

Translating Concepts in Chinese:

A case study based on *The Wealth of Nations*

Sui HE
Centre for Translation Studies,
University College London,
Gower Street,
London, United Kingdom.
sui.he.15@ucl.ac.uk

Abstract

The modern history of China is entwined with the publicity, adaptation and acceptance of western sociological and philosophical ideas, the initial stage of which was pervasively mediated by translation. Owing to the prominent role that concepts play in constructing ideological frameworks, the translation of concepts weighs heavily in this knowledge communication process. Set in this context, this essay examines the translation history of five concepts selected from *The Wealth of Nations*, based on six Chinese versions published between 1901 and 2001. These concepts are *nation*, *wealth*, *workmen*, *labor*, and *value*. By tracing and comparing different translations in a chronological order inspired by *Begriffsgeschichte* (Conceptual History¹ in English), this study aims to provide a comparative insight into the translation of chosen concepts as well as the changing meanings that they convey in a descriptive manner.

Keywords: Conceptual History; Translation of Concepts; Twenty-First Century China; Social-Historical Context, *The Wealth of Nations*.

1. Introduction

The history of translation in nineteenth and early twentieth century China has long been a popular research topic due to the intensity of ideological collision and cultural exchange of this period (Lackner et al. 2001). According to Lippert (2001, 57), in the first half of the nineteenth century, Protestant missionaries played a prominent role in the intellectual and linguistic contact between China and the West. Since late Qing (the end of the nineteenth century) when an unprecedented change took place, native Chinese translators such as Yan Fu (1854-1921) started to lend their voices in rendering and domesticating western ideas. In the twentieth century, the land of China witnessed the transformation from a feudal system to a semi-colonial state, and ultimately to independent sovereignty. As Richter (2009, 194; 2012, 23) speculates, since China was never completely colonized by an alien entity, the domestication of western ideology in China was more creatively shaped by native agents, compared to India where the

¹ I follow the convention of the English scholarship and use “Conceptual History” throughout the article.

binary option of either accept or reject was dominating the paradigm. This multi-layered competing power dynamic not only shapes modern Chinese history, but also makes relevant research into the translation and domestication of western ideas during this period more intriguing.

Within the broad realm of knowledge communication, the translation of concepts weighs heavily due to the vital role that they play in constructing ideological frameworks. Derived from Latin *concupere* (to take in and hold) and Medieval Latin *conceptum* (draft, abstract), “concept” gained the meaning of “a general notion, the immediate object of a thought” in the 1550s (Online Etymology Dictionary 2019). In the current study, the working definition of “concept” (*begriff* in German) resembles its general explanation as “term, idea” (Collins German-English Dictionary 2001, 113), which denotes the crystallization of interconnected ideas into a concise linguistic form. Owing to its clear focus complemented by constructive embedded information, concept has been widely used as a powerful tool for publicizing novel ideas like a bullet. This case is particularly true for social and political concepts, which represent the cluster of concepts reflecting on their contemporary social and political facts.

Situated within the historical background of twentieth-century China, this research aims to explore the translation and domestication of key western concepts in a descriptive manner based on a case study comprising five concepts selected from Adam Smith’s *The Wealth of Nations*. Even though translations of this specific book have been extensively studied in Chinese scholarship, a great majority of existing researches solely focus on individual translators, especially Yan Fu. Against this backdrop, the current research brings six different translations into conversation. Inspired by *Begriffsgeschichte* (Conceptual History or History of Concepts in English), this research presents a comparative insight into the evolvement of translations embodied in their individual socio-historical contexts in a chronological manner.

The structure of this chapter is as follows. Section 2 includes an essential review of the intersection of translation studies and conceptual history, as well as the guiding method of the current study inspired by these two disciplines. Section 3 displays an overview of the translation history of *The Wealth of Nations* in China, with a specific focus on the six versions sourced for this research. Section 4 comprises five case studies based on the concepts selected as data samples. Section 5 contains concluding remarks as well as suggestions for future research.

2. Translating Concepts in a Continuous History

The term translation itself is multidisciplinary in nature. Various types of practice and theories derived from translation can never solely belong to the realm of translation themselves. Moving from a prescriptive approach to a descriptive one, translation studies embraces a cultural turn (Lefevere and Bassnett 1990) and a translator’s turn (Robinson 1991), before taking off to further unleash its interdisciplinary potential. Translation of concepts is one of many topics that benefit from this trend. In history,

concepts have been widely used in social and political movements, which makes this topic a prominent research target of historians. Linked by the same research target, established expertise in concept research, such as *Begriffsgeschichte*, and intercultural insights offered by translation studies, can collectively facilitate the research on concept translation based on a reciprocal relationship between these two fields.

First articulated by Hegel (1837), *begriffsgeschichte* (conceptual history hereafter) started its development in Germany and the UK before spreading to the rest of the world. One of the prominent advocates Reinhart Koselleck (1923-2006) summarizes the idea conveyed by conceptual history as “old words acquired new meanings, which no longer require translation as one approaches the present” (cf. Sheehan 1978, 313). As Bevir (2000, 278) shows, the main idea of conceptual history is to first obtain the meaning of concepts based on a comprehensive understanding of the contemporary background of these concepts, and second arrange these meanings in a chronological way in order to present the development overtime and reveal the underlying reasons that could lead to such change.

As an early exploration of the connection between conceptual history and translation studies, Munday (2012, 54) observes that translation research related to terminology pays more attention to the standardization and unification, especially in product-oriented organizational translation activities. In comparison, conceptual history focuses more on the synchronic and diachronic variation of specific language usage. Although differences as such exist, the common ground shared by these two disciplines makes collaboration possible. The ongoing project Genealogies of Knowledge² nested at the University of Manchester in the UK, yields fruitful results based on rigorous research methods, which brings relevant studies on the translation history of concepts onto another level.

The consensus shared by conceptual history and translation studies is that, the meaning of concepts/translations undergo constant changes through time, depending on specific social and historical contexts, which makes it possible to establish a reciprocal relationship in between. As Burke (2005, 3) argues, “history deserves a large place in translation studies, and studies of translation deserve a large space in history”. In the pioneering book *Why Concepts Matter: Translating Social and Political Thought*, Richter (2012, 1-2) summarizes that conceptual history “emphasizes the central place of language and translation in political and social discourse, especially in concept formation, transmission, and reception”. Meanwhile, history of translation deals with questions such as “what has been translated, by whom, under what circumstances, and in what contexts” (p.4). These ideas echo with what Toury (2012, 31) proposed in descriptive translation studies based on his recognition of “assumed translation”, which requires the corresponding description to be properly contextualized.

