CSCanada
Studies in Literature and Language
Vol. 28, No. 1, 2024, pp. 14-21
DOI:10.3968/13348

ISSN 1923-1555[Print]
ISSN 1923-1563[Online]
www.cscanada.net
www.cscanada.org

On the Interpreter's Multiple Roles and Subjectivity: A Case Study of Bao Peng

YUAN Zhen[a],*

[a] Doctor of Philosophy, School of Foreign Languages, Zhaoqing University, Zhaoqing Guangdong, China.
* Corresponding author.

Supported by the Guangdong Planning Office of Philosophy and Soical Science (research project "报刊学视角下香港中文报刊翻译小说的形象变译研究" [translation: Reconstruction of Image in Translated Fiction in Hong Kong Chinese Newspapers and Periodicals from the Perspective of Periodical Studies], [grant number: GD23YWY11]).

Received 18 December 2023; accepted 29 January 2024
Published online 26 February 2024

Abstract

During the First Sino-British Opium War, Chinese interpreters were in great shortage, primarily owing to the Qing government's indifference to training qualified interpreting talents. Those in temporary employment had complex identities and played a variety of roles besides interpreting. A case in point is Bao Peng. He is one of the most noticeable interpreters in China at the time. He played five roles that helped to enhance his subjectivity in interpreting, namely a comprador, a messenger, a mediator, a negotiator and an adaptor. In this paper I make a probe into the five roles of Bao Peng and how they interact with one another and collectively enhance his subjectivity as an interpreter. My conclusion is that under unusual circumstances like that of the First Opium War, an interpreter with multiple roles tends to have influence and the ability to manipulate the dialogues and negotiations he is interpreting for and thus give play to his subjectivity.

Key words: Bao Peng; Multiple roles; Interpreter subjectivity; Sino-British negotiations; The First Opium War

Yuan, Z. (2024). On the Interpreter's Multiple Roles and Subjectivity: A Case Study of Bao Peng. *Studies in Literature and Language, 28*(1), 14-21. Available from: http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/sll/article/view/13348
DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/13348

INTRODUCTION

In the late Qing period before the breakout of the First Opium War (1839-1842) between China and Britain, also called the First Anglo-Chinese War in Britain, the Qing government attached little importance to foreign exchange and the training of interpreters and translators, therefore the entire Qing Empire was lacking for professional interpreters during the First Opium War. However, a certain professional staff called *tongshi*, [1] interpreters who undertook multiple tasks besides interpreting particularly within the Guangzhou Cohong system, [2] came into play in the Sino-British negotiations during the War. Bao Peng is a good case in point. This paper is devoted to an elaboration on the relationships between Bao Peng's multiple roles and his subjectivity as an interpreter based on the theories of translators /interpreters' subjectivity.

1. STUDIES OF INTERPRETERS' AND TRANSLATORS' SUBJECTIVITY

In the 1980s, a new terminology "cultural turn" emerged in translation studies. The representative theories for this "turn" are Itamar Even-Zohar's poly-system theory, Gideon Toury's theory of descriptive translation studies, and the "Manipulation School" represented by André Lefevere, Susan Bassnett and Theo Hermans. This concept of "cultural turn" was first put forward and

[1] The word "*tongshi*" is usually translated as linguists. In China's eighteenth to nineteenth century, the word "*tongshi*" referred to the translators or interpreters of Chinese ethnicity in charge of the communication with the foreigners (see examples in Hunter, 1994; Dyke and Arthur, 2005).
[2] In the Cohong system, the Hong merchants (collectively the Co-Hong), as a body corporate, were the monopolists of the foreign trade (see Hunter, 1994, p.20). They could control the foreign trade and synchronously assumed many kinds of official duties including dealing with foreign affairs on behalf of Qing Dynasty (for more information, see Xiao Guoliang, 2007).

delineated as waiving "the 'scientific' linguistic approach as based on the concept of 'equivalence' and moving from 'text' to 'culture'" in the introduction of the book *Translation, History and Culture* (Lefevere, 1992a, pp.3-4, cited in Snell-Hornby, 2006, p.50). This book contends that "'cultural turn' involves original contributions to the postcolonial field, to the feminist discourse and to the ideological misreading in translation" (Snell-Hornby, 2006, p.50). As mentioned above, "Manipulation School" is one of the core branches emerging during the transfer of paradigm in translation studies in 1980s which put its emphasis on the receiving culture and the target need (ibid, p.63). Bassnett and Lefevere (1992, p.vii) argue that translation is a kind of "cultural rewriting"; and Hermans (1985, p.11) also states that "from the point of view of the target literature, all translation implies a degree of manipulation of the source text for a certain purpose". The emergence of these theories manifests the translator's subjectivity in the sense that they all try to change the focus of translation studies from a prescriptive linguistic aspect, in which the translator is often invisible, to a descriptive cultural aspect, in which the translator is more visible.

