of analysis, this essay formulates some reasons of the translation in the Tang Dynasty of the ancient classics and of the Han commentators and asks a question very rarely addressed, namely that the ancient Chinese language was partly lost during the Six Dynasties, and that beyond the screen of a continuous tradition appears some discontinuity not only in the episteme of the Chinese philosophical history, but also in the Chinese language itself. It is this discontinuity that Kong Yingda's commentaries precisely reveal, and are aimed at filling out.

Rainier Lanselle

Language and discourse in the formation of late Ming and early Qing vernacular short story

Because the emergence and development of premodern Chinese fictional literature took place in a context of diglossia between literary Sinitic and new forms of vernacular, it was marked by narrative procedures which encompassed not only discursive, but also strongly linguistic aspects. A key-feature in the strategies of Chinese authors of fiction from the Yuan to early-Qing has long been the recycling of classical sources, recast and by the same way resemanticized. This enduring performative endeavor coordinated a subtle mix of rewriting,

quotation, amplification, commentary, and plain translation, with a constant shift between the two linguistic domains of classical and vernacular, the differentiation of which the authors showed a keen awareness.

The consequence of this creative environment was twofold. First it had a strongly transformative effect on the source texts that were submitted to such a process of overhauling, in a way very much akin to what has been described in the context of *inter*lingual translation. Depending on similar processes of dis-location and re-location, it postulated the creation of new readerships and contributed to the updating of whole corpuses of stories, oftentimes achieving unprecedented literary fame and cultural significance. And second it had important consequences in the field of narratology, as, through it, authors of fiction transformed to a great extent the identity of *who* was speaking. The expert/layman relationship subsumed under the *wen* 文言 vs./ *tongsu* 通俗 differentiation implied a very different narrative contract, affecting this time not only the reader, but the fictional identity of the narrator. Here we examine some effects of the constant tendency to present the narrator as, either a storyteller, or a schoolmaster. The consequences of this were manifold, and strikingly akin, this time, to what has been theoretically described in the context of *intra*lingual translation — in its effect on the transmission of knowledge, to cite but one example.

Relying on the corpus of the late-Ming to early-Qing *huaben* 話本 short stories and critical material such as prefaces, this essay focuses on a careful examination of the various creative techniques governing the recasting of classical material into vernacular narratives, with a particular attention to its linguistic aspects. On this basis, it examines how the qualification of intralingual translation can apply to these creations, implying phenomena by no means alien to interlingual translation. It also examines how the authors of the time, far from being consciously "translating" anything, were very much indebted to the discursive tradition in which, as scholars, they had been highly trained: the tradition of commentary.

Haun Saussy

A Neglected Feature of Translation: The Intertext

By "intertextuality" we usually mean a network of echoes and correspondences that construct the meaning of a work of literature by putting it in symbiotic relation with other pre-existing works of literature (classical statements of this insight are to be found in Kristeva, *Σημειοτική*, and Riffaterre, *La Production du texte)*. A translation, it might be said, is through-and-through intertextual, because, in theory, every word or sentence of the French translation of *Ulysses*, let's say, has its *raison d'être* in a corresponding word or sentence of the original English-language novel it purports to translate. But when a text is among the first to tread a certain path of cultural exchange, the equivalences and understandings that make translation possible may seem particularly weak. In such cases, translation is helped along—sponsored—by a preexisting text in the «target language» of

the translation relationship. That preexisting text may be mined for phrases, ideas, structures, devices, style, attitudes, a relation to an audience, or other aspects that might make more likely the success of the newly-introduced text from abroad. I call (The author calls) the text mined in this way the "sponsor text."

