

SUBJECTIVITY OF TRANSLATORS: COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TRANSLATIONS OF ZHUANGZI BY JAMES LEGGE AND ZHAO YANCHUN

Zhang Yihan¹ and Hua Jing²

¹Zhang Yihan, first author, BA student of School of foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, China

²Hua Jing, corresponding author, Associate Professor of School of foreign Languages, East China University of Science and Technology, Shanghai, China

<https://doi.org/10.59009/ijllc.2025.0139>

Received Date: 21 July 2025 / Published Date: 27 August 2025

ABSTRACT

Through a comparative analysis of James Legge's and Zhao Yanchun's English translations of Zhuangzi, this study explores the manifold embodiments of the translator's subjectivity in cross-cultural translation and the impact of such embodiments on the dissemination of philosophical ideas. Focusing on the linguistic and ideological dimensions, the study combines comparative and case study analyses to reveal the differences in the strategies of the two translators in terms of lexical choice, syntactic reconstruction, and philosophical interpretation. The differences between the two stem from individual linguistic ability, the context of the times, and the purpose of translation--Legge's translation served the establishment of Western missions in the nineteenth century, while Zhao Yanchun stood in the context of globalization and promoted dialogue between cultures. This study provides a new perspective on translation theory, reveals the paradigm shift from "knowledge introduction" to "value regeneration" in the translation of Chinese classics, and emphasizes the key role of translator's subjectivity in translation.

Keywords: Subjectivity of Translators; Zhuangzi; Sir Lush; Zhao Yanchun; James Legge; Philosophical Interpretation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Zhuangzi, a masterpiece of Taoism written by Zhuangzi (trad. 369-286 BCE) and his disciples in the mid-to-late Warring States period, focuses on critical philosophy, artistic concepts of Zhuangzi, covering a wide range of fields, including philosophy, life, politics, and society.

Zhuangzi's writings are celebrated for their fantastical imagination and ingenious conception, showing the artistic style of Romanticism, which can be regarded as a model of the prose of the pre-Qin scholars. His approach to writing, which uses spontaneous remarks to elaborate, emphasizes truth through repetition, and conveys broader meanings through fables, gives his works a unique style that is grand, magnificent, unrestrained, and unconventional (Shi, 2022). While his words may appear unrestrained and boundless, they are, in fact, deeply rooted and well-founded, often citing historical records to support his arguments and reasoning.

The *Zhuangzi* is not only a classic of philosophy but also an allegorical masterpiece in the realms of literature and aesthetics, which has an indelible and profound influence on the development of Chinese literature and aesthetics. As a representative work of Chinese philosophy, it holds a significant position in the history of Chinese philosophy and has had a far-reaching impact on various fields such as philosophy, literature, and art in many countries.

around the world. This has preserved and promoted the excellent traditions of Chinese culture and, in turn, uplifted the spirit of the Chinese nation.

Since the English scholar Frederic H. Balfour first translated and published *Zhuangzi* in 1881, many scholars at home and abroad have devoted themselves to the study and English translation of Zhuangzi's doctrines in more than a hundred years (Liu, 2012). Based on the translations of their predecessors and combining their own understandings, they have continuously introduced new ideas and formed a variety of versions of the English translation of *Zhuangzi*. These versions have played an immeasurable role in spreading Chinese traditional culture.

By comparing and analyzing these translations, we can not only summarize the valuable experience of translating traditional Chinese cultural texts, but also provide strong support for better dissemination of Chinese culture to foreign countries. However, due to the different focus, academic background, translation level, and understanding of the original work of each translator, these translations present different characteristics in terms of faithfulness to the original work, conveying cultural connotations, and linguistic expressions, etc. This is precisely why countless scholars have devoted themselves to studying the English translation of *Zhuangzi*.

Domestic research on the English translation of *Zhuangzi* started in 1998, and has formed a multi-dimensional research system after more than twenty years of development. The number of literatures shows a fluctuating upward trend, and the existing 141 research results cover the five major fields of comparative translation (Wu, 2022), theoretical application (Chen, 2024), strategy and method (Guo, 2019), translator's subjectivity (Yaolu Zhang, 2024; Yuhang Song, 2023) and reader's acceptance (Wu & Yao, 2024). Among them, the research on translation strategy takes up the heaviest proportion, involving the in-depth analysis of macro strategies such as naturalization and alienation (Li, 2021), and micro skills such as increasing and decreasing translation (Xia & Wu, 2013); translation theory research comes second, focusing on the application of conceptual metaphor (Tang, 2020) and other theories; and the research on translator subjectivity accounts for less than 10%, which still has room for expansion at the level of depth and breadth.

In the study of translators' subjectivity, although the existing results have initially broken through the traditional paradigm of "invisibility of translators" (Xu, 2010), the overall situation is characterized by three aspects: firstly, the number of researches is seriously insufficient; secondly, the research perspectives are relatively limited. Existing literature mostly focuses on the comparison of translators' styles or the translation of core terminology (Xie, 2014), and has not yet formed a systematic analytical framework; thirdly, the exploration of influencing factors is still shallow. Existing research mostly focuses on explicit strategies at the textual level, and there is insufficient correlation research on the deeper motives such as the translators' cultural standpoints and ideologies.

By analyzing and summarizing these research results in depth, we can further improve the quality of the English translation of *Zhuangzi* on the existing basis. This study focuses on the comparative analysis of the translator's subjectivity demonstrated in the translation process, with a view to promoting the comprehensiveness and depth of research in this field. This not only helps to promote the prosperity of the translation discipline in China and improve the overall translation level, but also promotes the international dissemination of Chinese traditional culture. In this process, we should not only respect the philosophical thoughts and cultural connotations of the original works, but also pay attention to the cultural background and acceptance level of the countries where the translations are made, and strive to find the best balance between faithfulness to the original works and closeness to the readers. In this

way, the charm of traditional Chinese culture will be spread more widely, contributing to the exchange and mutual appreciation of world culture.

2. SUBJECTIVITY OF TRANSLATORS

The subjectivity of the translator refers to the translator, as the subject of translation, exerting subjective initiative in the translation process while respecting the translation object to achieve the purpose of translation (Lin, 2021). This theory posits that translators are not passive or mechanical copiers of the source text but actively engage in interpreting, selecting, restructuring, and recreating the text. In doing so, they incorporate their cultural background, personal experiences, and aesthetic preferences. The translator's subjectivity plays a pivotal role in translation, directly influencing the style and quality of the translation through choices in translation strategies and orientation (Lin, 2010).

This study employs comparative and case analysis methods to delve into the translations of James Legge and Zhao Yanchun. Comparative analysis is used to meticulously compare their strategies in vocabulary selection, sentence construction, and the translation of cultural images, exploring the similarities and differences in these strategies and their impact on the overall style of the translation and reader reception. Specifically, the study focuses on how the translators handle culturally charged vocabulary, transform complex sentence structures, and faithfully yet creatively convey the philosophical ideas of the source language into the target language.

The case analysis selects representative translation examples to thoroughly examine the operational mechanisms of translator subjectivity within specific translation contexts. These examples reveal translators' differing choices when encountering language differences and cultural barriers and how these choices shape the final translation.

This study aims to build a comprehensive analytical framework with two dimensions. At the linguistic level, it examines vocabulary and sentence structure in translations to uncover the translator's subjectivity during language transfer. At the ideological level, it evaluates the accuracy of the philosophical ideas conveyed and any ideological changes during translation, revealing how the translator's cultural stance potentially influences the target text.