Similarly, Hermans (2007, p.120) argues that the translators/interpreters would select what to be translated or interpreted and what not to be translated or interpreted in their translating or interpreting process. He considers that it is the selection and deselection that enable the system of translation and interpretation to proceed and evolve (ibid, pp.114-115). These statements are exactly calling for the awareness of the translators/interpreters' subjectivity.

Notably, Lefevere (1992b, p.14) asserts that translators, like "critics, reviewers, teachers" etc., often have the privilege to repress a piece of literary works if it does not abide by the mainstream poetics. They should also try to rewrite those works to make them comply with the poetics so as to become acceptable within the literary system (ibid). This shows that translators basically function as rewriters and they must exert their power on the literary works they translate, and their subjectivity is hereby reflected.

Among the rather fewer theories on interpreter's subjectivity, the most influential include Michael Cronin's theory calling for a "cultural turn" in interpreting studies (2002, p.46) so as to encourage those researching on interpreters or interpreting activities to attach great importance to the "questions of power, and issues such as class, gender, and race in interpreting situations."

For instance, R. Bruce Anderson (1976, pp.218-221) argues that "the interpreter's position as the person in the middle has the advantage of power inherent in all positions that control scarce resources" after providing a representative model of a bilingual interpreter working for two parties which are both monolingual, thus demonstrating the interpreter's subjectivity when he/she is the only bilingual person on the spot. Similarly, Baker (2006, p.26) states that, like all social roles, translators or interpreters participate in the narrative context in which they are engaged with in various ways. And one of the features of "Narrative" Baker (ibid, p.114) proposes is "selective appropriation", meaning which events or experiences to choose to encompass in their transferred texts or dialogues when the translator or interpreter is working.

So far, few theories on translator subjectivity have been applied to interpreters, especially in China. This is a drawback in the field of translation studies now, which should be overcome for the sake of integrity of translation studies. Rachel Lung (2011, pp.xiii-xiv) contends that "the theoretical study of translation is best grounded in translation practice through which the nuances, features, and limitations of inter-lingual exchanges can be analyzed, specified, and explained. It warrants the investigation of, ideally, authentic translation practices." This paper then is a tentative study of interpreter subjectivity in the interpreting activities during the First Opium War in the first half of the 19th century under the guidance of the theories of translators' subjectivity.

2. BAO PENG'S IDENTITY

Bao Peng (1792-?) is a rare and active interpreter during the First Opium War. He was born in Xiangshan (today's Zhongshan), Guangdong in 1792. In 1828, he served as the comprador in an American firm in Guangzhou, as he had learned some Pidgin English, and the next year in Bifu firm opened by an American merchant. In 1836, he started to serve as the comprador for Dent, a notorious British opium trader. In 1839, for fear of being wanted for arrest for drug trafficking by LinZexu, the imperial commissioner to Guangzhou, he slipped into Weixian County, Shandong and lay close in the quarters of one of his friends, the county magistrate Zhao Ziyong, who then recommended him to the Shandong provincial governor TuoHunbu to help mediate with the British soldiers in Shandong Province.

In 1840, Bao Peng was sent by Tuo Hunbu to Dengzhou, Shandong to handle the negotiations on British ships at sea. Soon, he was appointed interpreter for the Qing minister Qi Shan based on Tuo's recommendation, and followed Qi Shan to Guangdong to serve as the sole interpreter in the Sino-British negotiations in Guangzhou during the First Opium War. In fact, Bao Peng was Qi Shan's total representative during the whole process of the negotiations. However, he was accused of letting out secrets about the coastal defense in Guangdong and situations in the mainland during the secret negotiations with the British, though without clear evidence, and was arrested together with Qi Shan, the latter for privately

concluding *Chuanbi Protocol*. In 1841, Bao Peng was sent to Ili, Xinjiang for a penal servitude for life according to the emperor Daoguang's imperial edict (for more information on Bao Peng's biographical material, see *The First Historical Archives of China*, 1992, vol.4, pp.55-56.).