An example is ready to hand. The introduction of Buddhism to China, starting in the late second century of our era, was a transcultural initiative taking many forms on different levels of Chinese society. At one extreme, foreign monks who had learned some form of Mahayana Buddhism preached to Chinese with some education who condensed their doctrines into pithy résumés. At another extreme, during the period of disorder and anomie that followed the collapse of the Han Dynasty, disaffected upper-class intellectuals who found congenial the escapist and individualist themes of the Daoist classic *Zhuangzi* recognized in Buddhist teaching some of the ideas that allowed them to achieve some distance from the Confucian imperatives of family duty and public service. This upper end of the social spectrum—so-called "gentry Buddhism" -- formed the milieu for a curious hybrid culture, sometimes known as Neo-Daoism or *xuanxue*, in which Buddhist themes intermingled with those of the *Laozi,* the *Zhuangzi,* the *Liezi* and their recent commentaries.

Naturally, when ideas and texts from one culture are introduced to another, there is room for conflict and for misunderstandings (both generous and ill-willed). The use of the language of the *Zhuangzi* as a vehicle for the conveyance of Buddhist ideas among the educated gentry of the third and fourth centuries is a form of interlingual translation (although virtually none of the Chinese involved in the «translation» knew Pali, Sanskrit, or any other foreign language); it is also an intralingual translation, causing the ideas in these earlier Chinese works to take on new connotations and to be extended in new ways by those who had been in contact with the exponents of monastic Buddhism. This essay concentrates on the use of *Zhuangzi* citations by two antagonists, a representative of the court and the important monk Huiyuan, arguing over the relation of the state and the Buddhist *sangha*. The intertext proves pivotal in more ways than one: not just providing a common vocabulary for the discussion, but supplying the actual stakes for which the antagonists compete.

Maria Franca Sibau

Vernacular Rewriting and the Art of Enlivenment: Intralingual translation in *Xingshi yan* (1632)

Many stories in the late Ming *huaben* collection *Xingshi yan* (1632) by Lu Renlong present a parade of filial sons, chaste wives, loyal ministers—historical figures whose names and deeds are found in classical language biographies disseminated through historical compilations, local gazetteers, anthologies, encyclopedias. No exception to this is the fourth story, which tells of Chen Miaozhen, a girl who performs *gegu* (flesh slicing) to save her ailing grandmother. Lu Renlong based his vernacular retelling (labeled as *yanyi*) on a biography written by the eminent early Ming literatus Song Lian.

In the foreword and in a tail commentary to the story, the commentator (who is usually assumed to be Lu Yunlong, the redactor's brother and an active publisher in the last decade of the Ming) proclaims the superiority of the vernacular tale vis-à-vis the classic statement of grandfilial devotion, Li Mi's "Memorial to Express My Feelings" (*Chen qing biao*, 3rd c. AD), on the one hand, and quatrains by famous scholars that celebrate virtuous paragons, on the other. Such superiority is predicated on the story's capacity to bring to life its heroine and its power to affect and stir the otherwise recalcitrant reader to action. Yet the commentaries themselves are written in classical language. This essay examines the story of Miaozhen as a text and as an artifact from a variety of angles, including the relationship between the classical source text and the vernacular retelling, the linguistic and ideological interplay between different paratextual levels (preface, eyebrow, and tail commentaries) and the story proper, and the connotative use of calligraphic script displayed in the original woodblock edition.

Viatcheslav Vetrov

Chinese Language Varieties as Competing Semiotical Models: Reflections on the Language Use in Wang Yangming's Philosophy

In Wang Yangming's work, both *suyu* and *wenyan* are used as a means of philosophical discourse. The choice of either variety is motivated not by socio-linguistic considerations, but by the necessities of the philosophical argument. One of the main issues for Wang Yangming is the unity of ethics and optics, i.e. the persuasion according to which a scholar who aspires to attain the Way should be able to get the right focus in the process of studying, to discard the unnecessary knowledge, to concentrate on the essential, never to reduce the true knowledge-issue (the "quality" of learning) to being a matter of mere quantity. The philosophical motivation of the parallel use of *suyu* and *wenyan* styles in the *Chuanxilu* is two-fold: on the one hand, Wang Yangming addresses the issue of simplicity and clarity of the true learning which had been continuously discussed by the Chinese intellectuals since antiquity and which constantly refers his disciples and readers to the realm of the topology of Chinese culture (this motivates the use of the *suyu*-style, the topos of "things-close-at-hand".) On the other hand, he is quite aware of the difficulties his contemporaries are confronted with while trying to understand the Canonical scriptures. Being convinced, that his own age faces quite the same problems as those discussed in the Canonical scriptures, he resorts to the use of *wenyan* to demonstrate the unity of ages as well as the ever-lasting unity of Principle.