² <http://genealogiesofknowledge.net>

It is necessary to understand that the challenge imposed by the study of concepts mainly lies in two aspects: 1) difficulties in tracing meanings and historical facts overtime and 2) identifying the degree of potential subjectivity. For the first point, as Sheehan (1978, 316) points out, since the number of translated concepts usually surges during social upheavals, it is difficult to keep trace of their changes in this unrested social condition. To address this issue, contemporary dictionaries can be used to trace meanings of concepts when possible. As for the second point, concept itself is a product of human thought, which is influenced by surroundings within specific time span aiming at specific outcome. The concern of authorial subjectivity has also been emphasized by many scholars since the initial development of conceptual history (for example Pocock 1972, Sheehan 1978 and Skinner 1978). Bevir (2000, 279) believes that the most appropriate context would be “the person who uses it on what particular occasion and in what particular situation”, which speaks to several mainstream translation theories in many ways. In the current study, this argument resonates with the descriptive approach in translation studies. In response to the traditional linguistic and prescriptive view of translation, Toury (1995/2012, 115) proposes a comparative analysis of “the coupled pair of replacing + replaced segments” in order to pertain translation research to its object level in a descriptive manner. With the establishment of *Target* journal, descriptive translation research has witnessed considerable development facilitated by advancing methodology.

With convincing solutions, these challenges cannot shield the benefits that conceptual history could bring to translation studies. It lends support to the chronological approach in translation analysis with comparative insights and it provides researchers with a diachronic vision of conceptual changes in a continuous historical scope, which, in practice, allows translators to obtain a thorough understanding of both source and target texts in history.

Guided by conceptual history and descriptive translation studies, this essay traces the meaning of translated concepts and arranges them in a chronological order to present the change of these concepts/translations overtime. In addition, etymology is one of the primary concerns of conceptual history. Therefore, both etymological information and contemporary meanings obtained from corpus-based dictionaries and existing literatures are included in the analysis, in order to provide a continuum of conceptual development of translation samples. Last but not least, as previously mentioned, conceptual history also focuses on identifying the reason that might lead to conceptual change. In the current study, however, this aspect of conceptual history is not discussed due to the limited number of data sample.

3. One Hundred Years’ of Translating *WN* in China

The Wealth of Nations (*WN*), short for *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, written by the Scottish economist Adam Smith (1723-1790), was first published in 1776. Between 1776 and 1789, five editions became available in Smith’s lifetime. Each edition contains two volumes, for a total of five books. Based

on Adam Smith's observation at the beginning of the Industrial Revolution, this collection aims at overcoming the defects of outdated theories of Mercantilism and Physiocracy back then. Taking self-interest and natural liberty as the basics, *WN* made a huge contribution to the formation of our modern society. In the introduction to the reprinted version of *WN* published in 1970, Seligman (1970, v) noted that this book "has become one of the classics of literature in general, as well as of the literature of economics in particular". *WN* marks the starting point of Classical Economics as a discipline and has laid a huge impact on later economists including Jean-Baptiste Say, David Ricardo and Thomas Malthus (O'Driscoll 1979, ix). With the help of translation, its influence breaks through the physical border of Scotland, crosses the Atlantic Ocean and the English Channel, and spreads all over the world.

As soon as the first edition of *WN* was published, a German translation became available in the same year, followed by French in 1778, Danish in 1779, Italian in 1790 and Spanish in 1792 (Lai 1996, 469). In China, this book started to attract people's attention in the 1870s. In 1874 when Tongwen Guan (*tóng wén guǎn* 同文馆) was established, a selected section from *WN* was introduced in the textbook *Manual of Political Economy* (Zhang 2010, 95). This introduction of *WN* was initiated by the American missionary William Alexander Parsons Martin (a.k.a. 丁韪良 Ding Weiliang). With the growing social attention, several abridged Chinese translations were published following this trend. In 1897, Yan Fu, as one of the primary advocates and translators of western thoughts back then, started to translate *WN*. In 1901, the first full translation into Classical Chinese was published, titled *Yuanfu* (*Yuán Fù* 《原富》). Thirty years later, the first Contemporary Chinese version, translated by Marxists Guo Da-li and Wang Ya-nan titled *Guofulun* (*Guó Fù Lùn* 《国富论》), was published in Shanghai. Dozens of Chinese versions became available in the twenty-first century, owing to an increasing public attention to the importance of political economics (Yang and Bao 2013, 211). The majority of Chinese scholars and ordinary readers rely on the translated versions of *WN*, which makes the research into these translations even more essential.

Taking six Chinese versions of *WN* published during 1901 to 2001 as source texts, this study compares the translation of selected concepts by drawing on their change of meanings in a chronological order. Even though there are many Chinese translations of *WN* published during the twentieth century, the selection criterion in the current study is oriented by the public influence of these translations, evaluated by research attention, marketing reflection and national media nomination. The six versions are:

1. 《原富》 *Yuán fù* (*The Origin of Wealth*), Yan Fu 严复, 1901.
2. 《国富论》 *Guó fù lùn* (*National Wealth Theory*), Guo Da-li 郭大力 and Wang Ya-nan 王亚南, 1931.

3. 《国民财富的性质和原因的研究》 *Guó mín cái fù dì xìng zhì hé yuán yīn dī yán jiū* (*Research into the Nature and Causes of National Wealth*), Guo Da-li 郭大力 and Wang Ya-nan 王亚南, 1972 (revised edition).
4. 《国富论》 *Guó fù lùn* (*National Wealth Theory*), Zhou Xian-wen 周宪文 and Zhang Han-yu 张汉裕, 1974 (Taiwanese edition published in Taipei).
5. 《国富论》 *Guó fù lùn* (*National Wealth Theory*), Yang Jing-nian 杨敬年, 1999.
6. 《国富论》 *Guó fù lùn* (*National Wealth Theory*), Xie Zong-lin 谢宗林 and Li Hua-xia 李华夏, 2001 (Taiwanese edition published in Beijing).

