Formations of World Literature(s) and Shaw's
The Man of Destiny in Chinese and Japanese Translation

Shunqing CAO
Beijing Normal University & Sichuan University
shunqingcao@163.com

Xin CHEN
Beijing Normal University
myeighth@qq.com

Abstract: In "Formations of World Literature(s) and Shaw's *The Man of Destiny* in Chinese and Japanese Translation" Shunqing Cao and Xin Chen expand Franco Moretti's dictum that "world literature is not an object, it's a problem" to elaborate that the concept of world literature(s) is in some sense a problematic one, which is itself under a process of problematization. Cao and Chen discuss how variation and heterogeneity contribute to a more in-depth understanding of formations of world literature(s). Taking the Bernar Shaw's *The Man of Destiny* they discuss the writer's presence in world literature from a bi-lateral perspective: Shaw's work in the English-speaking West and Shaw in Asia. For the former, Shaw stands in a specific place in recent postcolonial Irish Studies and thus raise problems for their research paradigm. For the latter, Cao and Chen present an analytical comparison between a Chinese and a Japanese translation of *The Man of Destiny*. Cao and Chen argue that by such a bilateral approach we may recognize the importance of heterogeneity so as to obtain further reflections on present discussions of world literature(s).
Key Words: World Literature(s); Bernard Shaw; Irish Studies; Heterogeneity

THE "PROBLEM" OF WORLD LITERATURE

In Franco Morreti's conjecture, world literature is a kind of "problem" that "asks for a new critical method" (55). However, we see a far more complicated problematization of this concept in the last few decades than merely on a methodological level. In the heated debates of this newly revived concept first coined by Goethe in 1827 (*Weltliteratur*), we may distinguish two major trends: a hermeneutic capture and a critical cartography. The latter term is inspired by Pheng Cheah from his 2015 book *What is a World?*: *On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. In Cheah's analysis, it refers to studies based on a constellation of economic-socio-cultural scholarship and criticism on global market and international

center-peripheral hierarchies in the intellectual and literary world. Although he singularizes himself from this series of research, regarding them to misread "world" as a spatial category rather than a temporal one, we agree with his discernment to limitedness of spatial criticism, but we think his illustration of "world" still possesses a certain one-ness or homogeneity between the "world" and "literature" which in our view should otherwise be treated with a complex operation between homogeneity and heterogeneity.

The hermeneutic understanding of world literature(s) is concerning how we read it, or more specifically, how world literature(s) can be constructed as a "reading." The two perhaps most influential projects to deal with this are by Franco Moretti and David Damrosch. For Morreti, the challenge we face is that our traditional close reading is hardly competent to cope with the ocean of texts and thus we should apply "distant reading" which will certainly entail some loss. Compared to Morreti's focus on the necessary "less is more" of approach to reading, Damrosch is involved in how we can obtain "more" from an "elliptical" reading. In his light, world literature is "a mode of circulation and of reading" (5) the double process of which suggests Damrosch's ambition to internalize every individual piece to the genesis of world literature. Different, although not polarized, emphases on loss or gain picture world literature as a phenomenological world-constituting process. The shape of world literature(s) hinges on its given-ness (what should or should not be given to the manifestation/characterization of world literature). On the other hand, the cartographical approaches usually have a theoretical horizon based on Marxism, world-system theory, postcolonial socio-cultural criticism and so forth. Compared to the hermeneutic route whose emphasis is world literature in its "given-ness," the critical perspectives underline world literature in its "becoming." Frequently cited theorists like Pascale Casanova often make assumptions revolving around a center-peripheral or power-powerless topology. Although geographic terms like cartography or mapping may suggest a static and spatialized connotation, this kind of metaphor indicates a relation network among different texts. As Casanova argues, "Understanding a work of literature is a matter … of looking at the carpet as a whole" (3). This intertextual wholeness foregrounds a place where it witnesses unbalanced or unsymmetrical productions and communications of literary texts and practices. For

scholars of thus persuasion, becoming is something that without being structured can hardly be grasped as a feasible research object. The world is both a place and a force for literature, but scarcely vice versa.