3. TWO ENGLISH VERSIONS OF *ZHUANGZI*

This study selects two English translations of *Zhuangzi* as case studies: James Legge's *The Writings of Kwang-tsze*, hailed as the "most authoritative complete English translation", and Zhao Yanchun's *Sir Lush*, the most recent complete translation by a Chinese scholar in the 21st century.

James Legge's 19th-century translation of *Zhuangzi*, *The Writings of Kwang Tsze*, is highly regarded for its fidelity to the original text and its rigorous academic annotations. It is considered one of the most authoritative English translations of *Zhuangzi* to date. As a pioneering work in early sinology research, Legge's translation was conducted from the dual perspectives of a missionary and a scholar, blending Western religious and cultural viewpoints with in-depth research on Chinese classics. The translation not only provides a faithful rendering of the text but also includes extensive prefaces, chapter summaries, detailed annotations, eight appendices, and an index of proper nouns (Wen&Gan, 2012). These supplementary materials significantly enhance the translation's academic value, offering valuable insights for subsequent translation efforts and profoundly influencing the Western understanding of *Zhuangzi*.

Zhao Yanchun's translation of 《庄子》, *Sir Lush* in 2019 by Higher Education Publishing House, represents a new translation philosophy. Unlike Legge's detailed annotations, Zhao focuses on poetic language to capture the literary essence of the original text and uses concise annotations to enhance readability. This approach reflects a deep understanding of the source text and a keen awareness of the target language and cultural differences. Zhao's translation retains philosophical depth while emphasizing aesthetic experience, showcasing the proactive efforts of contemporary Chinese scholars to introduce traditional culture to the world.

This comparison of two *Zhuangzi* translations which were separated by 128 years, holds special significance. By analyzing James Legge, a non-native English speaker, and Zhao Yanchun, a native Chinese speaker, it objectively examines the traditional notion that "the target language of translation must be the translator's native language" (Houtao Zhong, 2024). Additionally, these translations reflect the academic shift from Western dominance to Sino-Western dialogue. Comparing their approaches reveals how historical context and cultural identity influence translation strategies and highlights the role of translator subjectivity. Legge's documentary translation and Zhao's innovative interpretation complement each other, offering a multi-dimensional perspective on the complexities of cultural translation.

4. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH VERSIONS AT LEXICAL LEVEL

In the translation of *Zhuangzi*, James Legge and Zhao Yanchun show distinct differences in lexical translation strategies. Legge's practice, influenced by English expression habits, tends to literal translation, aiming for accuracy and objectivity. For terms without direct English equivalents, he uses transliteration with extensive annotations to guide readers in grasping the original meaning, making the text more accessible to Western audiences.

Zhao Yanchun, however, focuses on conveying the cultural essence of the Chinese text while maintaining the aesthetic quality of the translation. He aims to preserve the unique cultural flavor of *Zhuangzi* and strives for formal and content equivalence with the original. This dual pursuit of cultural precision and linguistic beauty leads to his distinctive lexical choices.

The translation of abstract philosophical terms and culturally loaded words in *Zhuangzi* forms the core meaning of the text. The following analysis, through specific examples, explores their different strategies in lexical translation, revealing their cultural considerations and translation philosophies.

Zhuangzi's concept of Dao 道 is a continuation and development of Laozi's Dao. Laozi's Dao emphasizes ontology and cosmology, highlighting its creativity (Dao gives birth to one, one to two, two to three, and three to all things) and the laws of "returning", as well as the characteristics of non-action, Not Engaging in Contention, softness, and humility (Chen, 1987). Zhuangzi's Dao, on the other hand, focuses on the spiritual realm achieved by those who attain it, aiming for a higher state of transcendence. As a philosophical term, Dao is complex and subtle in meaning.

For the core concept of "Dao" in *Zhuangzi*, Legge consistently adopts the transliteration "Tâo" to avoid subjective interpretation, leaving the concept explanation to the readers. This approach requires readers to construct the meaning through the text as a whole, ensuring they hold the understanding initiative without being influenced by the translator's preferences. In contrast, Zhao Yanchun creatively translates it as "the Word", inspired by the classic expression in the Bible's Gospel of John: "In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God. He was with God in the beginning." This suggests that "the

Word” and the Chinese “Dao” both signify the origin of all things. Zhao believes transliteration isn’t always suitable as it may cause a cultural rift between the East and West. Translating “Dao” as “the Word” aims to build a cognitive bridge for cross-cultural understanding by utilizing the religious context familiar to Western readers.

In specific translations, when “Dao” has a subjective behavior (similar to generating action), i.e., when “Dao” has the Power to create all things (Xiao Chen & Xiaohua Jiang, 2022), e.g.:

例1：道与之貌，天与之形，恶得不谓之人？

(《庄子·德充符》)

TT1 : The **Tào** gives him his personal appearance (and powers); Heaven gives him his bodily form; how should we not call him a man? **Tr. by James Legge**

TT2 : The **Word** gave them a look; Heaven gave them a form. Why can’t they be called humans? **Tr. by Zhao Yanchun**

例2：夫道,覆载万物者也,洋洋乎大哉!君子不可以不刳心焉。

(《庄子·天地》)

Translated by James Legge : It is the Tào that overspreads and sustains all things. How great It is in Its overflowing influence! The Superior man ought by all means to remove from his mind (all that is contrary to It).

Translated by Zhao Yanchun : The Word covers and carries everything, how great! A gentleman should not fail to open his heart.

When “Dao” becomes an object of cognition or an object, it does not generate subjective behavior, e.g.:

例1：不明于天者,不纯于德;不通于道者,无自而可;不明于道者,悲夫!

(《庄子·在宥》)

James Legge : Those who do not understand Heaven are not pure in their virtue. Those who do not comprehend the Tào have no course which they can pursue successfully. Alas for them who do not clearly understand the Tào!

Zhao Yanchun : If one does not understand Heaven, he does not have perfect virtue; if one does not get close to the **Word**, he’ll accomplish nothing. Sad, the one who does not understand the **Word**!

例1：道不可闻,闻而非也;道不可见,见而非也;道不可言,言而非也。知形形之无形乎!道不当名

(《庄子·知北游》)

James Legge: The Tào cannot be heard; what can be heard is not It. The Tào cannot be seen; what can be seen is not It. The Tào cannot be expressed in words; what can be expressed in words is not It. Do we know the Formless which gives form to form? In the same way the Tào does not admit of being named.

Zhao Yanchun : The Word cannot be heard, and what is heard is not the Word. The Word cannot be uttered, and what is uttered is not the Word. One should know what has a form is derived from non-form. The Word has no name in its proper sense.

Both translators maintain consistency in translation. Legge's "Tâo" maintains conceptual integrity through purely phonetic translation, and its value-neutral attitude reflects the positivist tendency of nineteenth-century Sinological studies to view Chinese philosophy as an "other" that can be objectively analyzed. Zhao translates "Dao" as "the Word," which carries a dual cultural code, pointing to the ultimate truth in the Bible and aligning with *Zhuangzi*'s ontology of "Dao". This creative translation transcends traditional methods like "Nature" or "Way" by linking it to Western classics, giving "Dao" a universal philosophical meaning.