The coverage of exactly 100 years embedded in the dramatic historical evolution of China over this period provides a unique angle to the interaction between translation and Chinese history. Dating back to 1901 when the Qing dynasty was trembling at the edge of its unstable sovereignty, the land of China was shrouded by the haze of invasion. Activists such as Yan Fu were desperately seeking solutions to save the autonomy. For the first completed version of *WN*, Yan Fu spent four years translating *Yuán Fù* before it was published by the College of Translation in Nan Yang Public School (*nán yáng gōng xué yì shū guǎn* 南洋公学译书馆) in 1901. Yan Fu believed that Smith's economic theories helped the British government out of the depression, and if these ideas were accepted by the royal court, it was possible to save the Qing Dynasty in the same way (Liu 2015, 33). The source text used by Yan Fu was Thorold Rogers' edition, published by the Oxford University Press in 1869. Rogers was a Member of Parliament in the UK during 1880 to 1886. As an economist and historian, he was a supporter of free-trade policy and an advocate for social justice and his notes might have influenced Yan Fu's understanding of *WN* (Liu 2015, 33). In addition, as one of the translations by Yan Fu which aimed at the introduction of western philosophy to Chinese audience, *Yuán Fù* also functioned as the supporting evidence of Yan Fu's own political and social theories (Ma 1995, 382). Although this translation has been criticized as being unfaithful, *Yuán Fù* was highly acknowledged by Yan Fu's fellow social activists in his era (ibid.).

When *Yuán Fù* was published in 1901, Wang Ya-nan was born. As a Marxist, he joined the Northern Expedition in 1927 but was expelled in 1928. He then moved to Dafo Temple (*dà fó sì* 大佛寺) in Hangzhou, where he met Guo Da-li, a 23-year-old recent graduate in philosophy who was passionate about translating Marx and Engels into Chinese. As a preparation for their later translation of *Das Kapital*, they decided to start with classics in Economics. The source text they used for translating *WN* was Thorold Rogers' second edition, published by Oxford University Press in 1880. In 1931, thirty years later after *Yuán Fù* was published, the first Contemporary Chinese version of *WN* was accomplished by Guo Da-li and Wang Ya-nan. The translation received great popularity and was re-printed for several times, resulting from the low stock in bookshops. In 1965, Guo and Wang started to draft the revised version which was published in 1972. Two versions by Guo Da-li and Wang Ya-nan are regarded as the most readable versions for their use of languages and their loyalty towards the original

copy. In the introduction to the first version, Guo and Wang (1972, 7) commented that Yan Fu's version was too tough to read with over-abridged content and the social, economic and cultural situation in late Qing was far below what the theory in this book required. In their own monographs, they strongly opposed the Capitalist ideas of Adam Smith. The main motivation for them to translate *WN* was to provide a critical foundation for their further introduction of Marxism, which was different from Yan Fu's incentive.

In 1999, the version translated by Yang Jing-nian was published, representing the perception of *WN* in the post "Reform and Open-up" era of contemporary China. Born in 1908, Yang Jing-nian obtained his doctorate in political economy at the University of Oxford in 1948. In the same year, he returned to China and worked as a professor at Nan-kai University (excluding 1957-1978 due to political reasons). As an active translator, his translation of economics, banking and finance, as well as his monographs on Chinese economy made a huge contribution to the establishment and development of Economics in China. In the introduction to his translation, Yang mentioned that the source text he referred to was Edwin Canaan's edition published by Methuen in 1904 and he also paid tribute to Guo and Wang's translations. Although this edition contains abundant side notes of the main content, without translators' acknowledgement, it is not possible to estimate to what extent they were influenced by these notes.

In addition, the only two copies translated by Taiwanese scholars, are chosen to provide a more comprehensive view in the 1970s and the 2000s. The 1974 version, translated by Zhou Xian-wen and Zhang Han-yu, also used Edwin Canaan's edition of *WN* as the source text. Both translators were renowned economists and active translators who received academic training in Economics in Japan. As economists, they played an important role in shaping and leading Economics research in Taiwan. In Wu's (2002, 789) review of the economic growth in Taiwan, he commented that Zhou and Zhang's translation of *WN*, as the first attempt to translate the book (in Taiwan) after Yan Fu, marked the starting point of the theoretical analysis in Economics.

The 2001 version was translated by Xie Zong-lin and Li Hua-xia – two Taiwanese translators and researchers who had doctorate training in Economics in the Washington University in St. Louis and the Southern Illinois University the USA. Noticeably, this version was published by the Central Compilation & Translation Press in Beijing and it is not addressed which edition they were referring to or their motivation to translate *WN*. The other translations of these two translators, such as *The Theory of Moral Sentiments* (Xie), *The Theory of the Leisure Class* (Li) and *Butterfly Economics* (Li), were also published by mainstream publishers in Beijing.

Based on the importance of these translations in understanding *WN*, and the vital role that selected concepts play in major ideological trends and historical events in the Chinese context, five concepts (*nation, wealth, workmen, labor, and value*) and their corresponding translations identified in the abovementioned Chinese versions were selected for the case study displayed in the following section.

4. Case Study

4.1 Nation

Originated from Middle English from Latin *natio(n-)*, “nation” has two basic contemporary meanings: 1) a country that has its own land and government; 2) the people of a particular country (Macmillan Dictionary Online 2019). In the late thirteenth century, “nation” meant “racial group”, and it did not acquire its political sense until the seventeenth century (Williams 1976, 178). The word “nation” contains informative messages throughout the book. Below is an extract from Chapter IV:

Different metals have been made use of by different **nations** (ST2) for this purpose. Iron was the common instrument of commerce among the ancient Spartans; copper among the ancient Romans; and gold and silver among all rich and commercial **nations** (ST3).

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book I, Chapter IV, p.21.³

Table 1 shows the translations of three source texts: ST1 in the book title, and ST2 and ST3 in the above extract.

Table 1: Translations of *Nation*.

	Yan Fu 1901	Guo & Wang 1931	Guo & Wang 1972	Zhou & Zhang 1974	Yang 1999	Xie & Li 2001
ST1	國 guó	國 guó	国民 guó mín	國 guó	国 guó	国 guó
ST2	(omitted)	國 guó	国 guó	國民 guó mín	国家 guó jiā	国家 guó jiā
ST3	國 guó	國民 guó mín	国民 guó mín	國民 guó mín	国家 guó jiā	民族 mín zú

As the table shows, there are three varieties in translation: 1) guo/guojia (*guó/guó jiā* 国/国家) – state, a political regime; 2) guomin (*guó mín* 国民) – people within a country; 3) minzu (*mín zú* 民族) – racial groups, which echoes the contextual elements of “Spartans” and “Romans” in the ST.

For the title, Guo and Wang changed their translation from guo (*guó* 国, 1931) to guomin (*guó mín* 国民, 1972), bringing the notion of people into conversation. In comparison, other translations rendered “nation” as guo/guojia (*guó/guó jiā* 国/国家), weighting heavily on the meaning of “state”. For ST2 and ST3, the level of variation among the translations increases. In the excerpt, ST2 and ST3 bear the same meaning, although ST2 is presented in an abstract manner and ST3 is mentioned alongside concrete examples. There is a similarity between Guo & Wang (1931 and 1972) and Xie & Li (2001, TW): when nation is mentioned as an abstraction (ST2), they referred to it as guo/guojia (*guó/guó jiā* 国/国家); when it concretely refers to either “ancient

³ All page numbers of abridged paragraphs are as in *WN*, edited by Edwin R. A. Seligman (1910).