In a word, Bao Peng was a man of complex background and multiple roles. He played a variety of roles in a succession of jobs before and while acting as an interpreter. To be fair, although Bao Peng was a controversial figure in China's modern history and in the history of translation, he indeed played an active role as an interpreter in the Sino-British negotiations in Guangzhou during the First Opium War.

3. BAO PENG'S MULTIPLE ROLES IN INTERPRETING IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE 19TH CENTURY

The fact that Bao Peng was a person with multiple roles entails more detailed elaboration. The focus of discussion in this paper will be on his multiple roles during his interactions with the British people from 1820s to 1840s, his subjectivity in interpreting manifested in those activities, as well as the contribution of those roles to his subjectivity in interpreting.

3.1 The Interpreter as a Comprador

In Bao Peng's life-time, his first recorded role in communicating with foreigners in English was a comprador. In 1828, he served as the comprador in an American firm in Guangzhou. The next year he transferred to Bifu Firm opened by an American merchant. In 1836, he began to serve as the comprador for Dent, the famous British opium trader. He privately helped foreigners purchase and sell goods including drugs, which brought him great profit as well as great risk. For at that time, recruiting a comprador needed to abide by rigid regulations. The following accounts are good proofs:

(1) When Bao Renguan (Bao Peng's uncle) was sick and back home, Bao Peng privately took his place and served as a comprador successively, purchasing various kinds of food for foreigners then, such as beef, mutton, chicken, duck, etc.. Apart from a salary of sixty pounds of foreign money, he could earn an extra of 200 to 300 silver every year (Association of Chinese Historians, 1957, vol. 3, p.255). [3]

(2) "Compradors are enjoined to be secured by *tongshi*. … They should be checked in every prefecture and county and given a card as the symbol of their official position. "…"If someone privately boards a foreign ship and acts as a purchasing agent for foreigners, or serves as a comprador without any official permission and supplies food for foreigners, then all the local civil and military authorities concerned shall take the responsibility to arrest and investigate the violators at any time." (Qi et al., 1964, vol.1, p.264) [4]

Undoubtedly, Bao Peng's behavior of purchasing goods for foreigners violated the official regulations and was at a risk of causing serious consequences. Therefore, in 1839, for fear of being wanted for arrest by Lin Zexu for drug selling, he slipped into Weixian County, Shandong, and went into hiding in the quarters of the county magistrate Zhao Ziyong.

As a comprador, Bao Peng could use his language ability to communicate with the foreign buyers and their conversations were more business or commercial oriented. His behavior or choice was more oriented to economic benefit. That is to say, he was more inclined to do profitable things. This was in line with the goal-pursuit of his patrons, the American and British merchants, and his own, which is the maximization of economic profit.

3.2 The Interpreter as a Messenger

The following two self-accounts of Bao Peng's reveal that he was once a messenger.

(1) When Zhao Ziyong came to Shandong Province in September 1840, he was ordered by the provincial governor Tuo Hunbu to bring me to Dengzhou port after Tuo heard of a foreign ship anchored there and found through inquiry that I was good at foreign language. When I got there, I could see small foreign sampans enter the port to fetch water now and then. I went up to have a check. When I met the foreigners, I greeted them in foreign manners, and they replied immediately. I asked one of them, "What have you come here for?" He replied, "We want to buy some food". The next day, Governor Tuo ordered me to follow Policeman Dong to the bigger foreign ship and talk to their leader. The leader took out two thousand pounds of foreign money and asked me to buy some goods for them. I did not dare to accept, so I reported back to Governor Tuo. He said to me, "If the foreigners behave peacefully, you can award them the goods and there is no need to charge them." Later I found they behave well, so I gave them the goods and they sailed away. After that I returned to Weixian County again (Association of Chinese Historians, 1957, vol. 3, p.253). [5]

(2) "On the 28th, I was handed a document, which read that the British was allowed the entire island of Hong Kong. I was told to deliver the document if everything went well. If things did not go well, I should not deliver it to them. When I arrived at Macao and met Elliot, I found things went badly, so I did not deliver the document to Elliot but brought it back to the Grand Secretary (Qi Shan)." [6]

[3] The English version of the extracts above are all my translation.

[4] Ibid.
[5] Ibid.
[6] Ibid.