The choice of translation terms reflects the translators' cultural stance: Legge's "Tâo" shows scholarly caution and respect for alien cultures, while Zhao's "the Word" reveals his ambition to bridge cultural gaps. The former guard's cultural specificity with academic purity; the latter seeks conceptual universality through interpretive initiative. Together, they embody the tension between "seeking common ground" and "respecting differences" in cross-cultural communication.

James Legge tends to use literal translation or transliteration for abstract concepts to preserve their philosophical ambiguity. For instance, he translates "逍遥" as "enjoyment in untroubled ease", presenting *Zhuangzi*'s concept of freedom through literal translation. He also provides an explanation in the footnotes: "The three characters which form the title of this Book have all of them the ideagram, which gives the idea, as the Shwo Wân explains it, of 'now walking, now halting.' We might render the title by 'Sauntering or Rambling at Ease; but it is the untroubled enjoyment of the mind which the author has in view.'" This further introduces the meaning of being unrestrained and free, compensating for the lack of clarity in the connotation of the original text that may result from literal translation. Zhao Yanchun, on the other hand, opts for the free translation of "flying free", using a dynamic image with more intuitiveness and visual appeal to convey the fluidity of "逍遥". Although this approach weakens the metaphysical aspect, it enhances the literary imagery, presenting the inner state of "逍遥". This strategy avoids the potential conceptual ambiguity of literal translation and establishes a connection between the philosophical implications and the readers' experiences.

In translating "化" from "化而为鸟", Legge uses the neutral term "changes". While this encompasses various meanings of "change", it tends to flatten the textural quality of the language. Translating "化而为鸟" as "It changes into a bird" only conveys the superficial physical change, failing to reveal the philosophical depth of *Zhuangzi*'s concept of "物化" (Transformation of Things), which to some extent weakens the conveyance of meaning.

Zhao Yanchun, however, selects the term "transformed", which is composed of "trans" and "form". Literally meaning "deformation", it implies a profound change in form and essence. In *Zhuangzi*'s philosophy of "物化", the emphasis is not only on the superficial changes in the form of things but more importantly on the breakthrough and elevation achieved during the transformation of life forms, which is a qualitative leap. The transformation of "鲲" into "鹏" is not merely a change from one biological form to another, but also signifies an ascent from a relatively limited, lower-level state of life to a more expansive, higher-level state of life. The profound meaning implied in Zhao's choice of "transformed" aptly reflects this

qualitative change and elevation in the process of “鯢” transforming into “鹏”, aligning more closely with *Zhuangzi*’s idea that life forms possess transcendence in his philosophy of “物化”. It also better conveys the profound implication of *Zhuangzi*’s philosophy that life achieves transcendence through transformation.

Zhao Yanchun focuses on conveying cultural-loaded words in his English translation of *Zhuangzi*. He advocates that the translation of proper nouns should balance semantic connotation and cultural symbolism. To address the limitations of previous translations (including Legge’s version), which often overlooked the cultural connotations of proper nouns, Zhao systematically restructured nearly 600 proper nouns through free translation. For example, he translates “庄子” as “Sir Lush”, “尧” as “Mound”, and “舜” as “Hibiscus”, using etymology and contextual relevance to give the translated names dual cultural encoding. In contrast, Legge adopts a transliteration strategy (e.g., “Kwang-ze” for “庄子” and “Yáo” for “尧”), supplemented by annotations explaining the background of the figures. While this preserves the phonetic features of the original names, it weakens their metaphorical function. The two translation approaches reflect different views on cultural translatability: Zhao activates the symbolic dimension of proper nouns through creative transcription, while Legge prioritizes academic rigor and fidelity to the original text.

James Legge translates “鯢” and “鹏” as “khwǎn” and “phǎng” in his translation of *Enjoyment in Untroubled Ease*, and he adds detailed annotations at these key points. These annotations provide professional explanations without disrupting the reader’s experience, thereby deepening their understanding of the original text of *Zhuangzi* and Chinese culture. For example, in his annotations, Legge mentions, “The khwǎn and the phǎng are both fabulous creatures, far transcending in size the dimensions ascribed by the wildest fancy of the West to the kraken and the roc.” This comparison links the immense size of “khwǎn” to the mythological creatures familiar to Western readers, such as the kraken and the roc, offering a more intuitive reference for the target-language readers to grasp the giant image of “khwǎn.”

Legge’s translation not only conveys the textual content of *Zhuangzi* but also adheres to the principles of fidelity and accuracy. Through meticulous annotations and comparisons, he effectively promotes cultural exchange between China and the West, providing readers with opportunities to understand Daoist philosophical ideas. Although such detailed descriptions may sometimes appear cumbersome and slightly affect the aesthetic quality of the original text, they undoubtedly deepen the readers’ comprehension. In contrast, Zhao Yanchun’s translation places greater emphasis on conveying the cultural and artistic essence of *Zhuangzi*. It aims to achieve a more vivid and artistic translation effect, focusing on the cultural depth and artistic quality of the language. This approach seeks to provide readers with a more engaging and aesthetically pleasing reading experience.

Zhao Yan Chun’s translation language is concise. When handling proper nouns in the original text, he did not directly transliterate “鯢” and “鹏” like Legge. Instead, he translated “鯢” as “Minnow” and “鹏” as “Roc”. This choice reflects Zhao’s consideration of the target - language cultural sensitivity. In Western culture, “Roc” is a mythological creature similar to “鹏” in mystery and size, making it easier for English-speaking readers to understand the symbolic meaning and image of “鹏”. Translating “鯢” as “Minnow”, which refers to a very small fish, seems contradictory to the huge size described in the original text. However, this contrast creates a sense of displacement, preserving the original text’s strangeness and exaggeration and providing readers with room for thought. Moreover, “鯢” can also mean

“minnow” or “small fish”. Thus, although Zhao’s translation choice may seem misleading at first glance, it has unique features in cultural communication and artistic effect.

Similarly, in translating other proper nouns, Zhao Yanchun strives to showcase their rich cultural meanings. He skillfully translates culturally - loaded terms in *Zhuangzi* and compiles a correspondence table of proper nouns after the translation, offering readers a way to deeply understand these terms, for example:

子独不知至德之世乎？昔者容成氏、大庭氏、伯皇氏、中央氏、栗陆氏、骊畜氏、轩辕氏、赫胥氏、尊卢氏、祝融氏、伏羲氏、神农氏.....

(《庄子·胠篋》)

James Legge : Are you, Sir, unacquainted with the age of perfect virtue? Anciently there were Yung-khāng, Tā-thing, Po-hwang, Kang-yang, Lî-lû, Lî-khû, Hsien-yüan, Ho-hsü, Zun-lû, Kû-yung, Fû-hsî, and Shān-nāng.

Zhao Yanchun : Don’t you know there was a heyday before? That’s the age of Allmade, Greathall, Grand, Center, Milletland, Blackhorse, Cartshafts, Allgreat, Bowl, Meltfire, Hidden Spirit, and Magic Farmer.

Zhao’s free translation not only conveys the literal meaning but also recreates the cultural connotations, showing his deep insight into cultural differences and professional respect for the source - language culture.

5. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF THE ENGLISH VERSIONS AT SYNTACTIC LEVEL

Translating *Zhuangzi* accurately while preserving its syntax and artistic charm is a huge challenge for translators. The English translations of *Zhuangzi* by James Legge and Zhao Yanchun offer samples to study different translation techniques and sentence - structure differences. By comparing their translations, we can gain insights into how to effectively transform and reproduce the source text in the target language in cross - cultural translation.