The two trends, if carefully examined, are not in themselves sufficiently evident and coherent. On the contrary, their solutions seem to belong to a larger process of problematization concerning world literature. The biggest problem of the first solution lies in Moretti's paradoxical division between world literature as an object and as a problem. Ironically, his method, as well as that of Damrosch's, to regard world literature as a "problem" re-creates another "object." What differentiates their attitudes is just how they treat "first-hand" materials of world literature. They still maintain a hierarchical order between the primary and the secondary, although presented in the reverse among various sorts of texts. This hierarchy is phenomenologically a first-person vision in which our viewpoints never change. The fact that they fail to posit a critical gesture toward scholars as agents and participants makes world literature a problematic one. They attempt to establish consistency in our action to "study" world literature, whereas they fall short of realizing that world literature is much broader than a reading of "worldwide" literature. Nonetheless, for them, to be problematic is at the same time to be solvable so that world literature, or precisely, the literary "world" can renovate through the all-embracing power of reading, of a hermeneutic circulation. But here reading is not solely a self-provoking faculty of our literary experience and world literature is far beyond a literary world. Moretti and Damrosch neglect that such reading is also an object for them: their reading occurs "outside" actual literary reception. And conclusively, they made a separation and an integration without consciously knowing them: the separation concerning separation between literary (primary) texts and critical (secondary) texts and the integration of a world constituent (literary materials) and a world constitution (reading those materials). They divide world literature, but subconsciously disguise it under a "whole" and they problematize world literature by not showing that there is a problem in it.

And similarly, critical cartography also delineates a becoming "outside" world literature. As Cheah points out, "cartography reduces the world to a spatial object" (8) while Moretti and Damrosch problematize world literature by showing that there is just "one" problem, namely the problem between a world (or worlds) and a literature (or literatures). Cheah

elaborates the divergence between "the global" (a spatial mapping) and the "world" (a temporal force) and recent studies about world literature(s) present weakness in answering two questions: "first, the question 'what is a world' … second, literature's causality in relation to the world" (Cheah 37). But we should notice that even Cheah's temporalizing world is still trapped into the problem we mention above, namely trying to propose just "one" solution to suture the disparity between the world and literature. Cheah does not discern that "world" and "literature" cannot be simply constructed into an integral whole, because world literature actually descends from two kinds of discourses: the discourse of the world and the discourse of literature. When combining two discourses together, we need to know that we cannot reduce the combination to a merely causal relationship or self-determining factor. Although Cheah claims that his "literary worldly causality" is not a traditional one, we shall say the problem, still, lies elsewhere. Recent theories on world literature(s) keeps a watchful eye on a universalized description of world formation and globalization. A large majority of them reach a consensus that it is a necessary cultural stance for us to preserve the plurality/diversity/minority of literatures in different cultural backdrops. But the main problem would be a misguiding essentialism that "if" we are able to protect the world, "then" we may protect our literature. Actually, in our opinion, the most dominant challenge these critical theorists may face would not be their surrender of literary creativity. They realize that literary creativity lies in its interaction with the world in which it flows. But unfortunately, this creativity is mistreated, for neither the world nor creativity is something we could plan or take single measure to "protect." In other words, problems do not come alone, and the "if/then" structure we pre-assume is inherent of world literature itself is thus for one thing a problematic assumption and for another a dynamic part in the larger processes of problematization.

Upon reflections on said two trends, we need to look back to the question we put forward at the beginning of our discussion, namely the "problem" of world literature. Indeed, we cannot simply say world literature "is" a problem, for which we would better say "there are" problems in world literature(s). Problems differ from a propositional statement "world literature is A, B, C..." and is an inconsistent existence inside the consistent being of world literature. Gilles Deleuze contends