Spartans” or “ancient Romans” (ST3), they chose *guomin* (*guó mín* 国民) and *minzu* (*mín zú* 民族) instead of the political sense.

The meaning of a source text can be tantalizing. In this case, however, the major difference lies in whether “nation” means state/government in a political sense or focuses more on the people within the nation. As a translator of the 2001 version, Xie Zong-lin (2010, 48) reflects on his translation experience and suggests that nation is closer to “state” than to “people” with two reasons: first, nation is frequently translated as “state”, as can be seen in “the United Nations”; second, the main issue discussed in *WN* is how to make a state wealthier.

In response to this view, Bao and Cao (2012, 66) argue that based on the historical context, Smith’s understanding of nation is nowhere close to the meaning of nation as in “the United Nations”. Quoting Smith, they also contend that nation denotes people:

Political economy...proposes to provide a plentiful revenue or subsistence for the people, or more properly to enable them to provide such a revenue sufficient for the public services. It proposes *to enrich both the people and the sovereign*.

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book IV, p.375.

Bao and Cao (*ibid.*) goes on to argue that although both “people” and “sovereign” are essential, “people” should have priority over “state”. Similarly, Li (2014, 27-31) also demonstrates that in Smith’s vision, individuals within the state are the real beneficiaries of economic activity.

As a mutual perception, Feng’s (2013, 69) suggestion is that both “people” and “state” have their respective merits rooted in classical Chinese political ideas. On the one hand, the choice of “people” echoes Confucius’s idea: good manners spread through morality; morality produces benefits; benefits appeal to citizens and this is the key to reign⁴. On the other hand, “state” appeals to the value of Guan Zhong⁵ that a wealthy state stabilizes its governance: only when someone is fully stocked, will s/he learn about manners and refrain; only when someone has an abundant supply of clothing and food, will s/he understand honor and shame⁶.

While the above arguments have their respective merits, contemporary authors offer new suggestions to the meaning of nation in *WN*, facilitating the understanding of social norms conveyed by this concept. For instance, Donaldson (2001, 25-36) argues that apart from its traditional forms, new forms of wealth such as social capital, should be counted when determining the wealth of a nation. This idea brings the translation choice of “people” to vivid life with great expectations: the wealth of people within a

⁴ 《左传·成公二年》：礼以义行，义以生利，利以平民，政之大节也。

⁵ 720-645 BC, a philosopher and politician who served as chancellor and was a reformer of the State of Qi during the Spring and Autumn period of Chinese history.

⁶ 《史记》：仓廩实而知礼节，衣食足而知荣辱。

state counts thereby a broader range of economic contributors is taken into consideration. It follows that “people” would be more appropriate than “state” for translating nation in modern times.

4.2 Wealth

According to Williams (1976, 280), “wealth” originally meant “happiness and well-being”. In the late fifteenth century, it acquired its general meaning as 1) abundance; 2) money and possessions. Later in the seventeenth and eighteenth century, the meaning of wealth was dominated by “money and possession”, leaving little space for “abundance”. In contemporary understanding, wealth denotes 1) an abundance of valuable possessions or money; 2) the state of being rich; 3) a plentiful supply of a useful thing. As a significant component, wealth represents the goal of a nation based on the theories proposed in *WN*.

Table 2 presents the translation of wealth in the title (ST1), in “national wealth” (ST2) and “wealth of a country” (ST3) extracted from Chapter VIII.

Table 2: Translations of *Wealth*

	Yan Fu 1901	Guo & Wang 1931	Guo & Wang 1972	Zhou & Zhang 1974	Yang 1999	Xie & Li 2001
ST1	富 fù	富 fù	财富 cái fù	富 fù	富 fù	富 fù
ST2	財 cái	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù
ST3	財 cái	(omitted)	富有 fù yǒu	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù	財富 cái fù

The main difference between fu (*fù* 富) and caifu (*cái fù* 财富) rests in their different emphases. As an adjective, fu (*fù* 富) means “abundant and rich”. As a verb, it means “to enrich”. In comparison, caifu (*cái fù* 财富) solely means “money or other valuable possessions” without the sense of “abundant”.

In Classical Chinese, fu (*fù* 富) is an independent word with various usages. As early as in the Warring States Period (fifth century BC), fu (*fù* 富), with its meaning of abundance, was mentioned as one of the nine methods to satisfy citizens in political theories⁷. Later in the Southern and Northern Dynasties Period (420-589), historian Fan Ye (398-445) mentioned fu (*fù* 富) alongside nation to express the meaning of “enriching and satisfying our people”⁸.

On the other hand, caifu (*cái fù* 财富) only appears in Contemporary Chinese. Specifically, the translation guomincaifu (national wealth, *guó mín cái fù* 国民财富), as found in the 1972 version – appears in mainstream contemporary Chinese

⁷ 《周礼·天官冢宰·大宰》：九曰籩，以富得民。

⁸ 《后汉书·方术列传上·许杨》：明府今兴立废业，富国安民 [...].

dictionaries as: valuable possessions, both tangible and intangible assets, of a society or a country within a certain period.

In general, fu (*fù* 富) is an ideal correspondence of wealth in Chinese, for they share a similar history in evolvement. Nevertheless, as a single-character word, fu (*fù* 富) is not widely used in Contemporary Chinese, thus it might decrease the level of naturalness if used in translation. Additionally, according to contemporary Chinese dictionaries, caifu (*cái fù* 财富) includes everything valuable, both tangible and intangible assets. The intangible value of labor, such as dexterity, frequently appears in *WN*. It is undoubtedly an important part of national wealth and a potential rendering of wealth in the *WN* context. Despite this, the perception of caifu (*cái fù* 财富) could be partial without reference to dictionary since the character fu (*fù* 富) can easily be taken for its face value as money.

4.3 Workmen

The word “workman” derives from Old English with a contemporary meaning of “a man employed to do manual labor”. The phrase “Good Workman” normally means “a person with specified skill in a job or craft” (Williams 1976, 282). Meanings of workman, laborer and worker are similar to each other: manual workers were generalized as laborers from the thirteenth century (ibid). After the nineteenth century, the spread of Marxism added a special sense to workmen – the plural form of workman – to denote a large and important social class. In *WN*, Smith frequently used the plural form “workmen” to represent a group of workers, as shown in three typical examples below:

A great part of the machines [...] were originally the inventions of common **workmen** (ST1) ...

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book I, Chapter I, p.9.