We use some content from *Zhuangzi* as an example to analyze the differences in sentence - structure construction between Legge’s and Zhao Yanchun’s translations:

例1：北冥有鱼，其名为鲲。鲲之大，不知其几千里也。化而为鸟，其名为鹏。鹏之背，不知其几千里也；

(《庄子·逍遥游》)

James Legge : There in North Sea is a fish called Minnow, whose body spans about a thousand miles. When transformed into a bird, it is called Roc, whose back spans about a thousand miles.

Zhao Yanchun : In the Northern Ocean there is a fish, the name of which is Khwān1,—I do not know how many lî in size. It changes into a bird with the name of Phǎng, the back of which is (also)—I do not know how many lî in extent.

The original text exhibits a high degree of symmetry in word count and sentence structure, creating a rhythmic pattern of alternating lengths and balanced cadence. The overall tonal patterns maintain consistency in the use of level and oblique tones, and the construction of sentences in the two segments shows marked symmetry. Additionally, the phrase “不知其几千里也” employs repetition to enhance its rhetorical effect. It is evident that the passage possesses an internal logic and profound cultural depth, showcasing cultural richness and

artistic flair. When translating this text, it is essential not only to accurately convey the content but also to ensure that the translation preserves the artistic qualities of the original, reflecting its unique characteristics.

When comparing the two translation samples, both demonstrate awareness of the original's structural features and incorporate them into their translations. Zhao Yanchun recognizes the artistic elements of rhythm and sentence structure in *Zhuangzi*'s text and strives to convey these elements in the translation. The structural symmetry of the original's paired sentences is retained in the translation. Specifically, the first sentence, "...called Minnow, whose body spans about a thousand miles," and the second sentence, "...called Roc, whose back spans about a thousand miles," maintain identical syntactic structures. This repetition recreates the original's stylistic artistry. Furthermore, the translation uses nearly identical vocabulary in the symmetrical parts, enhancing the rhythm and preserving the artistic qualities of the original.

James Legge also clearly recognized the structural features of the original text. Despite the tendency in English to use substitution instead of repetition in sentence construction, he opted to break conventions by employing the repetitive structure "I do not know how many li..." to translate the phrase "...不知其几千里也." In this way, Legge not only accurately conveys the meaning of the original text but also preserves its structural and artistic qualities to a certain extent. By doing so, Legge not only accurately conveys the meaning of the original text but also preserves its structural and artistic qualities, making the translation faithful and aesthetically pleasing.

例2：庖丁为文惠君解牛，手之所触，肩之所倚，足之所履，膝之所踦，砉然向然，奏刀騞然，莫不中音。合于《桑林》之舞，乃中《经首》之会。

(《庄子·养生主》)

James Legge : His cook was cutting up an ox for the ruler Wān-hui. Whenever he applied his hand, leaned forward with his shoulder, planted his foot, and employed the pressure of his knee, in the audible ripping off of the skin, and slicing operation of the knife, the sounds were all in regular cadence. Movements and sounds proceeded as in the dance of 'the Mulberry Forest' and the blended notes of 'the King Shāu'.

Zhao Yanchun : A chef severed a carcass for Lord Lettergood. Where his hand touched, where his shoulder leaned, where his foot trod, and where his knee bent, there arose a whir, a clap, and his knife gave off a chop-chop, all concerted, in tune with the dance of Mulberry Wood and in accordance with the canto of Straight Head.

James Legge translates "庖丁" as "His cook", emphasizing the subordinate relationship between "庖丁" and Duke Hui of Wen, reflecting his understanding of the original character relationship in his translation, a manifestation of his subjectivity. In sentence construction, he uses "Whenever"-led adverbial clauses of time to detail each movement of "庖丁"'s dissection, with the lengthy expression "applied his hand, leaned forward with his shoulder, planted his foot, and employed the pressure of his knee." This shows his faithfulness to the original action description and his effort to fully reproduce the dissection process. In sound description, unlike Zhao Yanchun's rich onomatopoeic words, he uses "in regular cadence" to summarize the rhythmic sense of sound, focusing more on conveying the overall rhythm, a translation choice based on his understanding of the original. For the cultural images "the dance of 'the Mulberry Forest'" and "the blended notes of 'the King Shāu'", he adopts direct transliteration with retained annotations, reflecting his respect for the original culture's authenticity and his hope

for readers to deeply understand its cultural connotations through annotations, showing his subjectivity in cultural information transmission.

Zhao Yanchun translates “庖丁” as “A chef”, a lexical choice that reflects his subjectivity in considering the target readers’ comprehension. “Chef” is a common English term for a cooking profession, enabling English readers to quickly grasp the character’s identity. In sentence construction, he employs four “where”-led adverbial clauses of place in parallel, coherently presenting the movements of “庖丁”’s hand, shoulder, foot, and knee during ox dissection. This makes the sentence structure compact and rhythmic, aligning with English’s information-integrating expression habit through clauses, showcasing his flexible syntactic use and subjective choice. In describing the dissection sounds, his use of onomatopoeic words like “a whirl, a clap” and “a chop-chop” vividly reproduces the original auditory effect. Based on his understanding of the original imagery, he actively selects more infectious vocabulary to enhance the translation’s expressiveness. For “《桑林》之舞” and “《经首》之会”, his translation of “the dance of Mulberry Wood” and “the canto of Straight Head” retains the original imagery while converting it through English expression. This approach reflects his subjectivity in cultural imagery transmission, respecting the original culture while striving to make it understandable for target readers.

In the translation process of *Zhuangzi*, James Legge and Zhao Yanchun show significant differences in syntactic translation. These differences vividly reflect the translators’ subjectivity in translation practice and also highlight their respective language - control abilities.

In the syntactic treatment of the English translation of *Zhuangzi*, James Legge always takes the clarity of English logic as the core pursuit. This orientation is deeply integrated into his translation strategy, fully reflecting the translator’s subjectivity. In the face of the semantically rich and logically obscure sentences in Chinese, Legge takes the initiative to sort out and reconstruct the information in the original text by virtue of his deep understanding of the syntactic structure of English.

This syntactic adjustment is not a simple language conversion, but is based on his grasp of English expression habits and readers’ understanding. In his translation, he actively reorganizes the information in the original text according to the logical thinking mode of English, so as to make it conform to the cognitive habits of English readers, and effectively help readers understand the complex semantic content of the original text smoothly. At the same time, his version of the translation does not modify the meaning of the original text too much, which highlights his subjective initiative to realize the clarity of English logic and accuracy and objectivity in the translation process.

In the translation of long and difficult sentences, Legge would break them into several logical phrases according to the rules of English syntax, and then utilize connectives or transitions to link these phrases together to build a clear logical chain. Although this approach will increase the length of the translated text, it can fully restore the meaning of the original text and ensure that there is no omission or mistranslation. This process fully demonstrates his translator’s subjectivity in sentence construction and his skillful ability in the use of English syntax.

Zhao Yanchun’s translation of *Zhuangzi* balances the aesthetics of Chinese syntax with the readability of English, reflecting the role played by his translator’s subjectivity in the translation process. Fully recognizing the aesthetic characteristics of Chinese sentences, he actively explores the similar aesthetic expressions in English.

When he encounters Chinese sentences with unique formal beauty, such as counterpoints and parallelisms, Zhao will construct parallel structures corresponding to them, striving to restore the beauty of the Chinese language in terms of form. This process reflects his keen

perception of Chinese sentence features and his subjective efforts to actively find corresponding expressions in English, showing his respect for and inheritance of the aesthetic value of the original Chinese text in translation, and highlighting his subjectivity as a translator.

