

FANG WEIGUI

YI, YANG, XI, WAI AND OTHER TERMS:  
THE TRANSITION FROM 'BARBARIAN' TO 'FOREIGNER'  
IN NINETEENTH-CENTURY CHINA

The symptom function of language constitutes an important source of connotation. In 1934, Karl Bühler wrote in his opus magnum *Sprachtheorie* that the symptom is related to the speaker “whose interiority it expresses”.<sup>1</sup> John Lyons sums up the position maintained by Bühler as follows:

... every utterance is, in general and regardless of its more specific function, an expressive symptom of what is in the speaker's mind, a symbol descriptive of what is signified and a vocative signal that is addressed to the receiver.<sup>2</sup>

Lyons describes every information as “a sign or signal which indicates to the receiver that the sender is in a particular state” and

as symptomatic of that state. In many cases, though not in all, the state in question can be plausibly interpreted as the cause of the symptom. This use of the term ‘symptom’, it may be observed, is close to the sense in which it is used in medicine.<sup>3</sup>

In a medical context, symptoms are understood as indications of an illness, respectively an appearance that is characteristic of an illness. In linguistics, a symptom is, roughly speaking, something that can cause, in the process of an utterance, certain associative, emotional, stylistic and evaluative co-significations and accompanying perceptions.

*Yi* 夷, *yang* 洋, *xi* 西 and *wai* 外 —although they are not etymologically related—are four Chinese words that can be used as nouns and as adjectives, depending of course on the context, to describe things, relationships and events outside the Middle Kingdom (*Zhongguo* 中國). In each case, the symptom meaning of the four words, especially of *yi* and *yang*, is easily recognized. And even that factor which transcends the meaning of each of these words becomes apparent.

---

<sup>1</sup> Karl Bühler. 1982 [1934]. *Sprachtheorie. Die Darstellungsfunktion der Sprache*. Stuttgart, New York: Fischer, p. 28.

<sup>2</sup> John Lyons. 1977. *Semantics*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, vol. 1, p. 52.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 108.

*Yi* was originally used only in combination with *dong*—*dong yi* 東夷 (eastern barbarians<sup>4</sup>), referring to areas or people to the east of Central China (*zhongyuan* 中原). This is why the term from the very beginning carried with it a negative denotation and connotation. Gradually, the character *yi* gained greater universality and came to signify, in addition to the eastern inhabitants, ‘barbarians’ of the periphery in general—in contrast to the peoples of *xia* 夏 and *hua* 華 or *huaxia* 華夏 (i.e. the inhabitants of what was to be called the Middle Kingdom later on). The term *yi*, which thus referred to ‘barbarian’ peoples of the periphery living on ‘Chinese’ soil or that of vassal states, was used since the late Ming and early Qing dynasty not only for additional groups of people surrounding the Middle Kingdom, but also for Europeans and Americans, so as to underline the inferiority of other human beings and cultures (if one was at all willing to recognize that further cultures existed in the world). Thus, both the intension (content of the category) as well as the extension (limits; reach) of the character *yi* were expanded, forming a specific context and a global reference, and signifying qualities, evaluations, etc.

The polarity of *yi* and *xia*, which expressed a historically developed attitude towards foreigners, appeared finally like an anthropological constant and constituted cultural codes. For the average human being growing up under the social and cultural conditions of the Middle Kingdom, the binary opposition formed by the said categories reflected an indisputable statement of fact: one was after all certain of the superiority and uniqueness of China’s political culture; one was certain that China must be taken for the centre of the world, and furthermore that there was no other state rivalling China. This basic attitude later on became easily apparent as prejudiced ethnocentrism, a xenophobic expression of the attitude of being on one’s guard, and this was correspondingly reflected in its lexical objectivation—by way of the word *yi*.