that "sense or the problem is extra-propositional" (157). For Deleuze, problems are not readily given, are not predestined for a solution whose result is simply true or false. In contrast, there are the problems which determine and limit a solution. Problems have their own limits, which Deleuze terms as "singularity" and an event, another significant Deleuze's concept, is "by itself problematic and problematization" (54; Deleuze uses the term "singularity" in a mathematical sense: singularity in mathematics refers to a point at which a mathematical object cannot be well-defined or analyzed and this point, in Deleuze's use, is where a problem obtains its determined condition). Hence, Deleuze theorizes problem and problematization as a mode of becoming, as a mode before any individualization or representation of truth, language, and being. So, if we accept Deleuze's notion, we should ask what is exactly the problem itself instead of an answer of world literature, which must undergo a certain process of becoming and contain an event, namely "something that happened" before it is determined as a concept. Concepts "are connected to problems without which they would have no meaning" (Deleuze and Guattari 16). And here we could draw a transitional conclusion: why solutions proposed by Moretti, Damrosch, Casanova, Cheah, etc. in addressing the non-definity of world literature(s) are in themselves problematic, this is for two reasons. First, they pay little attention to the importance of a consciousness that a problem does not deteriorate, but determines what world literature(s) should be. And second, their own schemes and solutions are inclusively the very parts of the problematization of world literature(s) and their attempts in one way delineate the problems that determine their interpretations. And we argue below a new way to enter the concept of world literature(s), a mutually indispensable experience of "encounters" and "engagements" by exemplifying some critical issues of recent Bernard Shaw studies and its neglected global traffic.

ENCOUNTERS, ENGAGEMENTS, AND POSTCOLONIAL SHAW

In our discussion Shaw's text serves as a "junctional" site where several problematic branches overlap, including Shaw himself, postcolonial studies, Irish literature, and world literature(s). Notably, Shaw seems to

pose a "threat" to some established postcolonial research on Irish literature or literary Irish-ness, an embodying "spectacle" of twenty-first century world literature. Here we intentionally use "spectacle" rather than "type" since we think world literature(s) do/does not have a type and because some of recent postcolonial Irish scholars are in some manner corresponding to Guy Debord's notion of "spectacles." For Debord, in the society of the spectacle "the commodity contemplates itself in a world of its own making" (34) and there are two kinds spectacles: the concentrated form which "characterizes bureaucratic capitalism" (41) and the diffuse form which "is associated with the abundance of commodities" (42). As to Irish literary studies (and broader Irish Studies), it undergoes a similar "self-making" process, both concentrated/bureaucratic and diffuse/abundant. This process is an agenda "to go beyond" postcolonial theories. On the one hand, with the expansion of global market and demand of a new cultural milieu, this "go beyond" involves a re-coordination of Irish literature in international spaces. On the other hand, in Irish Studies, it remains unresolved to reach consensus especially as to research about "postcoloniality" (see, e.g., Harte and Whelan). Postcolonial criticism becomes a dominant "center" in Irish Studies, while "marginalised several other important fields of inquiry and paradigms in Irish Studies" (Connolly 140) and shared values found in "agents of state" and the "self-proclaimed agents of critical culture" thus arouse alertness and caution among some scholars (see, e.g., Wilson). Some scholars thus propose "a subjective, yet self-reflexive, reading of Irish postcolonial studies" (Flannery 240). This concentrated/diffuse system is to some extent similar to the hermeneutic/critical understanding of world literature. On the one hand, there is an attempt to form an institutionalized postcolonial "worldview" and on the other a critical re-evaluation is also involved in its knowledge production. They are spectacles because a majority of them tend to "determine" the problems rather than come back to the problems that determine.

In postcolonial Irish Studies, so-called "Irishness" means a conjunction of different discourses, but Shaw's work is seldom mentioned. As Victor Merriman argues "*Beyond Boundaries* is a lively, comprehensive, and interesting collection of fourteen essays, in which -- strikingly, for our purposes -- there is not one reference to Shaw's work" (217). In Merriman's opinion, several factors may contribute to the reluctance to