In order to enhance the readability of the translated text, Zhao Yanchun takes into full consideration the reception habits of English readers and makes adaptive adjustments to the original expressions. He transformed the complex sentences in Chinese into the simple sentence structure in English, and by flexibly adjusting the position of sentence components, he placed the core information at the beginning of the sentence, which is in line with the characteristic of English expression that emphasizes the priority of information. At the same time, he avoids the use of obscure vocabulary and syntactic structures, and adopts expressions that are in line with daily language habits, effectively reducing the reader's comprehension difficulty. This reader-oriented translation strategy not only shows Zhao's accurate grasp of the laws of the English language, but also reflects his subjective consciousness based on the cultural context of the target language, reflecting the translator's two-way consideration of balancing the spirit of the original work and the needs of the readers in cross-cultural communication.

In addition, Zhao Yanchun also focuses on adjusting the length and rhythm of sentences, so that the translated text retains the sense of Chinese rhythm while adapting to the rhythm of English. He skillfully uses a variety of techniques to create a rhythmic translation, so that English readers can also feel the rhythmic beauty of the original text in the process of reading. This series of syntactic balancing techniques demonstrates his subjective pursuit of realizing the perfect fusion of Chinese syntactic beauty and English readability, further reflecting his subjectivity as a translator as well as his excellent linguistic mastery.

To summarize, the difference in the syntactic translation of *Zhuangzi* between Legge and Zhao Yanchun is the specific role of translator's subjectivity in translation practice. Based on their respective understanding of the translation purpose and grasp of the target language, they actively exert their subjective initiative in syntactic selection and adjustment, and at the same time, they fully demonstrate their profound skills and unique styles in mastering the English language.

6. COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF TWO ENGLISH VERSIONS AT THE LEVEL OF THOUGHT

The differences in the translations of *Zhuangzi* by James Legge and Zhao Yanchun are not only reflected in the linguistic styles, but also in the different paths of interpreting the philosophical ideas. This study takes "Zhuangzi Dreaming of Becoming a Butterfly" and "The Adjustment of Controversies" as examples to explore the ways of the two translators and their effects on conveying the philosophical ideas of *Zhuangzi*.

原文：昔者庄周梦为胡蝶，栩栩然胡蝶也，自喻适志与！不知周也。俄然觉，则蘧蘧然周也。不知周之梦为胡蝶与，胡蝶之梦为周与？周与胡蝶，则必有分矣。此之谓物化。

James Legge : Formerly, I, Kwang Kâu, dreamt that I was a butterfly, a butterfly flying about, feeling that it was enjoying itself. I did not know that it was Kâu. Suddenly I awoke, and was myself again, the veritable Kâu. I did not know whether it had formerly been Kâu dreaming that he was a butterfly, or it was now a butterfly dreaming that it was Kâu. But between Kâu and a butterfly there must be a difference. This is a case of what is called the Transformation of Things(Legge, 1891, p. 188).

Notes by James Legge: Hsüan Ying, in his remarks on these two sentences, brings out the force of the story very successfully:—‘Looking at them in their ordinary appearance, there was necessarily a difference between them, but in the delusion of the dream each of them appeared the other, and they could not distinguish themselves! Kâu could be a butterfly, and the butterfly could be Kâu;—we may see that in the world all traces of that and this may pass away, as they come under the influence of transformations.’ But the Tâoism here can hardly be distinguished from the Buddhism that holds that all human experience is merely so much mâya or illusion.

Zhao Yanchun: Before, Sir Lush dreamed that he was a butterfly, a butterfly that flied so free, so carefree! It didn’t know it was Lush. Suddenly, he woke up, and in a surprise he realized that he was Lush. Did Lush dream of being a butterfly or the other way round? There must be a demarcation between Lush and the butterfly. This is what is called metamorphosis.

The original text explores the dialectical relationship between reality and illusion through the fable of “Zhuangzi Dreaming of Becoming a Butterfly”. From a philosophical point of view, it breaks the clear boundaries between reality and dream, subject and object in people’s usual cognition. People usually think that reality is real and stable, and dreams are unreal, but this story blurs the distinction between the two, making people think whether what we recognize as real is only a subjective perception, and whether the unreal is also real at some level. Zhuangzi’s question “I did not know whether it had formerly been Kâu dreaming that he was a butterfly, or it was now a butterfly dreaming that it was Kâu” implies that the essence of all things is the same. In this fable, Zhuangzi and the butterfly are no longer completely independent individuals, but can be transformed into each other, which implies that there is no absolute difference in the nature of all things in the world, and that they are all ever-changing forms of existence in the universe. At the same time, it also reveals that the subject-object boundary is a false obsession of human cognition. People often habitually distinguish between subject and object, thinking “I” is the subject and external things are the object, but “Zhuangzi Dreaming of Becoming a Butterfly” suggests that this distinction may only be based on limited human cognition, and at a higher philosophical level, such a boundary may not exist (Zhuang, 2024).

James Legge’s translation adheres to a literal approach, striving for word-for-word correspondence. He renders “物化” as “Transformation of Things” and, in his commentary, cites the Buddhist scholar Xuan Ying’s view that the boundary between Zhuangzi and the butterfly can be “effaced under transformation”. While this translation appears objective, the religious connotations in the commentary introduce a bias. Legge asserts that Zhuangzi’s philosophy is “indistinguishable from Buddhism,” framing reality as an “illusion” and imposing the Buddhist concept of “emptiness” that denies phenomenal reality onto Zhuangzi. This overlooks the essence of “物化”, which affirms the naturalness of transformation (Zhu, 2019). Furthermore, his translation of “必有分矣” as “there must be a difference” uses the term “difference” to reinforce an objective distinction between Zhuang Zhou and the butterfly, contradicting Zhuangzi’s critique of “artificial demarcations”.

In contrast, Zhao’s translation employs linguistic choices to highlight philosophical reasoning. He translates “物化” as “metamorphosis”, preserving the imagery of dynamic transformation while avoiding religious associations. For instance, the line “不知周之梦为胡蝶与” is rendered as “Did Zhuang Zhou dream of being a butterfly or the other way round?”—an open-ended question that mirrors Zhuangzi’s dialectical logic. Notably, in translating “必有分矣”, Zhao selects “demarcation”, implying that such boundaries are artificial constructs rather than objective realities. Compared to Legge’s “difference”, “demarcation” aligns more

closely with Zhuangzi's critique of subjective judgment—Zhuangzi does not deny phenomenal differences but opposes the imposition of human-centric distinctions upon all things.

原文：天下莫大于秋豪之末，而大山为小；莫寿乎殇子，而彭祖为天。天地与我并生，而万物与我为一。

James Legge : Under heaven there is nothing greater than the tip of an autumn down, and the Thâi mountain is small. There is no one more long-lived than a child which dies prematurely, and Phăng 3û did not live out his time. Heaven, Earth, and I were produced together, and all things and I are one.

Zhao Yanchun: Nothing under the sun is as large as a tiny bit; a high mountain is small; none is as long lived as a child who dies prematurely; none is as short lived as Sire Peng, the immortal. Heaven and earth live with me; all things are identified with me.