In addition to the term *yi*, *yang* ‘oceanic’ or ‘coming from overseas’, *xi* ‘Western’ and *wai* ‘external’ or ‘foreign’—terms which, in opposition to *yi*, were not as plainly connected with value judgments and which expressed a more or less neutral point of view—all were

---

<sup>4</sup> The term used for (barbarian) inhabitants west of the centre was *rong* 戎, whereas *di* 狄 was used for barbarians of the north and *man* 蠻 for those of the south. Thus one speaks of *nan man* 南蠻, *bei di* 北狄, *dong yi* 東夷, *xi rong* 西戎.

expressions customarily used to signify the ‘Non-Chinese’ or ‘foreign’ Other, no matter whether they appeared as words or parts of syntagmas. As far as their image-laden aspects, their symbolic dimension, and their emotional depth are concerned, these four words are fundamentally different. They often give rise to specific associations, which are connected—for the speaker as well as the recipient—in a constant fashion to a symbol. Using one of these words evokes a specific segment of the system of categories. We deal here, to a large extent, with connotation—that is to say, with those associations which reproduce typified perceptions, something that is ‘also referred to’, something that is ‘also included’ in thought, if only marginally.

Roughly speaking, one understands by connotation an additional, peripheral component of meaning, such as evaluations, emotions, associations which may be connected with the lexeme; on the other hand, functional characteristics of the use of language which relate to historic, social, regional, stylistic markers, are grouped under the heading ‘connotations’; or both options are referred to—‘connotation’ being considered as the category comprising the one definition as well as the other.<sup>5</sup>

If we focus on China’s more recent development and contact with the outside world, we can easily see that after the Opium War (which destroyed the old Chinese world-view), and in the context of a cultural transformation and changing value judgments of the Chinese *literati* and officials, considerable differences appear in the use of these four words. Particularly in the second half of the nineteenth century, a fundamental change set in as to how the outside world and foreigners were referred to. In this period, we also notice a clear development with regard to the use of the four words and, connected with this, a replacement of one word by the other. This is not only because the application of diverse forms of expression and the possibilities of combination of the four words is reflecting the personal attitude of different authors, but because it reflects the values, norms of behaviour and psychological set of mind of the public as a whole.

---

<sup>5</sup> Klaus-Dieter Ludwig. 1982. “Zu normativen, konnotativen und stilistischen Angaben in Wörterbucheintragen”, in: E. Agricola, J. Schilat and D. Viehweger (eds.). *Wortschatzforschung heute. Aktuelle Probleme der Lexikologie und Lexikographie*. Leipzig: Verlag der Enzyklopädie (Linguistische Studien 25), pp. 166–84; 171. [The translation is mine, W. F.]

This brief paper is dedicated to this subject.<sup>6</sup> It aims to clarify the elements of meaning and the position of a word in the system of categories in order to determine a certain use of language. It aims as well—and, in fact, specifically—to clarify terms and their relatedness (contexts; relationships), and thus to explore the symptom(atic) meanings and associations, to be explained in terms of individual or social psychology, which call up the “facts and objects” in question and which at the same time rely on a knowledge how to use these words. Departing from concrete examples—reference books and travel reports of the nineteenth century—the replacement of the mentioned words, including the reasons for their replacement, will be discussed in order to clarify that we are not dealing with a simple change affecting words and categories but rather with a cultural phenomenon that is significant in terms of the history of categories, concepts or ideas. In other words: alongside a change of paradigms, a development takes place which leaves behind traces in the form of lexical and conceptual change. An inquiry into this change seems warranted because it may