In the first half of the 19th century, it was a rule for the feudal officials to arrange for *tongshi* to deliver messages between China and foreign countries. In fact, they used to employ foreign merchants as interpreters in whom even they themselves did not trust so much or sent those who were trusted in by foreigners to make direct contact with foreign countries, and make decisions after hearing their messages or reports. Therefore, as a messenger, Bao Peng's role at that time was to transmit messages between the mandarins and the British merchants and military officers, in Dengzhou, Shandong and during the Sino-British secret diplomacy in Guangzhou.

Bao Peng's subjectivity as a messenger was reflected through his decision-making process, even though it was only at the psychological level, when he was faced with the temptation of economic profit. More specifically, this job involved two different aspects of Bao Peng's interpreting activity. The first one was just concerned with greetings and inquiring about the purposes of foreigners on board the small ships at anchor. So, in this aspect, his subjectivity as an interpreter was relatively limited. The second was related to deciding on whether to help the foreigners buy goods or not and to judging whether things went along well. In comparison, the second aspect was actually more empowering than the first one. So his interpreter subjectivity was less restricted and easier to manifest. In other words, a messenger could enjoy more rights in the second aspect than in the first, since the first only required his language ability, while the second required both his language ability and his decision-making as well as judging ability. For example, when requested by foreigners to buy goods, Bao Peng had the right or freedom to decide whether to agree or not. The reason why he chose to refuse the foreigners' request this time probably was that Bao Peng was aware of his abnormal condition at the time under which he was ensconced and might be wanted for arrest. If he had been a comprador as previously, this would have been a lucrative chance for him to expand his business, and he was very likely to accept the request. But at that moment, his primary concern might be his safety. Though he was appointed an official messenger first for Governor Tuo and then for Qi Shan, he must be vigilant of his daily behaviors.

3.3 The Interpreter as a Mediator

The following account shows Bao Peng acted as a mediator between his superior in Shandong and the British people.

Paoupang (Bao Peng) had been on board the transport collecting different articles, which he intended as presents for the mandarins. From one of the transports he purchased a telescope. Captain Eyres gave him several tumblers and wine glasses, —all glass ware being highly prized by the Chinese. You cannot make them a present they more highly value. A uniform sword, which he was most anxious to obtain for the head mandarin, we could not spare him. He suggested to Captain Elliot, that the mandarins would be much pleased by our chin-chinning them; and as they had really been very civil in all our intercourse with them, the ships were accordingly dressed with the flags (Bingham, 1843, p.267).

From the above account, we can see that, by eagerly looking for goods to give as presents to his superior in the name of the British people and advising the British to ingratiate themselves with the Chinese officials, Bao Peng tried to assure his superiors that the British people were respectful and submissive to them. This just catered to the prevailing attitude among the mandarins that foreigners were inferior to the Chinese and foreign countries were all in a humble position compared with the Qing Empire. And this self-centered posture of the mandarins can find its verification in certain historical data (for more information about the general attitude toward western countries in ancient China and its tribute paying system, see Li Yunquan, 2004; Fairbank, 1968).

When Bao Peng acted as a mediator, his subjectivity as an interpreter found expression in the fact that he could act according to his own will. Specifically speaking, his will at the time was trying to be a good and efficient mediator between the Chinese and British negotiators. Bao Peng, as a messenger or communicator between the two countries, clearly knew what the general ideology of the mandarins was, and what the real needs and purposes of the British were. So he tried to act as a mediator to reduce the tensions between the two parties and create a seeming concordant situation that the British were deferential to the mandarins, that the mandarins could agree to the British's terms conditionally, that the British would not resort to armed provocation and that it was possible that all the conflicts between the two parties could be settled in a peaceful way. By doing so, Bao Peng could possibly curry favor with his superiors because what they wanted to see was just the fact that the British ultimately became domesticated.

On the other hand, if he could not play a mediating role effectively, he would have no other way but to be punished by his superiors. So in essence, he was worried about his own safety. Because at that time, the Chinese Emperor and all levels of officials were inclined to reprimand their subordinates when troublesome or knotty things happened, especially involving foreigners. Those dealing with cross-language mediation were most at stake. Hence it was understandable for Bao Peng to be thoughtful about his job and his safety under those circumstances. He performed successfully in acting as a mediator, and in this process, his subjectivity as an interpreter was fully manifested.

3.4 The Interpreter as a Negotiator

We have strong reason to say that Bao Peng acted not only as a messenger but also as a negotiator during the Sino-British negotiations or secret diplomacy in Guangzhou.