include Shaw's Irish influence, like "homelessness" in his plays or his controversial interest in fascist and totalitarian regimes. After being raised in Ireland, Shaw lived most of his life in London and interestingly, during his lifetime, he wrote one full-length play set in Ireland, *The John Bull's Other Island*. Shaw's Fabianism and internationalism and his uneasy criticism of Yeats's or Irish nationalists's texts may further lead to his marginalization in Irish scholarship. It is in the last decade that scholars developed a more in-depth sight on Shaw's Irish aspects. As Peter Gahan argues, "Shaw may now be easier to read as belonging to one or more strands of various Irish literary traditions" (7) and David Clare attributes Shaw's "lasting contributions to modern thought" to his facilitating to "make reverse snobbery" (7) which originates from his pride in matters Irish. With the re-discovery of an Irish Shaw, these scholars have noticed Shaw's role to re-investigate the former paradigm of Irish postcolonial studies: "Recentering Shaw's work, and his sharp, utopian, critical stance … may enable … to go beyond … inherited disciplinary boundaries" (Merriman 231).

Edward W. Said is known for his notion of "worldliness" and is regarded as the originator of the notion of "worlding" (see, e.g., D'haen 7). In *The World, the Text and the Critic*, Said asserts that "texts have ways of existing … they are in the world and hence worldly" (35) and texts are not divine intervention; rather, the Word enters human history continually during and as a part of history" (37). The actual situation of a text is not something mysterious inside or something external to textual existence, but "exists at the same level of surface particularity as the textual object itself" (Said 39). The surface particularity will confine not only the texts but also the interpreters and their interpretations. Said incisively reveals that critics and interpreters are inescapably playing a participant role in the world and history formation. Thus, we should be careful to divide between primary (original) and secondary (critical) texts. But Said keeps ambivalent in front of the crossroad of text and world: some texts will have two aspects: insisting on a circumstantial reality and on fulfilling a function, "a meaning in the world" (44). Said makes an effort to bring together the hermeneutic function (to show a world) and critical function (to show that "I have shown a world") of a text. But he depicts texts as belonging to a perfect tense, without regard to a future tense or future perfect tense of these texts. What will happen, what will become of, or, what is the event when texts and world (including the author and critics) come across? And

thus we can turn Said upside down: it is the event itself which bestows upon a universality or infinity upon an author, rather than a ceaseless substitutional reference to an absent author. It is not through writing we "keep" our death as an event. Conversely, it is through death that we realize our writing as an event. Shaw and other authors are at the same level to be a writer and a critic. The event of an author and a critic happens when they express that "I find that I will die … so that …" instead of a "if…then…" structure we find before. The "so that" does not have a predestined condition of "if" for death can never be a condition as such.

What does this new critical stance mean for us? Simply speaking, it is a way of not making a homogeneous whole or process to encompass an event. We should find a way to go "inside" an event to see it happening and communicating with other events, to see the determined conditions of problems. And we can arrive at a significant concept, heterogeneity. Like the yin and yang in Chinese culture, heterogeneity and homogeneity are not binary exclusions of each other. Essentially, they include each other. And this inclusion is not naturally given, it is given along with a happening, namely an event. Hence this event will have two sides: an encounter and an engagement. For heterogeneity and homogeneity, encounters and engagements, they are mutually inside one another. In the event, we not only "come" together but also "care" together, as we all realize a "so that" emerged from the deep of death. It is the ground of an empathy, and also, a ground of translation. Translation cannot be just defined as a maneuver, a motion, or a map from one point to another point, one set to another set. Translation is based on encounters and engagement, rather than a pure result of an information transfer.

HETEROGENEITY, HOMOGENEITY, AND SHAW'S WORK IN TRANSLATION

We present two cases of translation of Shaw's *The Man of Destiny*: a Japanese and a Chinese translation. The text is less frequently produced or studied compared to other Shaw texts such as *Pygmalion*, *Major Barbara*, or *Man and Superman*. Nonetheless, it is hitherto the earliest translation of Shaw's plays to Chinese (1912) and one of the earliest to Japanese (1912). However, the two translations display a contradistinctive style and translating strategy. The comparison between the two texts would thus