---

<sup>6</sup> Chen Xulu 陳旭麓 wrote a short but conclusive article on a similar topic, cf. Chen Xulu. 1984. “Bian yi yang” 辨“夷”、“洋” (Differentiating between *yi* and *yang*), in: id. *Jindaishi sibian lu* 近代史思辨錄 (Thoughts on modern history). Guangzhou: Guangdong renmin chubanshe, pp. 22–30. Cf. also, amongst others, Wang Ermin 王爾敏. 1995a. “Shijiu shiji Zhongguo shidaifu dui Zhong-Xi guanxi zhi lijie ji yansheng zhi xin guannian” 十九世紀中國士大夫對中西關係之理解及衍生之新觀念 (How Chinese officials and literati understood Chinese-Western relations, and the origin of new attitudes in the nineteenth century), in: id. *Zhongguo jindai sixiang shilun* 中國近代思想史論 (Essays on modern Chinese intellectual history). Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan, pp. 1–94; id. 1995b. “Wan Qing zhengzhi sixiang jiqi yanhua de yuanzhi” 晚清政治思想及其演化的原質 (The political thought of the late Qing period and factors of change in political thinking), in: id. *Wan Qing zhengzhi sixiang shilun* 晚清政治思想史論 (Essays on the history of political thought in the late Qing period). Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan, pp. 1–30; Xiong Yuezhi 熊月之. 1994. *Xixue dongjian yu wan Qing shehui* 西學東漸與晚清社會 (The dissemination of Western knowledge and the late Qing society). Shanghai: Shanghai renmin chubanshe; Ding Weizhi 丁偉志 and Chen Song 陳崧. 1995. *Zhong-Xi ti-yong zhi jian—wan Qing Zhong-Xi wenhuaguan shulun* 中西體用之間—晚清中西文化觀述論 (Between China and the West, essence and use. A commentary on attitudes towards Chinese and Western culture in the late Qing period). Beijing: Zhongguo shehui kexue chubanshe; Sun Guangde 孫廣德. 1994. *Wan Qing chuantong yu Xihua de zhenglun* 晚清傳統與西化的爭論 (Controversies over tradition and Westernization in the late Qing period). Taipei: Shangwu yinshuguan; Ren Fuxing 任復興. 1992. “Wan Qing shidaifu dui Hua-yi guannian de tupo yu jindai aiguo zhuyi” 晚清士大夫對華夷觀點的突破與近代愛國主義 (The rupture in the position of the literati and officials towards Chinese and barbarians in the late Qing period and modern patriotism), *Shehui kexue zhanxian* 1992.3, pp. 195–201.

contribute, in my opinion, to a clarification of many new terms which originated in this context.

During the severe crisis at the time of the Opium War, a few Chinese scholars increasingly felt the necessity to thoroughly get to know the outside world—according to the proverbial saying, “Learn from *yi*, in order to master the challenge of *yi*; learn from *yi*, in order to vanquish *yi*.”<sup>7</sup> With this and similar utilitarian motivations in mind, quite a few books were published on other countries and the earth as a whole.<sup>8</sup> After a slow beginning, more and more works appeared that introduced Chinese readers to cultures foreign to them, as well as to the various subsystems of such cultures. The major contribution of these books to the modern Chinese history of ideas is their general function which may be described as one of enlightenment. In other words: the effect of books like *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖志 (Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries [hereafter *HT*]) and *Yinghuan zhilüe* 瀛環志略 (A brief account of the maritime circuit [hereafter *YZ*]) has *de facto* surpassed their original purpose to vanquish the *yi* by way of getting to know them better. These books plainly show that in our world there exist not only at present *diverse* sovereign states, but that such states also existed in the past. Different countries have different beliefs (denominations) and value systems, different political systems, differ-

<sup>7</sup> The classical formulation is from Wei Yuan: “What is the purpose of this book? The answer is: To attack *yi* by *yi* methods; to treat *yi* with *yi* methods, and to overwhelm *yi* by *yi* technology and *yi* strength” 是書何以作? 曰: 為以夷攻夷而作, 為以夷款夷而作, 為師夷長技以制夷而作. Cf. Wei Yuan 魏源 (ed.). 1844a. *Haiguo tuzhi* 海國圖志 (Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries). Reprinted in: id. (ed.) 1978. *Zengguang Haiguo tuzhi* 增廣海國圖志 (Extended edition of the Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries). 5 vols. Taipei: Guiting chubanshe, vol. 1, p. 7. Elsewhere Wei says “In order to take counter-measures against *yi*, we have to gain clear insight into the circumstances of *yi* in the first place; in order to achieve this, we must above all get to know the face of *yi*.” 籌夷事必知夷情, 知夷情必知夷形. Cf. id. “Chouhai pian” 籌海篇 (On coastal defence), in: Wei Yuan 1978, vol. 2, 3.29.

<sup>8</sup> The following books are of particular significance in this context: Lin Zexu 林則徐. 1835. *Sizhou zhi* 四洲志 (Records of four continents). Reprinted in: Wang Xiqi 王錫祺 (ed.). 1877–1897. *Xiaofanghuzhai yudi congchao. Zai bubian* 小方壺齋輿地叢鈔·再補編 (Collected country surveys from the *Xiaofanghuzhai*-Studio. Addenda to the supplement). Shanghai: Zhuyitang, vol. 12 (hereafter *XFH*); Wei Yuan 1844a; Liang Tingnan 梁廷柎. 1993 [1846]. *Haiguo sishuo* 海國四說 (Four treatises on maritime countries). Beijing: Zhonghua shuju; Yao Ying 姚瑩. 1846. *Kangyou jixing* 康輶紀行 (Travel report of an emissary). n.p.; Xu Jiyu 徐繼畲. 1986 [1848]. *Yinghuan zhilüe* 瀛環志略 (Brief account of the maritime circuit). 3 vols. Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan.