People commonly perceive Mount Tai as vast and an autumn hair as tiny, or regard Pengzu as long-lived and a premature infant as short-lived. However, Zhuangzi inverts these conventional judgments through extreme contrasts, challenging the worldly standards of size, longevity, and value. This reveals that conventional value judgments are relative rather than absolute.

The phrase “天地与我并生，万物与我为一” further elevates this idea, expressing a philosophy of equality and unity among all things. From Zhuangzi's perspective, when viewed through the lens of the Dao, all things lack distinctions of size, longevity, nobility, or inferiority. They exist equally within the natural order, forming a harmonious whole. This highlights the philosophical core of equality among all things, reflecting Zhuangzi's unique worldview and profound contemplation of the universe.

James Legge translates “天下莫大于秋豪之末” as “nothing greater than the tip of an autumn down”, directly rejecting conventional standards of size. His rendering of “天地与我并生” as “Heaven, Earth and I were produced together” uses “produced”(passive voice), which may evoke Christian creationist frameworks for Western readers, yet “together” partially conveys the idea of equality and coexistence. However, his translation of “彭祖为天” as “Phăng 3û did not live out his time” deviates from Zhuangzi's core philosophy. The original text employs the paradox “殇子寿于彭祖” not to debate whether longevity meets a standard, but to negate the absolutism of the concept of “life span” itself. Legge's phrase “did not live out his time” shifts focus to the “completeness of lifespan,” implying an objective standard exists—as if Pengzu's “premature death” stems from failing to reach a predetermined length. This contradicts Zhuangzi's relativism, which dissolves all objective criteria. Such translation risks misleading readers into thinking Zhuangzi criticizes “insufficient lifespan” rather than exposing the illusion of standards, thereby diluting the text's subversive philosophical force.

Zhao Yanchun's translation employs paradoxical rhetoric and interactive language to convey relativism. For instance, “彭祖为天” is rendered as “none is as short lived as Sire Peng, the immortal”, juxtaposing “immortal” with “short lived” to expose the artificiality of lifespan judgments. This paradoxical pairing not only replicates Zhuangzi's intent to overturn common sense but also provokes reflection on the subjectivity of values. Additionally, “天地与我并生” is translated as “Heaven and earth live with me”, replacing passive voice with “live with” to dissolve subject-object duality. “万物与我为一” becomes “all things are identified with me”, where “identified” conveys both cognitive unity and ontological interpenetration, offering greater philosophical depth than Legge's “are one” by aligning more closely with Zhuangzi's vision of interconnectedness.

James Legge translates “天下莫大于秋豪之末” as “nothing greater than the tip of an autumn down”, directly rejecting conventional standards of size. His rendering of “天地与我并生” as “Heaven, Earth and I were produced together” uses “produced”(passive voice), which may evoke Christian creationist frameworks for Western readers, yet “together” partially conveys the idea of equality and coexistence. However, his translation of “彭祖为天” as “Phăng 3û did not live out his time” deviates from Zhuangzi’s core philosophy. The original text employs the paradox “殇子寿于彭祖” not to debate whether longevity meets a standard, but to negate the absolutism of the concept of “life span” itself. Legge’s phrase “did not live out his time” shifts focus to the “completeness of lifespan”, implying an objective standard exists—as if Pengzu’s “premature death” stems from failing to reach a predetermined length. This contradicts Zhuangzi’s relativism, which dissolves all objective criteria. Such translation risks misleading readers into thinking Zhuangzi criticizes “insufficient lifespan” rather than exposing the illusion of standards, thereby diluting the text’s subversive philosophical force.

Zhao Yanchun’s translation employs oxymoron and interactive language to convey relativism. For instance, “彭祖为天” is rendered as “none is as short lived as Sire Peng, the immortal”, juxtaposing “immortal” with “short lived” to expose the artificiality of lifespan judgments. This oxymoron not only replicates Zhuangzi’s intent to overturn common sense but also provokes reflection on the subjectivity of values. Additionally, “天地与我并生” is translated as “Heaven and earth live with me”, replacing passive voice with “live with” to dissolve subject-object duality. “万物与我为一” becomes “all things are identified with me”, where “identified” conveys both cognitive unity and ontological interpenetration, offering greater philosophical depth than Legge’s “are one” by aligning more closely with Zhuangzi’s vision of interconnectedness.

James Legge, as a missionary scholar, inevitably infused his *Zhuangzi* translation with Christian cultural frameworks. His Buddhist-inflected interpretation of “物化” reflects a Western religious lens—such as annotating the “梦蝶” as “delusion”, rooted in Victorian rationalism’s dismissal of intuitive experience. Despite this, his translation retains irreplaceable scholarly value: a literal strategy preserves textual fidelity, while citations of Chinese commentators like Xuan Ying demonstrate efforts to engage indigenous perspectives. This contradictoriness epitomizes 19th-century Sinology: laying foundations for Western comprehension of the East while misreading through cultural divides.

Zhao Yanchun’s translation embodies a contemporary scholar’s return to cultural authenticity. Avoiding religiously charged terms, he emphasizes natural transformation via “metamorphosis” and reconstructs Daoist “天人合一” through interactive expressions like “live with” and “identified”. Though risking “over-interpretation”, this linguistic innovation aligns closer to Zhuangzi’s intent to subvert conventional cognition.

The difference between the two translators is essentially the eternal dilemma of cross-cultural translation: Legge’s translation is like a rigorous academic specimen, providing reference for future generations, but also blurring the ideological undertones due to the filters of the times; while Zhao Yanchun’s version is like a philosophical reconstruction, which, although it may be distorted, allows the ancient wisdom to flow anew in the contemporary context.

7. DIFFERENCES IN SUBJECTIVITY OF JAMES LEGGE AND ZHAO YANCHUN

As a native English speaker, James’s linguistic strength lies in his mastery of English expression, while his study of the Chinese language demonstrates the dedication of a cross-cultural scholar. Although his study of Chinese began with missionary needs, he did not stop

at the instrumental level - he spent decades studying Chinese classics, even inviting Chinese scholar Wang Tao to assist in proofreading and restoring the original meaning of the texts. Although he did not fully convey the subtleties of *Zhuangzi*'s philosophy, he preserved the space for Western readers to understand the text with maximum literal fidelity. Behind this "scholarly translation" is his deep cultivation of Chinese literature: he refers to hundreds of commentaries, balances the views of the Han Dynasty scriptures with those of the Song Dynasty theories, and even writes the controversies of different commentaries in the footnotes to provide readers with a multi-dimensional perspective.

Zhao Yanchun's native Chinese roots give him a natural sense of context. He is able to capture the poetic and philosophical ideas in *Zhuangzi*'s "Enjoyment in Untroubled Ease" and "The Adjustment of Controversies" without having to cross the language barrier. His cultural resonance with allusions such as "相濡以沫" and "庖丁解牛" enables him to capture the metaphorical and dialectical logic of the original text. His English language skills enable him to accurately convey the philosophical ideas of *Zhuangzi* beyond the constraints of the literal language.

Legge's translation career spanned the mid-to-late nineteenth century, at the intersection of Western colonial expansion and the rise of Sinology. His work was not only a linguistic conversion, but also a cultural pioneering one—he tried to draw a map of Chinese thought for the European academia. For this purpose, in translating *Zhuangzi*, he not only referred to Taoist commentaries, but also introduced Buddhist interpretations, and even incorporated Confucian ethical perspectives into his commentary. This ponderous exegetical system seems to be mixed, but in fact it was meant to satisfy the hungry demand for Eastern knowledge in the West at that time. For example, he included a 100-page introduction to his translation of the Tao Te Ching, which covered everything from historical background, philosophical schools, and textual controversies, just like a miniature encyclopedia. This sense of "academic service" has made him a founder of Western Sinology, but it has also made the translation heavy and even criticized as "lengthy".