give an exemplification of homo/heterogeneity in different cultural backgrounds. But before we further expand our analysis, we should still lay a ground for the key concepts: what is heterogeneity? Perhaps the most important scholar of "heterogeneity" would be Michel Foucault, for whom different discourses are heterogeneous when there are discontinuity and ruptures inside and when they are combined together and "Dialectical logic puts to work contradictory terms within the homogeneous" (42) while a strategic logic seeks to establish a possible connection with heterogeneous terms. Foucault rejected a teleological or ideal narrative of history which "aims at dissolving the singular event into an ideal continuity" (154). For Foucault, a Nietzschean geneology means to "challenge the pursuit of the origin" (142) and its goal is to come back to the body, the "inscribed surface of events" (148) and Foucault calls this genealogical history an "effective history" to delineate different regimes which tear our bodies and events apart: "History becomes 'effective' to the degree that it introduces discontinuity into our very being" (154). But Foucault's approach can cause some problems. As Henri Lefebvre points out, Foucault's theory implies a liquidation of *temps historique* as *temps vécu* and it includes equally a tendency to an abstract scientificity (34). Unlike Said's perfect tense, what Foucault insists on is a kind of *passé simple*, a particular narrative tense in French as Roland Barthes called the *preterite* but unlike Barthes who considers this tense to be "freed from the existential roots of knowledge" (30), Foucault tends to regard those actions to be embedded in a power-knowledge typology. But Foucault's thought is in line with this tense with regard to his suspension of the "narrator" and the "narrated" to highlight events. In Barthes's opinion, this tense serves to remain a hierarchy of facts which is the very target Foucault veighs in on, but Foucault may be trapped into what he condemns, because discontinuity not only subsists in historical distortions of eventual bodies, but also is a part of the event itself. There will be an "ineffective" inside in this effective history, a pre-determinate of an event: only when one perceives the fact that "I will die" and give a name to it, the un-determinate or pre-determinate can thus be determined as an event and this pre-determinate place is where encounters happens and where heterogeneity works. Once an event is determined, then engagement comes into and with it and encounters and engagement are distributed to the opposite side of the "so that." Narration or writing is first and

foremost, beyond "cutting" off our body, an event that is determined by a first cutting, a cutting that we can only recognized but never realized, that is, our death.

Translation is an activity to nominate the pre-determinate or un-determinate as an event. To translate, as an event, is much more than to find a "solution" or mapping. It is purposed to find a problem, to limit how texts from heterogeneous discourses may strategically be mutually indexed, and also to find a subject being conscious of "I will die so that…." Only those who know that they will die can encounter with each other before a textual event happens and only through this encounter that they may engage with one another along with themselves, namely the subjects of this event. Different eventual subjects do not refer to an author-translator dualism. Eventual subjects pre-exist what then be identified as an author or translator, although different agents, like scholars, critics, readers, even those who do not care about may participate in the event of translation. The strategies of translation usually consist of a literal one and a liberal one. In some cultural backgrounds, a dominantly literal or a liberal translation may infer different attitudes toward the events in a translation: "Cultures that are relatively homogeneous tend to see their own way of doing things as naturally" so that Chinese culture in ancient days pays less attention to the "Other" and thus Chinese translations "stay close to the interpretational situation" rather than a "faithful translation" (Lefevere 14-15). But according to Lefevere, "translation activity arose in the West in cultures that were not homogenerous … internally divided by linguistic differences, or certain degrees of bilingualism" (Lefevere 14). Although in Chinese translation history there are indeed disputes as to the choice between the literal or liberal, Lefevere still illustrates a compelling interpreting model for the two strategies. Less heterogeneity in an encounter is often associated with a deeper heterogenization in an engagement of the knowledge production or discursive combination. But when translation is exercised in a heterogeneous context, then an apparently homogeneous product/text may thus be shown. Here we should notice three important points here. First, heterogeneity not only dwells "between" two cultures (in a macro-scope) or two agents (in a micro-scope), like a Chinese one and a Western one, but heterogeneity is inside themselves (for example, as Shaw himself to Western literature). It is not after we "compare" two things that we assign heterogeneity. It is for

their heterogeneity so that they are comparable to each other and then engender an event. And second, heterogeneity and homogeneity are mutually including and distributed so that they are accompanied by different encounters and engagements. And finally, the categorical biformity of heterogeneity/homogeneity and encounters/engagements are not double, but multiple: diversified individuals, groups, occasions, acquisitions, intentions, accidents will all take a part and play their role.