ent mores and customs. Whether the respective author intended it or not, a pluralistic view of history showed that the old monistic worldview of China was untenable. Exactly in these books which introduced the Chinese public to an outside world of which hitherto hardly anything was known, the inner process of development of current ‘dominant thinking’ (the *zeitgeist*) becomes visible. And this development is paralleled (in terms that are of importance to the history of ideas) by the development of forms of stylistic representation and of concepts used to refer to the outside world.

In the monumental opus *Haiguo tuzhi*, about 70 works by Chinese authors are included.<sup>9</sup> A large part of them originated in the period from 1793 to 1856. Thus, the terms used in this collection to refer to foreigners are clearly representative of the time. In the case of Wei Yuan and his contemporaries, the term *waiguo* ‘foreign country’ in fact constitutes merely an exception while the use of the term *yi* obviously dominates. Let us now look at expressions used in the *Brief Record of Occurrences Relating to the English Yi* (*Yingjiliguoyi qing jilue* 英吉利國夷情記略) by Ye Zhongjin 葉鍾進. The date of the publication of this text is not given in *HT*, but in view of the historic facts that are mentioned in it, it must be dated around 1830. In addition, let us look at the text *On England* (*Ji Yingjili* 記英吉利) by Xiao Lingyu 蕭令裕, which appeared in 1833:

Ye Zhongjin, *Yingjiliguoyi qing jilue* (*Brief Record of Occurrences Relating to the English Yi*):

各國，洋錢，夷情，洋商，英國，夷屋，澳夷，番差，夷館，洋圖，米夷，英夷，夷目，西夷，夷使，媚夷，外夷，夷公司，夷船，洋行，各國夷，米利堅夷，夷人，夷婦，他國夷，洋面，夷商，夷性。<sup>10</sup>

Xiao Lingyu, *Ji Yingjili* (*On England*):

泰西，西洋各國，西洋，英夷，英吉利，英夷學，彌利堅夷學，夷商，夷稟，夷性，番人，海外諸番，洋商，他國，外國，夷人，外番，紅毛館，夷船，外夷，夷囚，諸番，夷樓，西洋，夷氣，西洋人，蠻夷，西洋堂，西洋夷目，番梢，西洋圖，華夷參錯，澳夷，西洋市樓，夷舶，夷兵，夷館，洋行，外藩，番銀，外洋商船，夷官，番字，紅毛番，夷夏之辨，夷利。<sup>11</sup>

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Wang Jiajian 王家儉. 1964. *Wei Yuan dui Xifang de renshi jiqi haifang sixiang* 魏源對西方的認識及其海防思想 (Wei Yuan's knowledge of the West and his thought about coastal defence). Taipei: Taiwan jinghua yinshuguan, p. 50; Xiong Yuezhi 1994, p. 258.

<sup>10</sup> Quoted from Wei Yuan 1844, vol. 52, pp. 790–5.

<sup>11</sup> Quoted from *ibid.*, pp. 803–11.