The topology of culture is here discussed as the primary frame of reference for the language-use in Wang Yangming's work. However, as most secondary sources in Sinology interpret the use of *suyu* and *wenyan* in Chinese sources in socio-linguistic terms (relying largely on Charles Ferguson's *diglossia* theory), the problem of culture topology is by necessity supplemented by the discussion of the language-typology issue. As a means of philosophical

investigation, neither *suyu* nor *wenyan* can be interpreted as a low or a high variety. For this reason, this essay proposes to refer to both varieties as competing semiotical models rather than as illustrating a diglossic language situation in the classic, Fergusonian sense of the term.

<div align="right">

Cultural Area: Korea

</div>

Marion Eggert

Translation, Transcoding, Code Switching: Diglossia in Chosŏn Korean Poetry

Widespread assumptions about the "high" and "low" social status during Chosŏn times of Literary Sinitic on the one hand and the Korean language on the other hand are hard to uphold when we look at poetic genres and their language use, at least up to the 17th century, since a number of "high" poetic genres made use of the vernacular. This essay approaches the complexity of the relationship between these two languages in pre-modern Korean poetry by taking a closer look at their linguistic interpenetrations: renderings of Chinese poems in Korean verse as well as the other way around (A), and the use of language materials or registers of one of the two languages in poetic works composed in the other language (B).

Concerning (A), the essay differentiates between *translation* as a means of making a text available to monolinguals, and *transcoding* as a means to make use of the potentials of the codes as such (i.e. the "source language"/"target language" – concepts which can of course become vague in a diglossic/bilingual situation). These potentials certainly include (but are not limited to) the socio-cultural significance of the respective languages, i.e. the (second order) code according to which their use is deciphered; a careful reading of instances of transcoding should therefore be able to give some indication of this code.

At the same time, it needs to be asked to which degree acts of transcoding (and translation) produce, reinforce, change, or break down this (second order) code. In this respect, instances of code switching within a literary work (B) may be enlightening, since they can prepare the ground for, or be a sign of, code merger. From this perspective, the essay tests the hypothesis whether linguistic code merger is accompanied by a tendency towards sharper demarcations between writing systems.

Ross King

Inscriptional repertoires and the problem of intra- vs. interlingual translation in traditional Korea

Modern-day Korean parlance about translation frequently references 'translation into *hangul*', 'translation into Korean letters' or (worse) 'translation into Chinese letters'. Is this yet another instance of clumsy English on the part of Koreans producing such phrases for the consumption of foreigners, combined with the tendency on the part of lay persons to conflate speech and writing? This essay suggests rather that such usage has deep historical

roots and can be found in abundance in traditional Korean contexts, all of which raise important questions about premodern Korean ideologies of language, writing and translation. These in turn beg theoretical questions about the status of language, writing and translation in premodern Korean literary culture, about the relationship between 'Chinese' language and writing and Korean vernacular language and inscription in traditional Korea, and about the vocabulary that we use today to understand and better contextualize and historicize these issues. This essay therefore focuses on conceptualizations of translation in traditional Korea by examining 1) Language and writing/linguistic codes and inscriptional ecologies and 2) Terms for Translation and Types of Translation. It concludes that the premodern Korean inscriptional spectrum was not a simple binary of cosmopolitan orthodox *hanmun* vs. vernacular Korean, but was a range of inscriptional styles that included *Idu* and *kugyŏl*. Moreover, the ways in which texts were inscribed, re-inscribed and transliterated between these different inscriptional styles challenges modern-day notions of 'translation', on the one hand, but also invites an understanding of them as more intra-lingual than inter-lingual: *hanmun* was not a foreign language. Until China and Chinese language(s) and Chinese script were de-centered and Other-ized, these sorts of facile inter-inscriptional flip-flops were all just intra-lingual recastings/regraphicizations/reinscriptions of the same underlying semiotic core, as far as the Koreans of the day were concerned.