The value which the **workmen** (ST2) add to the materials, therefore, resolves itself in this case into two parts, of which the one pays their wages, the other the profits of their employer upon the whole stock of materials and wages which he advances.

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book I, Chapter VI, p.42.

...in every part of Europe, twenty **workmen** (ST3) serve under a master for one that is independent...

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book I, Chapter VIII, p.58.

Table 3: Translations of *Workmen*

	Yan Fu 1901	Guo & Wang 1931	Guo & Wang 1972	Zhou & Zhang 1974	Yang 1999	Xie & Li 2001
ST1	工傭 gōng yōng	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén

ST2	力作者 lì zuò zhě	(omitted)	劳动者 láo dòng zhě	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén
ST3	勞力者 láo lì zhě	(omitted)	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén	工人 gōng rén

In *WN*, whether the term “workmen” specially refers to industrial workers remains a question. However, in most cases, it was used to describe industrial production process. Therefore, “workmen” in *WN* is clearly related to the employment relationship in the Capitalist framework, in contrast to the self-sufficient production system in the Chinese history. As Table 3 shows, translations of workmen in relation to both “employer” (ST2) and “master” (ST3) mostly appear as gongren (worker, *gōng rén* 工人) except for Yan Fu, whose translation contains the most creative elements.

For ST1, Yan Fu chose gongyong (hired worker, *gōng yōng* 工佣) even though the usage of gongren (worker, *gōng rén* 工人) had been recorded in his contemporary dictionaries (see for example, Kwong 1887). In dictionaries published around Yan Fu’s time, *gōng* 工 was noted as craftsman, peasants and other laborers in general, while *yōng* 佣 meant being employed (Hemeling 1905/1916). The combination of these two characters did not exist as a commonly used word in Classical Chinese, nor in Contemporary Chinese. However, Yan Fu’s translation of workmen as gongyong (*gōng yōng* 工佣) is a decent conceptual equivalence of workmen in *WN*. Before the first half of the twentieth century in China, the so-called self-sufficient agriculture-based peasant economy dominated the society, when the concept of employment relationship was not widely accepted. Therefore, it is not redundant for Yan Fu to include both “craftsman” and “employed” to spread the idea of modern employment relations in text since this concept was not yet well received in people’s mind.

Except for Yan Fu, all translators chose *gōng rén* 工人. Later, this term became standardized in translating workmen in *WN* and started its new life as an independent concept in Chinese. Among all these translations, *gōng rén* 工人 was initially used by Guo and Wang (1931) to emphasize the identity of workmen as human (*rén* 人), in contrast to Yan Fu’s focus on the employment relation. Since the New Culture Movement in the 1920s, Marxism spread wildly in China and the concept *gōng rén* 工人 was frequently used as a slogan to publicize Marxist ideas. Although it is the literal translation for workmen, *gōng rén* 工人, as a term in its own right, does not convey the employment relation carried by the original concept. However, when this relation was widely accepted by people, this constructive translation strategy witnessed a huge success with less in text but more in mind.

History shows that the standardization of *gōng rén* 工人 was mainly driven by the governmental propaganda of a specific period in contemporary China. This standardization process also means that employment relation was widely acknowledged. More importantly, the social status of workmen was promoted as public slogans of that period show. This upraised status of working class revealing the changing meaning of the target text, is further shown in the translation of “master” and “employer” included

in the excerpts earlier: only Yan Fu translated the people who hired workmen literally as “master”, and all other translators consistently rendered it as “employer”, though both “master” and “employer” were used in *WN*.

To put these translations into a historical timeline, it shows that even though the same concept was used in translation, the actual meaning and representation of this standardized term *gōng rén* 工人 experienced several shifts in the twentieth century, resulting from the revolution and reform of the economic system. Initially, it was widely used to spread Marxism in China. For example, in Mao Zedong’s (1925) influential article titled “An Analysis of Social Classes in China” (*Zhōngguó shèhuì gèjīcéng de fēnxī* 《中国社会各阶层的分析》), *gōng rén* 工人 denotes the composition of a social class that represents the most advanced productivity. Major translations of Marxism theories and public slogans used by Chinese Marxists consistently chose *gōng rén* 工人 as the Chinese term for “workmen” and its affiliated terms, which thoroughly changed the social status and intellectual connotation of “workmen” in English. This trend influenced and was in turn driven by the authoritative translation of *Das Kapital* by Guo and Wang published in 1938. Since the establishment of People’s Republic of China in 1949, the Working Class had been honored as the leading power and considered the greatest supporters of Socialism construction. Since the reform in the 1980s, a large number of state-owned companies went bankrupt, leaving a great number of workers unemployed. As a result, the Working Class, mainly consisting of workers from these enterprises and once protected by the government, gradually lost their advantages (Chen 2009, 165). Together with the reform of household registration policy, peasant people from rural areas were able to travel freely and find new ways of living. As a result, the actual representation of the Working Class changed from workers of state-owned companies to individual workers from remote rural areas. With the ongoing reform in higher education and medical institutes in China, the meanings of social concepts have been undergoing constant changes. This example of workmen only gives a glimpse of this massive trend.

4.4 Labor

“Labor” is a notable example where the original meaning contained in the source text overpowers the original meaning of chosen Chinese terms due to the change of social and historical contexts. According to Online Etymology Dictionary (2019) and Williams (1976, 146), labor is derived from Latin *labor* and *laborem* via old French *labor* (noun) and *labourer* (verb). Based on contemporary dictionaries, it carries three contemporary meanings in English as a noun: 1) work, especially physical work; 2) especially referring to the Labor Party; 3) the process of childbirth.

According to Williams (*ibid.*), labor was initially associated with demanding manual works. In the sixteenth century, the meaning of pain in relation to childbirth was added to the concept. In the seventeenth century, the sense of difficulty mingled with pain became dominant and labor started to represent a general social activity with

collective abstraction. Later on, Adam Smith’s classical economics theory and Marx’s labor theory of value further enhance the sense of labor being productive work and an element of production in paid employment.

In order to differentiate labor as an independent concept from the term “division of labor”, samples were chosen where “labor” was used independently. The following extract is an example:

...it is but a very small part of these with which a man’s own **labor** (ST1) can supply him. The far greater part of them he must derive from the **labor** (ST2) of other people, and he must be rich or poor according to the quantity of that **labor** (ST3) which he can command...**Labor** (ST4), therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable value of all commodities.

Adam Smith, *WN*, Chapter V, p.26.