We can deduce from these examples and the contemporary discourse in general that the outside world and its inhabitants were frequently characterized by using *yi* and less often by other terms such as *fan* 番 ‘savages’, in order to reproduce typical perceptions of foreign countries and of foreigners. *Yi* occurs, in speech or written texts, either as a value judgment or as a term signalling negative values; or it constitutes in a certain way—as a prefix or suffix—a morpheme introduced in the process of composing words and categories in order to underline the barbaric character of what is being described. *Yi*, in the examples cited in the last paragraph, has a very concrete meaning—whereas in other texts it is sometimes diffuse and abstract or even so devoid of content that it triggers no thought or perception process whatsoever. What we are dealing with—speaking in general terms—are obviously not only concept-related principles of composition of the *yi* form, which are easier to grasp rationally; more often we are dealing with more subtle means of composition and style. Looking through the prism of state affairs, houses, ships, banks, money, reports, knowledge, but also people, characters, superiors, ambassadors, merchants, inmates, soldiers, officers, etc., we see England, America and in fact, the entire outside world: all these phenomena which could apparently only appear in connection with *yi*—being in this way its self-evident *formant*. This coloration of the Other is, so-to-speak, deeply anchored in the consciousness (or even the subconsciousness), and it seems that we cannot ignore it in ‘Chinese thought’ at the time. Yet, this use of *yi* is not only typical of *HT*; it is also present in the *YZ* of 1848. If one is compelled to name a country and its inhabitants, one frequently takes to extremes such solutions as inventing a new term, in order to degrade foreigners. After all, a phrase such as 啖咭喇國夷人啞啞啞哩 晚噴啞 等來廣稟稱 ... is no exception.<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>12</sup> Quoted from Liang Tingnan 1993, p. 236. The sentence would roughly translate: “The English barbarian Bloomfield [?] came to Canton with some others and reported...”.—When giving names to foreign countries and people, characters are used or invented in Chinese translations which incorporate *kou* 口. According to the general opinion, *kou* here refers to the mouth of animals rather than humans. It is very obvious that fleeting or suggestive impressions, emotive values, accompanying meanings, elements by which an atmosphere or a mood is evoked, attitudes that include a volitional element, and in part evaluative associations are being subsumed under this component. Interestingly enough, the Greek expression for the ‘barbarian’ (*βάρβαρος*) originally referred to his incomprehensible language as well. The barbarian was seen as an incomprehensible babbling.

Even though *HT* and *YZ*—as introductory overviews concerned with ‘country studies’, i.e. geography, history and politics—constitute works which exerted a stimulating influence on Chinese intellectuals during the second half of the nineteenth century, it is possible to say that, during this period, the use of the term *yi* as an expression describing foreigners had already become outmoded. If, in the case of Wei Yuan and Xu Jiyu, the scientific and informative aspect was dominant and if their works were to obtain (relatively speaking) a ‘more objective’ value, due on the one hand to a sort of positivist geography, and on the other to a certain historical ‘base’, we can witness, especially in the 1860s, a whole sequence of travel journals, travel reports and travel descriptions which present as much information on cultural and geographic, historic and natural specificities of the countries visited. This is why we shall now turn our attention to the travel reports displaying interest in the objective world in order to trace lexical and conceptual changes. Especially in the travel depictions, which often merge journalistic elements with those of travelogues, a clear development with regard to the characterization of the outside world can be observed. It becomes more and more obvious that the authors were slowly turning away from *yi* while increasingly embracing *yang*, *wai*, and *xi*—even if the points of transition were sometimes fluid. For the sake of comparison and in order to explore the changes in the use of language, I have collected the relevant passages of three travel reports in which *yi* has already disappeared:

Bin Chun 斌春, *Chengcha biji* 乘槎筆記 (Collected notes from a mission, 1866):

泰西，外國，《海國番夷錄》，洋樓，洋船，洋人，外洋，西語西文，西國，西俗，諸國，西洋，列國，西土。<sup>13</sup>

Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾, *Shi Xi jicheng* 使西紀程 (Diary of an embassy to the West, 1877):

洋文，西洋，西洋人，洋行，西洋風俗，洋元，洋槍，番人，洋人，洋船，洋醫，英人，洋琴，洋婦，西洋文字，西教，西洋各國，洋教，西洋圖，洋務，夷狄，西洋文物，洋樓，洋畫。<sup>14</sup>

Qian Depei 錢德培, *Ouyou suibi* 歐游隨筆 (Miscellaneous notes from a journey to Europe, 1877):

<sup>13</sup> Bin Chun 斌春 . 1866. *Chengcha biji* 乘槎筆記 (Collected notes from a mission). Reprinted in: *XFH*, vol. 11, 36 pages, *passim*.

<sup>14</sup> Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾 . 1877. *Shi Xi jicheng* 使西紀程 (Diary of an embassy to the West). Reprinted in: *XFH*, vol. 11, 14 pages, *passim*.