<div align="right">**Cultural Area: Japan**</div>

Rebekah Clements

Intralingual translation and the creation of eighteenth century Japanese prose

The Japanese Kokugakusha (or "nativist") Ban Kōkei (1733-1806) is best known for his published collection of biographies of eccentrics, *Kinsei kijinden* (Eccentrics of our times, 1790), which was one of the best-selling books of Japan's late eighteenth century, and for his Japanese-style poetry (waka). Less known, however, is that Kōkei was an ardent proponent of writing what he *called "kunitsu bumi"* (prose in the national style). At a time when most prose writing in Japan used either the medium of written literary Chinese, or a hybridized mixture of Chinese and Japanese elements, Kōkei advocated a move towards a purer Japanese style that drew upon precedents in Japan's literary past while incorporating contemporary linguistic developments. Much like the well-known European example of Cicero, who developed his rhetorical Latin language centuries earlier by translating from classical Greek, the main methodology used by Kōkei (who did not know of Cicero) was translation, or as he called it *"utsushibumi"* ("transferred" or "translated" text). In Kōkei's usage, *utsushibumi* meant two things: intralingual translation between the elegant literary language of the Japanese past and contemporary, everyday Japanese; and interlingual translation between literary Chinese and Japanese. This essay puts Kōkei's efforts at language reform in the context of eighteenth century developments in intralingual translation from classical into vernacular Japanese, and explains the role of translation in his

attempts to develop a "national" language nearly one hundred years before the national language advocacy of the *Genbun itchi* ("Unification of Spoken and Written Japanese") movement of the Meiji period.

Matthew Fraleigh

Intralingual and Interlingual Glossing of Sinitic Poetry in Early Modern Japan

Interlingual approaches of glossing and construing Chinese language texts in accord with the syntax, grammar, and lexicon of the Japanese language were important from the very inception of writing in the archipelago and remained dominant from the tenth century until well into modern times. With the rise of commercial publishing, spread of literacy, and rapid urbanization that characterized Japan's early modern period (1603–1868), interest in engaging with (and producing) Sinitic poetry expanded to an unprecedented extent. Especially from the latter half of the early modern period, Japanese Sinologues such as Ogyū Sorai 荻生徂徠 (1666–1728) began to more explicitly theorize the linguistic issues at stake in various interpretive methodologies and to reflect upon the significance of such key terms as "gloss" 訓 (Jp. *kun*; Ch. *xun*) and "translation" 譯 (Jp. *yaku*; Ch. *yi*). This intellectual ferment prompted scholars to expand the potential of glossing approaches at both the interlingual and intralingual levels. This essay focuses on three Sinitic poetic treatises written in Japan around the turn of the eighteenth century: *Katsugen shiwa* 葛原詩話 (1784) by the Buddhist priest Rikunyo 六如 (1734–1801), *Shishisai shiwa* 孜孜齋詩話 (1800) by the young scholar Nishijima Rankei 西島蘭溪 (1781–1853), and *Yakō shiwa* 夜航詩話 (1816) by the scholar Tsusaka Tōyō 津阪東陽 (1757–1825). It examines the range of interpretive approaches each of these "remarks on poetry" (Jp. *shiwa*, Ch. *shihua*) employs in engaging with Sinitic poetry (including both intralingual and interlingual glossing, as well as practices more explicitly framed as translation) with the goal of identifying what the texts reveal about contemporary Japanese conceptualization of linguistic register in Literary Sinitic.