For theoretically, at the meetings with foreigners, the leading role was Bao Peng's superior, senior Chinese official Qi Shan, yet in reality Qi Shan was dumb and deaf in front of the British people, both lacking experience in dealing with foreigners and lacking the ability to understand a word of foreign languages. The following three statements serve as proofs that Bao Peng acted as a negotiator during the First Opium War.

(1) As Qi Shan's dependence on Bao Peng became stronger to remove the language barriers, his trust in Bao Peng was gradually elevated. In the end, Qi Shan simply went all out to terminate the arrangement for others to follow him. Instead, he let him deal with the British all by himself. As Bao Peng claimed, he first went to Macao together with supervisors Zhang Dianyuan and Bai Hanzhang to meet the British for four times, then with Chen Rongqing, the military attaché in Guangdong for five times, and finally all by himself for four times, which put him into a state without any supervisory control (Ji and Chen, 2007, pp.172-173). [7]

(2) Bao Peng was granted the power to make decisions during the entire process of Sino-British negotiations. In the negotiation with the British on compensation for the prices of opium, the British claimed a compensation of 20 million dollars for the opium payment. … But after the "messenger" Bao Peng's bargaining with the British again and again, the compensation of the payment was ultimately reduced to 6 million dollars. The fact that Bao Peng should have had power to bargain with the British on the compensation of the payment of opium showed that he was indeed granted a great authority (Ji and Chen, 2007, p.173). [8]

(3) "The British army was about to come. Those foreigners must purport to attack our army and they were eager for action. Qi Shan himself was worried that Humen was at stake. Therefore, on the 28th, he instructed Bao Peng to deliver a document to Elliot, which read, 'I am ill now and cannot think over the terms of negotiation. You need to wait. In case a nuisance happens, all these will return to nothing.' And he prepared another one, which mainly mentioned that if the British surely want to occupy the entire island of Hong Kong, he shall have to submit it to the Emperor for decision. So they need to wait for instruction, too. If Bao Peng made sure everything was in peace after arriving there, he could hand them two documents to ensure that they would not bother. … But if things were very bad, he should only hand them the first one. A couple of days later, Bao Peng reported back that the British did not behave obediently, so he brought back the second document." (Association of Chinese Historians, 1957, vol. 3, pp.250-251) [9]

These three statements above prove the fact that, when Bao Peng participated in the Sino-British negotiation, his role shifted to a negotiator partly responsible for deciding the destiny of a certain part of China's dominion. He was granted more power to do more important things than just deliver messages between different parties of the negotiations or carry out tasks assigned by his superiors. As the above accounts show, Qi Shan's entrustment equaled to totally empowering Bao Peng to decide on whether to cede Hong Kong or not. Whether to promise the British's terms all depended on Bao Peng's own judgment of whether things were in peace or not, then he made the decision all by himself. Though that was an obscure authorization, it was clear enough to prove that Bao Peng actually acted as a negotiator.

When acting as a negotiator, Bao Peng's subjectivity as an interpreter became most obvious in that he, apart from interpreting, could also make important decisions on the negotiations about the domain of his own country. Bao Peng was more than in charge of the language interpreting between Qi Shan and Elliot, or between the official representatives of China and Britain. His role now bore much more significance than the aforementioned ones: he was given substantial power by Qi Shan to shape route for the negotiation with Elliot to a certain extent. In this case, his subjectivity did not mainly come from intuition as when he was a comprador, but from his superior Qi Shan, and it was more diplomacy-oriented. As his superior's manipulation on him became more and more weakened, or his supervision of him was almost inexistent, his subjectivity as an interpreter was swollen and expanded to the largest extent.

One more thing to note, when Bao Peng served as a comprador, his subjectivity was more overt and visible. Yet, when he acted as a negotiator, his subjectivity became more invisible. However, even though it was invisible, he still played an important role in the Guangzhou Negotiation between China and Britain during the First Opium War.

3.5 The Interpreter as an Adaptor

The following two accounts serve as a demonstration that Bao Peng behaved as an adaptor at one time.

(1) White Button having been ushered into the captain's cabin, where cherry brandy was produced, a long conversation took place between Paoupang and Captain Elliot relative to the supplies, &c.; the mandarin frequently asked what they were saying. On one occasion, when Paoupang had been exposing and abusing the whole fraternity, he answered White Button's query by assuring him, that he was telling the captain what very good persons mandarins were, and that the people liked them very much (Bingham, 1843, vol. 1, p.256).