The situation changed since the nineteenth century when East Asia was colonized and Western thought became a political and cultural "objective" to follow and to adopt. In this case, a literal translation usually suggests an institutionalization of bringing various discourses together, while a liberal one is an evasion of this process. Many scholars pay less attention to a literal translation because they are apt to consider literality as noncreative, which may shadow the translator's autonomy or his/her cultural inheritance and cultural background. But in our opinion this is a biased view because a homogeneous translation is usually circumscribed by heterogeneous pretexts. Homogeneous engagements co-occur with heterogeneous encounters, which results in a seemingly paradoxical conclusion that a literal translation may be the "farthest" rather than the closest text to the original one, for between two texts there can emerge a large amount of intermediate and heterogeneous pre-texts. And in our case, a typical heterogeneous pre-text is the short introduction to the Japanese translation of *The Man of Destiny* 運命の人 by Kusuyama Masao (楠山正雄). As Kusuyama states, the first performance of this play by The Society of Literature and Art (文藝協会) "made most of audience seem to understand but on the other hand seem unable to conceive and finally left with an inched face (1). Kusuyama implicates the reason should be Shaw's lacking "drop" (下げ), a Japanese theatrical concept which refers to a kind of burlesque or hilarious materials at the end of a story or performance (2). This theatrical concept belongs to a traditional aesthetic discourse as 落語 (Rakugo) and Kusuyama is aware of the contradiction between traditional and imported aesthetics, as well as raising an awareness of which he aestheticizes this kind of contradiction. He thinks what distinguishes Shaw from other playwrights is his emphasis on an "instant mood" 刹那の気分 and "the spiritual struggle of an extraordinary human being" (2).

Shaw's belief in "life force" in some way forms an appropriate metaphor for Kusuyama and the Society of Literature and Art managed by Tsubouchi Syouyou (坪内逍遥). Kusuyama's aestheticization of contradiction is perhaps shadowed by his teacher Tsubouchi. Tsubouuchi sometimes remain deliberately uncertain and ambivalent in the establishing principles of the Society. He pours his efforts in finding an equilibrium point between three different and even exclusive artistic doctrines: a utilitarianism (for earning profit), an art-for-art pursuit and a pedagogical end of art. Tsubouchi does not denounce the demand of an actor or playwright to regard theater as a "job," but he thinks that his colleagues should aim at a higher fulfillment to go "up." And his reconciliation made between an art-for-art'ssake and art-for-society-and-cultivation is a frequently used discursive strategy not only in Japan, but also East Asian circles to stress that two opposite doctrines do not essentially contradict. They can both be borrowed to "bring up aesthetic sense of our generation by the power of art, and by virtue of this to aim at the sublimation of our life" (Tsubouchi 270). Shaw's life force thus provides a homogenizing metaphor, a "going-up" to theoretically "overcome" heterogeneous discourses not only from Japanese and Western literary thought, but the heterogeneity in Western literature itself: naturalism, realism, idealism, and romanticism. And this homogenizing process occured in a much broader epochal and local background: two years before the premiere of *The Man of Destiny* in Japan in 1910 (Meiji 43rd year) is considered as the "first year" of Shaw's works in Japan. (Ooura 60) According to Ryuuichi Ooura, the first completed translation of Shaw's play is *The Philanderer* by the Japanese philosopher Wajji Terrou (和辻哲郎), but the first performed script in Japanese is *The Shewing-Up of Blanco Posnet* (馬盗坊) by the Japanese writer Mori Ougai (森鴎外). Although Mori's is a translation from German, his involvement with Shaw's introduction in Japan is significant at a time of the transformation of Japanese theaters including the reorganization of The Society of Literature and Art, the foundation of the Theatrical Research Institute (演劇研究所), and the Japanese Théâtre Libre (自由劇場) launched by Osanai Kaoru (小山内薫). With the arrival of New Drama (新劇), as stated in the preface of *The Man of Destiny*, the center of Japanese literary circles shifted from novels to drama. The institutionalized process delineates a discontinuity of the drastic transformation of professional theaters. On