Jean-Noël Robert

Japanese Buddhist Poetry and Bilingualism

This essay is part of an ongoing research on the relationship between Japanese language Buddhist poetry *(shakkyô-ka* 釈教歌*)* and the Chinese-language Buddhist sources, which can be considered as the original Scriptures from the Japanese point of view, since there was hardly ever a knowledge of Sanskrit among Japanese clerical circles deep enough to give direct access to Indian sources. It uses as a starting point the *waka* poems about the *Lotus Sutra* as a distinctive subgenre of Japanese poetry. They were utilized by the medieval poets, who were generally deeply versed in Buddhist lore, as a means of transposing the Buddhist teachings into Japanese language and of hierarchizing the relationship between Chinese and

Japanese. A consequence of that use was that Buddhist *waka* played an important role in the sacralization of the Japanese language in an epoch when there was no systematic translation of the Buddhist scriptures into Japanese. Thanks to the practice of assimilation of Japanese deities and Buddhist entities as expressed in the formula *honji-suijaku* 本地垂迹 ("Emanations descending from their original basis"), the Japanese language was thus endowed with a double religious value: on the one hand, it was a creation of the Japanese gods, on the other hand, it was precisely for this reason deemed supremely fit for conveying the Indian and Chinese Buddhist teachings as well.

The essay further compares and contrasts Buddhist *waka* poetry, whose most distinctive literary constraint is the use of purely Japanese vocabulary *(yamato-kotoba)* and the prohibition of Chinese vocabulary *(kango),* with another poetic genre, much less successful in the literary history of Japan, the *imayô-uta*, as partially preserved in the *Ryôjin-hishô* 梁塵秘抄 (end of the twelfth century), certainly more popular at that time, which made free use of Chinese vocabulary and was in that more similar to the Korean *sijo* 時調 poetry.

<div align="right">**Cultural Area: Vietnam**</div>

John D. Phan

Aestheticizing the Vernacular in early modern Sino-Vietnamese translation

As in other parts of East Asia, Literary Chinese predominated both documentarian and imaginative expression for most of Vietnam's history as an independent polity. Examples of vernacular (i.e. Vietnamese-language) writing date to the early 2nd millennium (following indepedence from the crumbling Tang Dynasty), but early examples are restricted mostly to Buddhist proselytization, and occasional literati whimsy. The vernacular was not treated with any seriousness by the literati community until the 15th century, when notable Lê 黎 Dynasty statesman, Nguyễn Trãi 阮廌 (1380-1442), produced a sizeable body of poems written in Vietnamese (and using the now moribund script called "Chữ Nôm" 字喃). This early flash of brilliance in vernacular poetry, while greatly influential, soon faded away before a classical educational system reinvigorated by Neo-Confucianism.

Vernacular writing would only gain steady momentum following a crisis in that classical education system, brought on by a series of clan wars spanning the 16th-17th centuries. Starting in the mid 17th century with the printing of an influential Sino-Vietnamese dictionary entitled *Explication of the Guide to Jeweled Sounds* 指南玉音解義 (Viet. *Chỉ nam ngọc âm giải nghĩa*), Vietnamese authors began to take an interest in the translation of Literary Chinese compositions (both imported and authored regionally) into vernacular Vietnamese. The *Explication* itself is built on the elaboration of Literary Chinese definitions, into versified couplets for each term. This practice of elaborating an original Literary Chinese text into the vernacular also constituted an exploration of the literary

boundaries of the Vietnamese language—an excavation, probing, and ultimately, an expansion of the limits of the vernacular to express literary, intellectual, ethical, and philosophical content as dictated by the Literary Chinese original. Such experiments in translation, in turn, paved the way for a renaissance of vernacular literary expression, over the 18th-19th centuries.

<div align="right">**Cultural Area: Central Asian/Altaic Spheres**</div>

Funada Yoshiyuki

Did Mongolian Language Affect Chinese Language? Focusing on the "Literal Translation Style" Used in Translating Mongolian Documents into Chinese under Mongol Rule

This essay examines the influence of Mongolian language over spoken Chinese, focusing on the question of the so-called "literal translation style" (*Zhiyiti*)—i.e. a style of Chinese language metaphrased from Mongolian. The emergence of this style was epoch-making in that state power created, on its own initiative, a particular style of translation, and required that officials use it in translating Mongolian official documents, including edicts, into Chinese. The *Zhiyiti* was a type of "contact language," or Mongolic Chinese, based on Chinese vocabulary and Mongolian syntactic structures.