(2) Paoupang, at all events, made such a good story out of the mandarin's refusing to receive any compensation for the small quantity of supplies furnished, and of their squeezing him ultimately for it, that it was arranged that

[7] Ibid.
[8] Ibid.
[9] Ibid.

he should be paid for all that should have been supplied when he came to Canton with Keshen, by which means he would prevent the mandarins at this place getting hold of the dollars. That the inhabitants generally were squeezed and made to give their cattle as a bribe for us to go away, I think very possible; but I do not think they would have ventured to squeeze an attaché" of Keshen's: at all events, he succeeded in squeezing us (ibid, pp.256-257).

From the first account we can see that Bao Peng (Paoupang) played the role of an adaptor in his talks with Captain Elliot and with the "White Button". [10] When Bao Peng was talking with Elliot, he complained about the faults or defects of his fellow Chinese officials. Perhaps he thought that by talking to a probably irrelevant person he could freely express his dissatisfaction with them. However, when asked by his fellow official what he was talking about, he would say he was praising the whole party of the Chinese officials.

The context of the second account actually involved the fact that, the mandarins did not ask for payment for the food supplies to the British. Even if the British intended to pay, they would refuse to accept it, which was a part of its soothing policy towards the foreigners from afar. [11] However, as is shown in this account, Bao Peng would make up stories at times to achieve his hidden aims. Sometimes, with the intention of increasing incomes, he would privately extort money from the British people. Sometimes, he would even exploit other mandarin officials as an excuse or disguise to squeeze money from the British people.

All these were made possible mainly because he was the only bilingual person, and the others present could not understand the foreign language he was speaking. More specifically, the British had no idea of what he said to the Chinese officials, while on the other hand, the Chinese officials did not understand what he said to the British. [12]

When playing the role of an adaptor, Bao Peng's subjectivity as an interpreter was reflected in his behavior in delivering messages and communicating with foreigners. The two examples show that an interpreter tends to take advantage of his exclusive superiority of bilingualism to heighten his subjectivity in interpreting, whether his/her intention is good or evil, for public interest or for private interest, especially when he is the only bilingual person. He can factually manipulate the context or language environment at his discretion. Thus, his subjectivity is fully manifested.

In the above two instances, Bao Peng could and did avail himself of his bilingualism and even told lies or white lies with abandon or made up stories in order to achieve his hidden aims. Or he might think that he could obtain some "sense of fulfillment" and pleasant sensation by fouling his fellow officials. We can say, acting as an adaptor especially for private purposes, his subjectivity as an interpreter was mainly shown in breaking or violating certain established moral and professional norms. It was the role of an adaptor he played for private purposes that brought him unfavorable comments and offended or displeased a number of senior officials at the time, though he played an irreplaceable part in the Sino-British negotiations or secret diplomacy in Guangzhou during the First Opium War.

4. A SUMMARY OF BAO PENG'S MULTIPLE ROLES

Bao Peng was regarded by certain historians and researchers of translation studies as one of the most active interpreters in China in the first half of the 19th century. He indeed functioned as an indispensable part on the Chinese side during the Sino-British negotiations or secret diplomacy in Guangzhou. He played a variety of roles in his interpreting activities. In fact, all the five unknown or obscure roles that were described above were hybrid and embedded in his officially-appointed and well-known identity as an interpreter.

From the above analysis, it is unequivocally manifested that Bao Peng played an active role in the communications with the British and Americans, including merchants, soldiers and official negotiating representatives during the First Opium War, and this was mainly because his multiple roles helped to heighten his subjectivity as an interpreter in his communication and interpreting with foreigners. Did these five roles Bao Peng played exist simultaneously? Or can we say they were synchronic or diachronic? His role of a comprador appeared when he worked in the American and British merchant firms. After that, he worked as a subordinate of the Shandong provincial governor Tuo Hunbu, and his roles became a messenger, a mediator, and an adaptor. Then, at the time when Bao Peng was appointed interpreter for Qi Shan's negotiation with Charles Elliot, his role changed to a negotiator. Yet, even when he played the role of a

[10] This fellow official, the "White Button" in the account, was the official appointed to monitor Bao Peng.

[11] The following statement by Bingham could show that the British troop did receive many supplies from the Chinese government:
We had been supplied at this place with one hundred and fifty bullocks, twenty sheep, many dozens of poultry, with flour, &c. The bullocks were embarked solely for the use of the troops at Chusan, where they proved a most seasonable supply (Bingham, 1843, pp.266-267).