Table 4: Translations of *Labor*

	Yan Fu 1901	Guo & Wang 1931	Guo & Wang 1972	Zhou & Zhang 1974	Yang 1999	Xie & Li 2001
ST1	(omitted)	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng
ST2	(omitted)	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng
ST3	功力 gōng lì (footnote)	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng
ST4	功力 gōng lì	劳働 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	労働 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng	劳动 láo dòng

Before the 1930s, the meaning of labor perceived in Chinese was obscure. This led to translation differences found in the 1901 version and the subsequent translations. Yan Fu rendered labor as gongli (*gōng lì* 功力), which means the strength devoted to work as a living method (Classical Chinese Dictionary 2013). English-Chinese dictionaries of Yan Fu’s time (Kwong 1887; Hemeling 1905/1916) show that the English word labor primarily meant laoli (physical work, *láo lì* 劳力), which to some extent explains Yan Fu’s choice of gongli (*gōng lì* 功力). In Yan Fu’s era, the term laodong (*láo dòng* 劳动) was denoted as exercising one’s body with a close link to health and wellbeing. Although this term had been in existence before Yan Fu carried out his translation, it was not part of the modern production conversation and was not used in political and social contexts back then. This development of meaning is also true for the Japanese term *roudou* 労働, where the meaning of *hataraku* はたらく (to work) was also added to its original connotation of exercising for health (Grand Japanese Dictionary online). After the 1930s, this term was bonded with capital production activities in China (Morgan 1932). Taking laodong (*láo dòng* 劳动) as the corresponding Chinese term for labor undoubtedly changed the original meaning of this term, which is reflected in the difference between Yan Fu’s translation and all other versions since the 1930s.

Due to historical and regional conventions, Guo and Wang (1931) and Zhou and Zhang (1974) used traditional Chinese characters in their translation. It is interesting to see that Guo and Wang (1931) used *dòng* 働 in contrast to the later-standardized traditional Chinese *dòng* 動 used in Zhou and Zhang’s 1974 version. There are two possible reasons for this discrepancy. On one hand, Chinese language was in a transferring stage in the 1930s and no standardized reference was available back then. The difference between *dòng* 動 and *dòng* 働 lies in the radical of “亻” – a variation of man (*rén* 人). The usage of *dòng* 働 in Guo and Wang (1931) might indicate their preference in emphasizing the importance of people in the production process. Second, as pioneer translators, Guo and Wang could also be influenced by Japanese translations of *WN*. Before their Chinese translations, the available translations of *WN* in China were in Classical Chinese, German, and Japanese. In this condition, Japanese translations might have played a part in Guo and Wang’s translation of *WN*. According to Japanese dictionaries, *roudou* 労働 and *roudou* 労働 both mean “labor” and can be used interchangeably. In the Grand Dictionary of Japanese (online database), these two terms are explained as “in Economics, the act of humans working on objects using their human parts including hands, feet and brains, in order to obtain necessary living resources”⁹. However, based on the etymological information recorded in the dictionary, in the 1870s, these two terms were used interchangeably with traceable evidence. But later since the 1890s, with the development of *roudou undou* 労働運動 (labor movement or working-class movement), 労働 – the original Japanese term – became popular¹⁰. Also, in their verb forms, *ugoku* 動く implies “to change” or “to move” while *hataraku* 働く represents “to work”. Therefore, *roudou* 労働 is more frequently seen when describing the actual practice of labor in Japanese.

4.5 Value

Derived from Latin *valere* (be strong, be of value) via Old French *value* (worth, price, moral worth), value acquired the meaning of “social principle” from 1918 (Online Etymology Dictionary 2019). As a noun, it has four main contemporary meanings: 1) the amount that something is worth; 2) the degree of importance and usefulness; 3) principles and beliefs; 4) quantity with concrete meanings in different subjects such as mathematics (Oxford Dictionary online 2019; Macmillan Dictionary online 2019). Based on Adam Smith’s assumption of social participants as individuals driven by self-interests, value functions as a norm in capital markets, which plays a fundamental role in the formation of a self-regulating economy. In *WN*, it denotes the natural value of goods in relation to their real and nominal prices, covering both functional (i.e. utility)

⁹ 経済学で、人間がその生存に必要な物資を得るために、手・足・頭脳などの活動によって労働対象にはたらきかけること。[<https://kotobank.jp/word/労働・労働-2093544>].

¹⁰ 明治三〇年頃から活動が盛んになった労働運動では、「労働」を用いている。[ibid.]

and moral aspects. The excerpt which provide the context for chosen examples is presented as follows:

The **value** (ST1) of any commodity [...] labor, therefore, is the real measure of the exchangeable **value** (ST2) of all commodities.

Adam Smith, *WN*, Book I, Chapter V, pp.26-27.

Among the translations shown in Table 5 below, Yan Fu used zhi (*zhí* 值, worth) for ST1 and gui (*guì* 贵, expensive or valuable) for ST2. Yang (1999) chose jiage (*jià gé* 价格, price) for ST2. In addition to these translations, all others rendered value as jiazhi (*jià zhí* 价值). Although all four Chinese expressions mentioned above share certain similarities in meaning, jiazhi (*jià zhí* 价值) is undoubtedly the best choice for translating value based on the conceptual information this pair of translation segment conveys.

Table 5: Translations of *Value*

	Yan Fu 1901	Guo & Wang 1931	Guo & Wang 1972	Zhou & Zhang 1974	Yang 1999	Xie & Li 2001
ST1	值 zhí	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí
ST2	贵 guì	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí	价值 jià zhí	价格 jià gé	价值 jià zhí

Similar to the situation of translating other concepts, it was challenging for translators to find Chinese terms that corresponded to their English counterparts back then. In the case of “value”, Yan Fu’s choice of zhi (*zhí* 值) indicates this difficulty. At that time, zhi (*zhí* 值) mainly meant “when” and “encounter” in Chinese, which can be found in phrases such as shizhi (*shí zhí* 时值) or zhengzhi (*zhèng zhí* 正值), both of which mean “at the time when”. As for his rendering of ST2 as gui (*guì* 贵), this translation does cover the morality sense contained in the original concept. As a speculation, this translation could be the result of Yan Fu’s disagreement on the Labor Theory of Value by Adam Smith. In an article about Yan Fu’s working manuscript of the *WN* archived at the National Library of China in Beijing, Liu (2015, 36) shows that Yan Fu’s note on *WN* suggests that he held different ideas from Smith’s theory of value. In his hand-written annotations, Yan Fu clearly commented that “value is not determined by labor”¹¹ and suggested that it should be determined by supply and demand.