the other hand, numerous scholars and writers shared this aestheticization of "contradiction." As Iwasa Soushirou (岩佐壮四郎) points out, Shaw has been received in two aspects: one is Shaw as an icon of being an iconoclast opposed to the propagation of Bushido or Japanese chauvinism after the victory of Russo-Japanese war (221) and the second is Shaw as a great observer who diagnose those "heroes" or "saints" from their profile as common people (Iwasa 222).

Contrary to Shaw's reception in Japan characterized by a homogenization of contradiction and close to elitist literary taste, Shaw's Chinese debut seems to be more proximate to pop culture which stresses more on "stay the same" which does not mean to keep a kind of homogeneity; rather, what the text preserves is a status quo of heterogeneity, a bizarre and mosaic hybrid of different discourses and languages. This translation is published serially on the issue 16, 19, and 22 of *Novel Times* (in 1912, 1913, and 1914). Generally, we can classify three dimensions of discontinuity and heterogeneity from this text. The first one is a particular and transitional language style located in the spectrum from vernacular Chinese (白话) to classic Chinese (文言). At that time, with Liang Qichao's call upon the Revolution in Novels and Dramas, new forms of vernacular literature were on their way to substitute traditional classic literature, which, however, underwent painful and even traumatic transformation to produce a strange misplacement: "old" language to translate "new" literature. Second, the narrative is blended not with traditional Chinese and modern Western drama, but also with what can be called a biographical and romantic story-telling narrative borrowed from popular texts. These phenomena indicate the multiplicity and hybridity of this newly emergent literary form in China and its dispersion in other genres and discourses. Biographies, Western novels and Western plays are in such a relationship where typical encounters and engagement works -- they are mutually inclusive. And finally, the attitude toward Napoleon is heterogeneous. On the one hand, this play alters a considerable proportion of ironies on Napoleon than the original, partly by changing these ironies into a defense, partly by erasing some negative information (like Napoleon's using his wife to seduce the Directory), and on the other hand, sarcasms on Napoleon's disturbed mind before the lady spy are penetrative through lines at times. All the three factors result in a kind of openness to various heterogeneities of different discourses. To keep its

heterogeneity is in a way to eschew a homogenization which is at its edge. So here, what matters is not Shaw as a whole, as an integrity, as the totalization of his works and anecdotes, for who is known is Napoleon instead of Shaw in 1912 Republic of China. It is a translation "floats" into a new cultural circumstances.

CONCLUSION

The seemingly far-flung representation of Shaw and his text's translation to Chinese and Japanese reflects our primary theme: an awareness of the complex relationship between heterogeneity and homogeneity dispersed within events and that involves a strategic and subjective operation of encounters and engagements. This consciousness ushers in a new way of looking at world literature(s). We thus need to make manifest a situation wherein our own writings, criticisms, texts, as well as our participations will finally come to an end that can never be reached. To understand and engage with world literature(s) is important research, a translation and above all an event that in turn demands us to return to the strategy and subject in the act of combining world and literature together, wherein we are just the very part rather than keeping outside as a hermeneutic or critical agent. At the end of *The Man of Destiny*, the burning of the letter symbolizes two things. One is the defeat of Napoleon and the other is the loss of meaning, namely the content of the letter as a symbol of literature. The letter in Shaw's play is thus the embodiment of a strategic and subjective combination of "world" and "literature." Finally, there is no ruling or protecting the world and no affirmed or negated meaning. What is left here is merely an unsolved problem, which determines the whole play, the whole event where encounter and engage all the character's wisdom, courage, calculation, pretention, excitement, awe, thrill, irony, and their overall energies to try to give it a name.

Works Cited

Barthes, Roland. *Writing Degree Zero*. Trans. Annette Lavers and Colin Smith. New York: Macmillan, 1968.

Casanova, Pascale. *The World Republic of Letters*. Trans. M.B. DeBevoise. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 2007.