[12] One might wonder why the live recorder of these dialogues did not find out Bao Peng's misrepresentation or the inconsistency between what he said to Elliot and what he said to his fellow Chinese officials. Wasn't there a bilingual recorder on the spot? Well, this could be possible, but since Bao Peng could blatantly speak opposite words in face of those people, he must be confident that no one else present possessed the bilingual talent as he did. Even if there was one, he must lack the real power to influence Bao Peng's behavior. Or the bilingual recorder might be absent at the time but collected discourses from the parties respectively and then put them together to form the historical records.

negotiator, he still had the recessive and implicit role of a messenger or adaptor sometimes. Therefore, his multiple roles had interactions with one another.

How hybrid and embedded were Bao Peng's multiple roles? Firstly, his role of a comprador contributed positively to the performance of his interpreting in the negotiation on the terms of compensation of opium payment. For in the negotiation with the British on compensation for the prices of opium, the British originally claimed a compensation of 20 million ounces of silver for the opium payment. But after Bao Peng's bargaining with the British again and again, the compensation of the payment was ultimately reduced to 6 million ounces of silver. This fact showed adequately that his success in bargaining and reducing the compensation down had a positive correlation with his ability developed in his roles as a comprador.

Secondly, his role of a messenger also contributed positively to the performance of his interpreting. Data show that, through the Guangzhou negotiation amidst the First Opium War, there were in fact only two face-to-face negotiations between Qi Shan and the British representative Elliot (for the specific data, see *The First Historical Archives of China,* 1992, vol.3, pp.530-531). All the other negotiations were carried out through messages and documents delivered by messengers, and the most active and important messenger was Bao Peng. He was perhaps the busiest person during the Sino-British negotiations and secret diplomacy in Guangzhou. Therefore, undoubtedly, his role of a messenger was deeply embedded in his identity as an interpreter.

Thirdly, his role of a mediator contributed positively to his performance in interpreting as well. As the mandarins all held a self-centered attitude towards the British people, while the latter thought they were more advanced than China and should not be given such cold welcome and bad treatment. Thus, misunderstandings and deadlocks often arose between the two parties of negotiations. As a messenger between the two sides, Bao Peng knew well what the exact needs of both sides were, hence effectively playing the role of a mediator in order to break the deadlocks that he could do through his own efforts. This formed a part of his interpreting task then. And it is a good reason for us to assert that his role of a mediator contributed positively to his performance in interpreting as well.

Fourthly, his role of a negotiator contributed positively and greatly to his interpreting. In fact, it was the role of a negotiator that promoted the performance of his interpreting to a substantial extent. As historical data show, Qi Shan was the leading role in the Sino-British negotiations in Guangzhou during the First Opium War, and had a special relationship with Bao Peng and trusted in none but him, neither the officials from Guangzhou nor other interpreters. As he did not understand a word of English, he just empowered Bao Peng to deal with the British all by himself for several times, which put him into a state without any supervisory control. This provides evidence that Bao Peng really acted as a negotiator in his interpreting activities then, which greatly enhanced the level and influence of his interpreting.

Finally, his role of an adaptor contributed somewhat to his interpreting, whether positively or negatively. In dealing with the British people and in pleasing and pacifying his superiors, he told lies and made up stories at times, in order to achieve his own aims, which not only brought him personal economic benefit but also elicited strong reprehension from most of the mandarins. Anyway, there was obviously a connection between his this role of an adaptor and his identity as an interpreter.

CONCLUSION

Bao Peng was active as an interpreter and his subjectivity was fully manifested in terms of translation studies. The different roles he played in his interpreting processes were interactive and complementary and played a common part in promoting his subjectivity in interpreting. In other words, his subjectivity as an interpreter was reflected in his shifts among different roles. As different roles vested different power and freedom, the more power and freedom his roles invested him with, the more obvious his subjectivity as an interpreter became. He combined these hybrid roles to carry out his interpreting activities, and his subjectivity in interpreting was fully manifested.

In the theory of patronage and rewriting, Lefevere points out that patrons determine the ideology of translation and translators are supposed to follow their patrons' ideology(Lefevere, 1992b, p.15). However, this case study proves that an interpreter sometimes tends to restate or adapt the original discourses. In the discussion of the roles Bao Peng played, it is explicit that Lefevere's theory of patronage does not necessarily apply, in that, for an interpreter, his/her superior is the patron by whose ideology he/she should stick faithfully to the original and true senses of discourses while interpreting. And he/she should display honesty and friendliness toward his/her countrymen as well as foreigners. However, Bao Peng did not, at times, follow his patron's ideology when carrying out his duties as an interpreter, but chose to have his own way, instead. This shows that Lefevere's theory of patronage is not always followed in practice, and when the intention of pursuing personal benefit is in conflict with the patron's ideology, an interpreter is likely to choose the former instead of the latter.