After the Age of Enlightenment in the eighteenth century, ordinary people in the west started to look at individuality and liberate themselves from absolute monarchy and Roman Catholic Church through a series of reform and revolution. Consequently, people gained their rights to have individual beliefs and started to explore this modern

¹¹ 真值不由功力決定。（《原富》手稿，嚴復，1901-1902。）

concept. The value of a society was then formed based on these individual values in a bottom-up manner. However, the deeply rooted feudalism in China prevented this modernization trend. In Yan Fu's contemporary, people did not have enough space for their own faith apart from being obedient to the royal court and honour Confucianism, which was manipulated as a strong tool to govern the people. As the replacement, dogma was everywhere. The principle of feudal moral conduct "Sangang Wuchang" (*sān gāng wǔ cháng*, 三纲五常, literally means three rules and five standards) is an example. Social ideology was in strict control by Tianzi (*tiān zǐ*, 天子, the emperor, the child of the heaven), as an efficient tool for governance. Even though this rigid system started to crack back then, value, in a liberal sense, was still emerging. This conflict also appeared in Yan Fu's translation as Hu (2002, 65) mentions. Since the twentieth century, people started to set free from this kind of manipulation. Thereafter, the standardized Chinese term of value – *jià zhí* 价值 – came into being.

However, Yang (1999) chose *jiage* (*jià gé* 价格), which literally means "price", in his translation of ST2. It is clearly denoted that price does not equal value and price is merely the monetary representation of value (Zhu 1986, 80). Also, in Guo (2004, 59), the ordinary translations of *jiage* (*jià gé* 价格, price) into English are "price, cost, figure, rate, level and ratio", where value is not an option. In comparison, the term *jiazhi* (*jià zhí* 价值), chosen by the majority of translators, is a better option for translating value into Chinese. The reason mainly lies in two aspects. In terms of the meanings, *jiazhi* (*jià zhí* 价值) covers both functional and moral aspects as value in English. For example, the term *jiazhiguan* (*jià zhí guān* 价值观, literally means the outlook on value) are used to denote both individual and societal value.

5. Concluding Remarks

The main idea of conceptual history is to reveal how concepts become fundamental subjects of a society by looking into the movement, reception, and further development of concepts (Wang 2014, 50). In the modern Chinese context, translation plays a critical part in this process. As the present study shows, retrieving both historical and contemporary meanings of translation products and arranging them in a chronological order as conceptual history requires, are useful to contextualize translation products in their contemporary contexts and observe translation shifts over time. This method not only meets the expectation of descriptive translation studies but also reinforces the credibility of the descriptive approach to examining the translation of concepts by taking both contemporary and historical elements into consideration.

It is shown that the obscure conceptual meaning in English and the lack of full correspondence in Chinese collectively lead to different translation results based on translators' contemporary contexts. This is particular true for Yan Fu's translation, where new terms were composed to denote foreign concepts, or existing terms acquired new meanings to serve their historical roles. As a tool to naturalize western concepts for domestic needs, Chinese translations, blended with the novel meanings they

conveyed, were then accepted as independent concepts. The discrepancies in translating keywords in the selected Chinese versions have revealed that the meaning of a concept is adapted for different circumstances, thus its target text is autonomous from birth and gradually gains its identity as a new concept in the target culture before further modifying its meaning under different social and political contexts. Based on this point, this study also seeks to offer clues to discuss the source-target relationship in translation practice, which can hopefully invite further discussions on the conceptualization of translation at a theoretical level.

There are several future directions of this topic. First, oriented by the descriptive feature shared by Conceptual History and Translation Studies, it is necessary to expand the data sample included in the discussion: the recent trend of corpus analysis within Translation Studies could be of great help. Second, apart from the two research questions discussed in this paper, other issues such as translation strategies for concepts are also interesting to look into based on the categories of concepts within the realm of Conceptual History. Third, to obtain a higher accountability in tracing the meaning of concepts through time, other materials such as slogans, governmental documents, and literary works could be used as reference when analyzing translation issues. Last but not least, comparisons can be made between Chinese and other languages such as German, Russian, and Japanese. As a part of the world history, China shares an interactive relationship with the other countries where Conceptual History and Translation Studies together provide the route for researchers to reach a wider context.

List of Translations

- Smith, Adam. 1869. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 1st edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press; trans. by Yan Fu (1901/1981) as 《原富》 (*Yuán fù*). Shanghai: The Commercial Press (originally published in Shanghai: Nanyang Gongxue Translation Publishing House in 1901).
- Smith, Adam. 1880. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, 2nd edition, Oxford: Oxford University Press; trans. by Guo Da-li and Wang Ya-nan (1931) as 《国富论》 (*Guó fù lùn*), Shanghai: Shen Zhou Guo Guang Press.
- Smith, Adam. 1880. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, Oxford: Oxford University Press; trans. by Guo Da-li and Wang Ya-nan (1972) as 《国民财富的性质和原因的研究》 (*Guó mín cái fù dì xìng zhì hé yuán yīn jí yán jiū*), Shanghai: The Commercial Press.
- Smith, Adam. 1904. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, London: Methuen; trans. by Zhou Xian-wen and Zhang Han-yu (1974) as 《国富论》 (*Guó fù lùn*), Taipei: Bank of Taiwan Press.
- Smith, Adam. 1904. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*, London: Methuen; trans. by Yang Jing-nian (1999) as 《国富论》 (*Guó fù lùn*), Xi'an: Shaanxi People's Publisher.

Smith, Adam. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*; trans. by Xie Zong-lin and Li Hua-xia (2001) as 《国富论》 (*Guó fù lùn*), Beijing: Central Compilation & Translation Press.