Zhao Yanchun, on the other hand, is in the era of globalization in the 21st century, where cultural pluralism and equal dialogue have become the mainstream. Unlike the earlier mode of "one-way export" in Chinese studies, his translation aims at "mutual cultural appreciation", neither packaging *Zhuangzi*'s thoughts as exotic wonders nor catering to Western stereotypes, but rather devoting himself to reconstructing the uniqueness of Chinese philosophy in the English language, focusing on conveying Chinese philosophies to the world. Rather, they are committed to reconstructing the uniqueness of Chinese philosophy in the English context, focusing on conveying the essence of Chinese philosophy to the world, and also considering how to enable English readers to cross the cultural gap. This strategy reflects the contemporary translator's active bridging of cultural differences rather than unilateral cultural output.

James Legge, a missionary and the first Sinologist in modern Britain, was the pioneering figure who systematically studied and comprehensively translated ancient Chinese classics into English. In the course of his missionary work, he realized that Confucianism was a major obstacle to his missionary work. He therefore decided to embark on the translation of Chinese texts in order to gain a deeper understanding of Chinese culture and psychology, and thus to spread Christian ideas more effectively. James opposed the imposition of Catholic ideas on the Chinese and did not seek short-term missionary results, but hoped to make a long-term contribution to the missionary endeavor through an in-depth study of Chinese culture and the prescription of the right medicine. He always approached his translation work with seriousness, earnestness and zeal, avoiding the easy interpretation of Chinese culture by Christian culture, in order to maintain the "purity" of both Christian and Chinese culture. His translations are not

simple linguistic conversions, but extensions of scholarly research—every translation includes detailed commentary, edition proofreading, and cross-cultural comparisons, an openness that has made his translations cornerstones of later research, but which also discourages the general reader from reading them due to information overload.

Zhao Yanchun's translations are more culturally conscious and reader-oriented. He is not only oriented to the international academic community, but also takes into account the acceptability of the general readers. Under the guidance of the strategy of "light on annotation, heavy on core", he fully preserves the format, phonetics, and literary aesthetics of the original text and realizes the clarity and fluency of literary translation. Although some academic depth may be sacrificed, Zhuangzi's philosophical thought is closer to the contemporary reader's cognition.

The differences in translator subjectivity between Ricardo and Zhao Yanchun are rooted in the intertwining of personal background, mission of the times, and cultural aspirations. As a nineteenth-century pioneer of Sinology, Jacob's translations always sought a balance between the religious goals of missionaries and the academic ideals of scholars. He systematically translated Chinese classical texts, both to provide a rigorous scholarly foundation for Western academia and to deepen his understanding of Chinese culture in service of his missionary endeavors. His "scholarly" translations—incorporating extensive annotations, textual collation, and cross-cultural comparisons—though tinged with a religious perspective due to the limitations of his time, laid the groundwork for later research with their objectivity and comprehensiveness. In contrast, Zhao Yanchun's translations reflect the cultural awareness of a contemporary scholar. Unburdened by the weighty mission of being a "cultural intermediary", he leverages his native speaker's sensitivity and global vision to transform Zhuangzi's philosophy into a resource of ideas that resonate with modern audiences. He reduces complex scholarly research and instead employs linguistic innovation—such as oxymoron—to make Zhuangzi's wisdom more accessible to contemporary readers. This approach preserves cultural uniqueness while opening the door to ordinary readers.

Zhao Yanchun and James Legge's differences reflect the historical trajectory of translating Chinese classics abroad: Legge's rigorous scholarship reduced cultural estrangement, while Zhao's dynamic interpretation bridges the gaps across ancient-modern and Chinese-Western contexts. The former laid the foundation for Western Sinology, while the latter revitalized traditional philosophy - seemingly opposites, but actually complementary. Their work together proves that translation is not only the transcoding of language, but also the inheritance and mutation of cultural genes in different time and space.

8. CONCLUSION

This study, guided by the theory of translator subjectivity, analyzes the English translations of *Zhuangzi* by James Legge and Zhao Yanchun, revealing that translators play a significant role in the translation process. Factors such as translation strategies, language proficiency, and historical context significantly impact translation quality.

The exertion of translator subjectivity is not a single-factor demonstration but a collective reflection of individual and social factors. Translators should enhance their language skills and develop a unique translation style to strengthen individual subjectivity. In translating traditional Chinese cultural classics, neither domestication nor foreignization alone can bridge cultural gaps between the East and West; a flexible combination of both strategies is necessary to convey the original's meaning and aesthetic beauty.

Legge's translation is academically rigorous, laying a foundation for Western missionary work, while Zhao's translation is ideologically dynamic, revitalizing traditional wisdom. Their

complementary nature reflects the historical trajectory of Chinese classic translations—from “knowledge introduction” to “value regeneration”. Translation is a dynamic cultural gene transfer across different times and spaces. This study also challenges the traditional view that “the target language must be the translator’s native language”. Legge, a native English speaker, had an advantage in language fluency but partially misinterpreted Zhuangzi’s thought due to cultural bias. Zhao, a native Chinese speaker, overcame English expression challenges and more accurately conveyed the uniqueness of Zhuangzi’s philosophy through creative strategies. This comparison shows that native language ability is merely the starting point, not the decisive endpoint of translation. A translator’s cultural sensitivity, philosophical interpretive power, and cross-cultural strategies more significantly influence the ideological depth and reception of the translation.

In conclusion, this study finds that translator subjectivity plays a key role in the English translation of *Zhuangzi*. The view that “the target language must be the translator’s native language” is not absolute. When translating traditional Chinese cultural classics, the translator’s subjectivity and social-cultural background should be fully considered to ensure translation accuracy and effective cultural transmission. The value of classics lies not in being frozen in text but in continuously radiating new ideological brilliance through the translator’s creative interpretation.

This paper is funded by East China University of Science and Technology(No. X202410251339).

REFERENCES

- James Legge. The Sacred Books of the East: The Texts of Taoism. Oxford University Press, 1891.
- Guying Chen陈鼓应. Zhuangzi lun 'dao'—jian ping Zhuang Lao daolun zhi yitong庄子论“道”——兼评庄老道论之异同 [Zhuangzi on ‘Dao’—With Comments on the Similarities and Differences between Zhuangzi and Laozi's Dao Theories]. Zhexue yanjiu 哲学研究4(1987):90.
- Xi Chen陈晔 and Xiaohua Jiang蒋骁华. ‘Dao’ butong, yi xiang wei mou—jiyu yuliaoku de diyige Zhuangzi yingyiben zhong 'dao' de fanyi“道”不同，亦相为谋——基于语料库的第一个《庄子》英译本中“道”的翻译 [‘Dao’ Differs, Yet They Collaborate—A Corpus-Based Study of the Translation of ‘Dao’ in the First English Version of *Zhuangzi*]. Waiyu yu fanyi外语与翻译29(1)(2022):1-7,98.
- Yili Chen陈怡莉. Tushi lilun shijiao xia Zhuangzi yingyi duibi yanjiu图式理论视角下《庄子》英译对比研究 [A Comparative Study of English Translations of *Zhuangzi* from the Perspective of Schema Theory]. PhD diss., Northwest Normal University, 2024.
- Huiqin Guo郭惠琴. Zhonghua dianji fanyi fangfa yu celüe yanjiu—yi Zhuangzi hexin sixiang shuyu de yingyi wei li中华典籍翻译方法与策略研究——以《庄子》核心思想术语的英译为例 [Research on Translation Methods and Strategies of Chinese Classics—Taking the English Translation of Core Conceptual Terms in *Zhuangzi* as an Example]. Hanzi wenhua汉字文化3(2019):101-2.
- Xiao Li李晓. Lin Yutang, Weili Zhuangzi hexin shuyu yingyi celüe duibi yanjiu林语堂、韦利《庄子》核心术语英译策略对比研究 [A Comparative Study of Lin Yutang and Arthur Waley's Translation Strategies for Core Terms in *Zhuangzi*]. PhD diss., Hunan University, 2021.