The starting point of this analysis is the fact that you can find some common linguistic elements between the language of official documents written in *Zhiyiti* and that of the *Laoqida (Nogeoldae)*, one of the oldest Chinese language textbooks originally published during the Mongol period. This essay proves, firstly, that the *Laoqida* was not metaphrased from Mongolian. Then, it proceeds to analyze highlight why the linguistic elements of *Zhiyiti* are found even in the materials which were written without the use of the *Zhiyiti* style. Although *Zhiyiti* was a linguistic style chiefly meant for the purpose of translation, the documents produced in *Zhiyiti* were also read out aloud on various occasions so that people listened to the sounds of the *Zhiyiti*. It was through this process that the sounds of *Zhiyiti* came to affect the colloquial or spoken Chinese language.

It is noteworthy that state policy contributed, in this way, to the transformation of a language, even if in a limited degree. This is an interesting case, which might stimulate the further development of sociolinguistic history.

Imre Galambos

Manuscripts of Chinese educational texts among China's north-western neighbours

With the spread of Buddhism in East and Central Asia, the region developed a cultural and literary tradition, parts of which transcended political and linguistic boundaries. Within this common heritage, the Chinese influence was particularly strong, and Chinese Buddhist literature commonly circulated beyond the frontier. Although most of this shared culture

was Buddhist in content, there were also many other types of texts that found their way across the borders, including the classics, histories, dictionaries, military treatises or medical literature. One of the most interesting types of texts in this context are primers and other educational texts, which had typically been compiled in their original environment for the sake of teaching literacy skills and conveying basic cultural knowledge to children living in China proper. Some merely consisted of lists of characters so that children would learn how to write the most common ones, others also included didactic knowledge designed to educate in fundamental cultural values. Ironically, the earliest surviving copies of many of these texts—and, in fact, at times the only copies—come from sites that once belonged to China's neighbours. Of these Korea and especially Japan are probably the riches sources for such material. Yet in this paper I am primarily interested in manuscripts preserved beyond the north-western frontier, most importantly among the Uighurs, Tibetan and Tanguts. In these cultures, Chinese primers circulated both in their original language and in translation, which means that even decidedly culture-specific information could be used for teaching literacy skills in another language. Taken together, the rich body of Chinese educational material preserved in Central Asian languages demonstrates the enormous prestige of Chinese written culture along the Silk Road.

Pierre Marsone

Written and Oral Language in the *Memorandum on the Matrimonial Unions of the Great King* (*Dawang ji jieqin shi* 大王記結親事)

The document that we propose to study is unique, and almost improbable, in the history of Chinese epigraphy. It is a stele that was unearthed in 1974 in the township of Cunjin'gouxiang, near to Ningchengxian in Inner Mongolia. The stele was found at the heart of the territory of the Xi 奚, a people who were closely related to the Khitan, and who we know to have been governed by a Great King (Dawang). They were speakers of an Altaic language, and few of them indeed would have spoken, let alone read, Chinese.

However, probably at the demand of the king himself, the Xi inscribed a stone of 1 x 0.35m that is original in multiple ways. First, it is inscribed not only on the front and back but also on its two sides. Then, it is not written from right to left like an ordinary Chinese inscription, but its columns are to be read from left to right. A third major originality of the stele is the language it employs. In contrast with the vast majority of Chinese steles, the text contains no poetic forms and no moral or philosophical considerations. It is a listing of the hundreds of sheep, horses, and cattle exchanged during the conclusion of marriages, and also a clear mention of the application of the law of sororate that the Khitan abolished only in 940. If it would be difficult to speak of 'Classical Chinese', the stele could be considered as being globally composed in 'the written language', *shumianyu* 書面語; yet it is scattered with expressions drawn from the spoken language or from dialect, which constitutes a supplementary originality.

This document of considerable ethnological value is extremely difficult to translate precisely. This essay identifies and assembles its vernacular expressions in order to analyse as closely as possible the mixing of written and oral language that it contains and the reasons that could have led to the use of such an unexpected register of language in the epigraphy of the edges of the sinicized world at the beginning of the tenth century.