References

- Bevir, Mark. 2000. Review: Begriffsgeschichte. *History and Theory* 39(1): 273-384.
- Burke, Peter. 2005. Lost (and Found) in Translation: A Cultural History of Translators and Translating in Early Modern Europe. In *KB Lecture*. Wassenaar: Netherland Institute for Advanced Study.
- Chen, Feng. 2009. State Institution and the Establishment of Working Class (*Guó jiā zhì dù yǔ gōng rén jiē jí dī xíng chéng* 国家制度与工人阶级的形成). *Sociology Studies* 5: 165-188.
- Donaldson, Tomas. 2001. The Ethical Wealth of Nations. *Journal of Business Ethics* 31(1): 25-36.
- Etymology Dictionary Online. 2019. <https://www.etymonline.com/>. Accessed 24 July 2019.
- Feng, Hong. 2013. A Comparison between Wealth of Country and Wealth of Nation thoughts in Ancient China (*Zhōng guó gǔ dài guó fù lùn yǔ mǐn fù lùn dī jīng jì sī xiǎng zhī bǐ jiào* 中国古代国富论与民富论的经济思想之比较). *Forward Position* 18: 68-71.
- Guo, Li-hong. 2004. Different Translations of ‘Jia Ge’ in Business English (*Jià gé yī cí zài shāng wù yīng yǔ zhōng dí duō zhǒng yì fǎ* 价格一词在商务英语中的多种译法). *Chinese Science and Technology Translators Journal* 17(2): 59.
- Hegel, Friedrich. 1837. *Vorlesungen über die Philosophie der Weltgeschichte*. English edition: Hegel, Friedrich. 1975. *Lectures on the Philosophy of World History*. Trans. H. B. Nisbet. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hemeling, K. 1905/1916. *English-Chinese Dictionary of the Standard Chinese Spoken Language and Handbook for Translators (based on G. C. Stent 1905 dictionary)*. London: P. S. King & Son.
- Hu, Pei-zhao. 2002. Discussion on “Yuan Fu” and “Guo Fu Lun” (*Dāng biàn “yuán fù” yǔ “guó fù lùn”* 当辩“原富”与“国富论”). *Academic Monthly* 9: 63-66.
- Lackner, Michael, Iwo Amelung, and Joachim Kurtz. 2001. *New Terms for New Ideas: Western Knowledge and Lexical Change in Late Imperial China*. Leiden: Brill.
- Lai, Cheng-chung. 1996. Translation of The Wealth of Nations. *Journal of European Economic History* 25(2): 467-475.
- Lefevere, André and Susan Bassnett. 1990. *Translation, History and Culture*. London: Pinter.

- Lefevere, Andre. 1999. Composing the Other. In *Post-colonial Translation*, ed. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi, 75-76. London: Routledge.
- Li, Tao. 2014. Translation and Wealth of Nation: Discussion on Yan Fu's Motivation (*Fān yì yǔ guó jiā fù qiáng: xī yán fù fān yì zhī yòng yì* 翻译与国家富强: 析严复翻译之用意). *Shanghai Journal of Translators* 2014(2): 27-30.
- Linguistics Group of the Classical Chinese Dictionary. 2013. Classical Chinese Characters Dictionary (*Gǔ hàn yǔ cháng yòng zì zì diǎn* 古汉语常用字字典). Beijing: The Commercial Press.
- Lippert, Wolfgang. 2001. Language in the Modernization Process: The Integration of Western Concepts and Terms into Chinese and Japanese in the Nineteenth Century. In *New Terms for New Ideas: Western Knowledge & Lexical Change in Late Imperial China*, ed. Michael Lackner, Iwo Amelung and Joachim Kurtz, 57-66. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Liu, Jin-yu. 2015. Analysis of Yan Fu's notes on the Wealth of Nations (*Yán fù shǒu pī "guó fù lùn" yīng wén dǐ běn yán jiū* 严复手批《国富论》英文底本研究). *Chinese Translators Journal* 5: 33-39.
- Kwong, Chiu Ki. 1887. *An English and Chinese Dictionary*. Hong Kong: Lee Chong Lung.
- Macmillan Dictionary Online. 2019. <https://www.macmillandictionary.com/>. Accessed 24 July 2019.
- Ma, Zu-yi. 1995. History of Translation in China (*Zhōng guó fān yì shǐ* 中国翻译史). In *An Encyclopaedia of Translation: Chinese-English and English-Chinese*, ed. Sin-wai Chan and David E. Pollard, 373-387. Hong Kong: The Chinese University Press.
- Morgan, Evan. 1932. *New Terms*. Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh.
- Munday, Jeremy. 2012. A Translation Studies Perspective on the Translation of Political Concepts. In *Why Concepts Matter: Translating Social and Political Thought*, ed. Martin J. Burke and Melvin Richter, 41-58. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- O'Driscoll, G. P. 1979. *Adam Smith and Modern Political Economy: Bicentennial Essays on the Wealth of Nations*. Ames: Iowa State University Press.
- Oxford English Dictionary. 2019. <https://www.oed.com/>. Accessed 24 July 2019.
- Pocock, J. G. 1972. *Politics, Language, and Time: Essays on Political Thought and History*. London: Methuen.
- Richter, Melvin. 2009. Conceptual History, Translation, and Intercultural Conceptual Transfers. *Concept and Communication* 6: 165-205.

- Richter, Melvin. 2012. Introduction: Translation, the History of Concepts and the History of Political Thought. In *Why Concepts Matter: Translating Social and Political Thought*, ed. Martin J. Burke and Melvin Richter, 1-40. Leiden and Boston: Brill.
- Robinson, Douglas. 1991. *The Translator's Turn*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Sheehan, James. 1978. Begriffsgeschichte: Theory and Practice. *The Journal of Modern History* 50(2): 312-319.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1978. *The Foundations of Modern Political Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Smith, Adam. 1970. *The Wealth of Nations; Introduction by Professor Edwin R. A. Seligman*, ed. by Edwin R. A. Seligman. London: Dent.
- Terrell, Peter et al. 2001. *Collins German Dictionary*. "begriff". Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers.
- Toury, Gideon. 2012. *Descriptive Translation Studies and Beyond (2nd expanded ed.)*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamin Publishing Company.
- Williams, Raymond. 1976. *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society*. London: Fontana/Croom Helm.
- Wu, Ho-mou. One Hundred Years of Chinese Economics: Development in Taiwan (*Zhōng guó jīng jì yī bǎi nián: jīng jì xué zài tái wān dì fā zhǎn* 中国经济一百年: 经济学在台湾的发展). *China Economic Quarterly* 1(4): 787-796.
- Xie, Zong-lin. 2010. How did I translate *The Wealth of Nations* (Wǒ shì zěnyàng fānyì guó fù lùn dí 我是怎样翻译国富论的). *Chinese Science and Technology Translators Journal* 23(1): 48-51.
- Yang, Hong-yun and Zhen-yu Bao. 2013. Critical Review of the Contemporary Retranslations of *The Wealth of Nations* (*Guó fù lùn dāng dài fù yì bǎn běn pī píng yán jiū* 《国富论》当代复译版本批评研究). *Jinghai Academic Journal* 6: 210-214.
- Zhang, Deng-de. 2010. The Spread and Influence of Adam Smith and *The Wealth of Nations* in Modern China (*Yà dāng sī mì jí qí guó fù lùn zài jìn dài zhōng guó dí chuán bō hé yǐng xiǎng* 亚当斯密及其《国富论》在近代中国的传播和影响). *Theory Journal* 9: 95-99.
- Zhu, Shan-li. 1986. Price, Theory of Value and the Hierarchy of Economic Theory (*jià gé jià zhí lǐ lùn yǔ jīng jì xué dì céng cì* 价格、价值理论与经济学的层次). *Journal of Peking University* 6: 80-86.