- Lin Lin林琳. Zhuangzi zhong shengtai yinyu de fanyi yanjiu 《庄子》中生态隐喻的翻译研究 [A Study on the Translation of Ecological Metaphors in *Zhuangzi*]. PhD diss., Northeast Normal University, 2021.
- Qianyang Liu刘乾阳. Kuawenhua shijiao xia Zhuangzi 'dao' de yingyi yanjiu跨文化视角下《庄子》“道”的英译研究[A Study on the English Translation of ‘Dao’ in *Zhuangzi* from a Cross-Cultural Perspective]. PhD diss., Shandong University, 2012.
- Lingling Shi师玲玲. Zhuangzi neipian de jiegou yu fengge yanjiu 《庄子》内篇的结构与风格研究 [A Study on the Structure and Style of the Inner Chapters of *Zhuangzi*]. PhD diss., Northeast Normal University, 2022.
- Yuhang Song宋宇航. Dianji biaoti yingyi zhong de yizhe zhutixing tanxi—yi Zhuangzi·Neipian biaoti wei li典籍标题英译中的译者主体性探析——以《庄子·内篇》标题为例 [An Analysis of Translator's Subjectivity in the English Translation of Classic Titles—Taking the Titles of the Inner Chapters of *Zhuangzi* as an Example]. Yingyu guangchang英语广场19(2023):26-9.
- Jiali Tang唐嘉俐. Benti yinyu lilun shijiao xia Zhuangzi yinyu yingyi fenxi本体隐喻理论视角下的《庄子》隐喻英译分析 [An Analysis of Metaphor Translation in *Zhuangzi* from the Perspective of Ontological Metaphor Theory]. Dazhong wenyi大众文艺17(2020):133-4.
- Jun Wen文军 and Xia Gan甘霞. Guonei Zhuangzi yingyi yanjiu: huigu yu qianzhan国内《庄子》英译研究:回顾与前瞻 [Domestic Research on English Translations of *Zhuangzi*: Review and Prospects]. Guangdong waiyu waimao daxue xuebao广东外语外贸大学学报23(3)(2012):33-8.
- Dongyue Wu吴冬月. Zhuangzi Kunpeng yixiang yingyi bijiao yanjiu 《庄子》鲲鹏意象英译比较研究 [A Comparative Study of the English Translation of the Kun-Peng Image in *Zhuangzi*]. Yingyu guangchang英语广场36(2022):3-6.
- Han Wu吴瀚 and Xiaodong Yao姚晓东. Jiyu Python qinggan fenxi de Zhuangzi yingyi haiwai jieshou yanjiu基于Python情感分析的《庄子》英译海外接受研究 [Research on the Overseas Reception of English Translations of *Zhuangzi* Based on Python Sentiment Analysis]. Waiwen yanjiu外文研究12(4)(2024):81-90,96,106-7.
- Sha Wu伍莎. Zhuangzi neipian de zhexue shuyu yingyi bijiao yanjiu 《庄子》内篇的哲学术语英译比较研究 [A Comparative Study of the English Translation of Philosophical Terms in the Inner Chapters of *Zhuangzi*]. PhD diss., Sichuan International Studies University, 2021.
- Chunge Xia夏春鸽 and Na Wu武娜. Dianji yingyi fangfa qianxi——yi Zhuangzi yingyi wei li典籍英译方法浅析——以《庄子》英译为例 [A Brief Analysis of Methods for Translating Chinese Classics into English—Taking the English Translation of *Zhuangzi* as an Example]. Haiwai yingyu海外英语15(2013):152-3.
- Jia Xie谢佳. Yizhe zhutixing xia Zhuangzi hexin ci 'dao' de yingyi yanjiu译者主体性下《庄子》核心词“道”的英译研究 [A Study on the English Translation of the Core Word 'Dao' in *Zhuangzi* from the Perspective of Translator's Subjectivity]. PhD diss., Hunan Normal University, 2014.
- Luya Xu徐鲁亚. Zhuangzi sange yingyiben de yizhe zhutixing yanjiu 《庄子》三个英译本的译者主体性研究 [A Study on the Translator's Subjectivity in Three English Versions of *Zhuangzi*]. PhD diss., Shanghai Normal University, 2010.

- Qinqin Zhang张芹芹. Shixi yizhe zhutixing zai wenxue fanyi zhong de tixian——yi Aoman yu pianjian de liangge zhongyiben wei li试析译者主体性在文学翻译中的体现——以《傲慢与偏见》的两个中译本为例 [An Analysis of the Manifestation of Translator's Subjectivity in Literary Translation—Taking Two Chinese Translations of *Pride and Prejudice* as Examples]. Huaihai gongxueyuan xuebao (shehui kexue ban)淮海工学院学报(社会科学版)8(7)(2010):99-101.
- Yaolu Zhang章瑶露. Fanyi lilun shijiao xia yingyiben yizhe zhutixing yanjiu——yi Xiaoyaoyou yingyi wei li翻译理论视角下英译本译者主体性研究——以《逍遥游》英译为例 [A Study on the Translator's Subjectivity in English Translations from the Perspective of Translation Theory—Taking the English Translation of *Free and Easy Wandering* as an Example]. Xin Chu wenhua新楚文化19(2024):65-8.
- Houtao Zhong钟厚涛. Yizhe xianshen yu kuawenhua shengcheng——lun Deguo shiren dui Zhongguo Canglang shihua de yingyu fanyi译者显身与跨文化生成——论德国诗人对中国《沧浪诗话》的英语翻译 [Translator Visibility and Cross-Cultural Generation—On the English Translation of the Chinese *Canglang Shihua* by a German Poet]. Dangdai bijiao wenxue当代比较文学2(2024):22-38.
- Shuran Zhu朱舒然. Lun Zhuangzi de zhexue fanyi——yi Qiwlun wei li论《庄子》的哲学翻译——以《齐物论》为例 [On the Philosophical Translation of *Zhuangzi*—Taking *The Adjustment of Controversies* as an Example]. Waiyu jiaoxue yu yanjiu外语教学与研究51(1)(2019):96-108,160-1.
- Yan Zhuang庄妍. Cong 'wuhua' kan Qiwlun 'Zhuang Zhou meng die' dui 'wo' de xiaojie从“物化”看《齐物论》“庄周梦蝶”对“我”的消解 [The Dissolution of ‘Self’ in Zhuang Zhou Dreams of a Butterfly in *The Adjustment of Controversies* Viewed from ‘Transformation of Things’]. Mingjia mingzuo名家名作4(2024):38-40.