Cheah, Pheng. *What is a World?: On Postcolonial Literature as World Literature*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2015.

Clare, David. *Bernard Shaw's Irish Outlook*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016.

Connolly, Linda. "The Limits of 'Irish Studies': Historicism, Culturalism, Paternalism." Irish Studies Review 12.2 (2004): 139-62.

Damrosch, David. *What is World Literature?* Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2003.

Debord, Guy. *Society of the Spectacle*. 1967. Trans. Donald Nicholson-Smith. New York: Zone Books, 1995.

Deleuze, Gilles, and Félix Guattari. *What is Philosophy?* Trans. Hugh Tomlinson and Graham Burchell. New York: Columbia University Press, 1994.

Deleuze, Gilles. *The Logic of Sense*. Trans. Mark Lester. Ed. Constantin V. Boundas. New York: Columbia University Press, 1990.

D'haen, Theo. "Worlding World Literature." *Recherches littéraires/Literary Research* 32 (2016): 7-23.

Flannery, Eóin. *Ireland and Postcolonial Studies: Theory, Discourse, Utopia*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.

Foucault, Michel. *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978-1979*. Trans. Arnold I. Davidson and Graham Burchell. New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008.

Gahan, Peter. "Bernard Shaw and the Irish Literary Tradition." *Shaw: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* 30.1 (2010): 1-26.

Iwasa, Soushirou (岩佐壮四郎). "GBSの影" ("Under the Influence of George Bernard Shaw"). *The Memoirs of Kanto Gakuin* 105 (2005): 212-34.

Lefebvre, Henri. *Espace et politique. Le Droit à la ville II*. Paris: Anthropos, 2000.

Lefevere, André. "Chinese and Western thinking on Chinese Translation." *Constructing Cultures: Essays on Literary Translation*. By Susan Bassnett and André Lefevere. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 1998. 12-24.

Merriman, Victor. "Bernard Shaw in Contemporary Irish Studies: Passé and Contemptible?" *Shaw: The Annual of Bernard Shaw Studies* 30.1 (2010): 216-35.

Moretti, Franco." Conjectures on World Literature." *New Left Review* 1 (2000): 54-68.

Ooura, Ryuuichi (大浦龍一). "日本演劇におけるバーナード・ショー元年" ("The First Year of Bernard Shaw in Japanese Theatre"). *Bernard Shaw Studies* 13 (2013): 45-64.

Said, Edward W. *The World, the Text and the Critic*. London: Faber, 1984.

Shaw, Bernard. *The Man of Destiny. Bernard Shaw: Collected Plays with Their Prefaces*. Ed. Dan H. Laurence. London: Dodd, Mead, 1975.

Shaw, Bernard, Jinghan Chen, and Lady Green. "脚本名译拿破仑" (A Translation of a Famous Play: Napoleon). Novel Times 1914: 1-35.

Shaw, Bernard. 運命の人 (*The Man of Destiny*). Trans. 楠山正雄 (Kusuyama Masao). Tokyo: Gendaisya, 1912.

Tsubouchi, Syouyou. 教化と演劇 (Cultivation and Theater). Tokyo: Tokyo Syoubunkan, 1915.

Wilson, Mick. "Terms of Art and Tricks of Trade." *Third Text* 19.5 (2005): 535-43.

Author's profiles:

Shunqing Cao teaches comparative literature and literary theory at Sichuan University and Beijing Normal University. His interests in scholarship include classic Chinese literature theory, comparative literature, comparative poetics, and world literature(s). In addition to numerous articles and books in Chinese and English, his recent book publications include *The Variation Theory of Comparative Literature* (2013) and the edited volume 中外文论史 (History of Chinese and Western Literary Theory) (2012). Contact: <shunqingcao@163.com>

Xin Chen is a PhD candidate in comparative literature at Beijing Normal University where is completing his dissertation about Bernard Shaw scholarship in the English-speaking world. His recent publications include "Alai's Reception in the English-speaking World," *Comparative Literature & World Literature* (2018). Contact: <myeighth@qq.com>