REFERENCES

Anderson, R. B. (1976). Perspectives on the role of interpreter. In R. W. Brislin (Ed.), *Translation: Applications and research* (pp. 208-228). New York: Gardner Press.

Association of Chinese Historians. (1957). Bao Peng xu gong (siyue shijiuri) [A continued testimony of Bao Peng (April 19th)]. In *Zhongguo jindaishi ziliao congkan, yapian zhanzheng, san [Series of materials on modern Chinese history: The Opium War (vol. 3)]* (p. 253). Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.

Association of Chinese Historians. (1957). Qi Shan you xu gong (siyue ershiqiri) [A continued testimony of Qi Shan (April 27th)]. In *Zhongguo jindaishi ziliao congkan, yapian zhanzheng san [Series of materials on modern Chinese history: The Opium War* (vol. 3)] (pp. 250-251). Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.

Association of Chinese Historians. (1957). *Zhongguo jindaishi ziliao congkan, yapian zhanzheng, san [Series of materials on modern Chinese history: The Opium War* (vol. 3)]. Shanghai: Shanghai People's Publishing House.

Baker, M. (2006). *Translation and conflict: A narrative account.* London, UK: Routledge.

Bassnett, S., & Lefevere, A. (1992). General editors preface. In S. Bassnett & A. Lefevere (Eds.), *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame* (pp. vii-viii). London, UK: Routledge.

Bingham, J. E. (1843). *Narrative of the expedition to China, from the commencement of the war to its termination in 1842; with Sketches of the manners and customs of that singular and hitherto almost unknown country.* London, UK: Henry Colburn Publisher.

Cronin, M. (2002). The empire talks back: Orality, heteronomy and the cultural turn in interpretation studies. In M. M. Tymoczko & E. Gentzler (Eds.), *Translation and power* (pp. 45-62). Amherst and Boston: University of Massachusetts Press.

Dyke, V., & Arthur, P. (2005). *The Canton trade: Life and enterprise on the China coast, 1700-1845*. Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press.

Fairbank, J. K. (Ed.). (1968). *The Chinese world order: Traditional China's foreign relations.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Hermans, T. (1985). Introduction: Translation studies and a new paradigm. In T. Hermans (Ed.), *The manipulation of literature: Studies in literary translation* (pp. 7-15). New York: St. Martin's Press.

Hermans, T. (2007). The conference of the tongues. Manchester, UK & Kinderhook, NY, USA: St. Jerome Publishing.

Hunter, W. C. (1994). *An American in Canton (1825-44).* Hong Kong: Derwent Communications Ltd.

Ji, Y. X., & Chen, W. M. (2007). *Zhongguo jindai tongshi [Tongshi in modern China].* Beijing, China: The Academy Press.

Lefevere, A. (1992a). *Translation/History/Culture: A sourcebook.* London, UK: Routledge.

Lefevere, A. (1992b). *Translation, rewriting and the manipulation of literary fame.* London, UK: Routledge.

Li, Y. Q. (2004). *Chaogong zhidu shilun: Zhongguo gudai duiwai guanxi tizhi yanjiu [A historical review of the tributary system: A study of the system of foreign relations in ancient China].* Beijing, China: Xinhua Publishing House.

Lung, R. (2011). *Interpreters in early imperial China.* Amsterdam, Netherlands & Philadelphia, PA, US: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Qi, S. H., et al. (Eds.). (1964). *Chouban yiwu shimo (daoguang chao) [The whole story of preparing for the affairs of barbarians (Daoguang's reign)].* Beijing, China: Zhonghua Book Company.

Snell-Hornby, M. (2006). *The turns of translation studies.* Amsterdam, Netherlands & Philadelphia, PA, US: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

The First Historical Archives of China (Ed). (1992). *Yapian zhanzheng dangan shiliao di san ce, di si ce [Archival historical materials of the Opium War, vol. 3 and vol. 4].* Tianjin, China: Tianjin Gujin Publishing House.

Xiao, G. L. (2007). *Qingdai guangzhou hangshang zhidu yanjiu [A study of Co-hong System of Guangzhou in Qing Dynasty]. Studies in Qing History*, (01), 32-48.