洋務局，西洋，洋人，各國，洋役，西人，洋人，西藥，歐美各國，西國，西法，洋水仙，洋花，洋船，洋語，洋差，洋文，西醫，洋琴，西俗，西例，洋員，泰西，西書，洋醫，西語，外洋。<sup>15</sup>

The almost exclusive use of *xi*, *yang* and *xiyang* in these texts clearly and distinctly indicates a change, not only with regard to the intellectual meaning of a word (denotation) but also with regard to those emotional and evaluative *marginal meanings* which can in part be described as stylistic variants. In two more texts we shall find quite a few expressions and concepts which have remained in use until today:

Zeng Jize 曾紀澤, *Shi Xi riji* 使西日記 (Diary of a mission to the West, 1878–1880):

泰西，洋務，外洋，洋文洋語，外國人，洋人，外國語，外國，外部，西音，西字，西人，國外，西國，各國，歐洲各〔諸〕國，西文，泰西，西書，西洋，西士，西法，西學，洋行，洋款，洋槍，西洋人，西醫，洋船。<sup>16</sup>

Song Yuren 宋育仁, *Taixi geguo caifeng ji* 泰西各國采風記 (Notes on the mores and customs of diverse countries in the West, 1895):

西國，西教，泰西，夷習，洋語，西國，西人，外國，外國人，外夷，西治，中外古今，夷狄，西政，外域，譽洋者，慕洋者，夷法，外洋，外部，別國，西方，西文，西士，西教，西洋各國，洋文，洋書，西學，外邦，諸國，西域，西歷，洋譯，洋務，外國字母，泰西諸國，歐人，西俗，西語，外夷，華夷之界，夷禍，夷政，夷夏之辨。<sup>17</sup>

It must be mentioned that in a number of travel reports, for instance in the last example given here, the word *yi* can still be found. But a qualitative change has already occurred: *yi* is used almost exclusively if and when one wants to contradict the old cliché—or if (not without irony) the author discusses history. The more recent uses of *yi* are very often purely rhetoric and contrastive when *yi* is applied in opposition to ‘things Chinese’.

It is true that it is rather problematic and perhaps even impossible to precisely determine the moment or short period of transition when the *yi* form dies away, gives way or breaks through to new forms of expression. It is also true that the use of *yi* or its synonyms has not been entirely abandoned until the early twentieth century. Still, we

<sup>15</sup> Qian Depei 錢德培 . 1877. “Ouyou suibi” 歐游隨筆 (Miscellaneous notes from a journey in Europe). Reprinted in: *XFH*, vol. 11, 43 pages, *passim*.

<sup>16</sup> Zeng Jize 曾紀澤 . 1878–1880. *Shi Xi riji* 使西日記 (Diary of a mission to the West). Reprinted in: *XFH*, Addenda to the supplement, vol. 11, 28 pages, *passim*.

<sup>17</sup> Song Yuren 宋育仁 . 1895. *Taixi geguo caifeng ji* 泰西各國采風記 (Notes on the mores and customs of diverse countries in the West). Reprinted in: *XFH*, Addenda to the supplement, vol. 11, 40 pages, *passim*.

discover instances (in our case, even historic events) which allow to identify and in fact date, in a very intriguing way, the lexical and conceptual change taking place. For reasons I will discuss below, I want to mark the year 1860 as a caesura for argument's sake. If we compare the sources published before and after that date, which I have selected so far, we immediately see that the word *yi*, understood as a generalized, intersubjectively valid representational element, was gradually pushed into the background and was superseded by *yang*, *xi*, and *wai*. This becomes very clear from the following examples:

*Table 1: Examples of the gradual change in the description of foreign people and countries*

| <i>Chinese terms before 1860</i> |                          | → | <i>Chinese terms after 1860</i> |   |
|----------------------------------|--------------------------|---|---------------------------------|---|
| 紅毛番                              | red-haired barbarians    |   | 西洋人                             | Westerners                              |
| 西洋夷                              | Western barbarians       |   | 洋人                              | Westerners                              |
| 夷人                               | barbarians               |   | 西人                              | Westerners                              |
| 番人                               | barbarians               |   | 外國人                             | foreigners                              |
| 西夷                               | barbarian areas          |   | 西洋                              | The West                                |
| 各夷                               | barbarian areas          |   | 西方                              | The West                                |
| 諸番                               | barbarian areas          |   | 各國                              | foreign countries                       |
| 外夷                               | barbarian areas          |   | 諸國                              | foreign countries                       |
|                                  |                          |   | 外洋                              | foreign countries                       |
|                                  |                          |   | 外邦                              | foreign countries                       |
|                                  |                          |   | 外國                              | foreign countries                       |
|                                  |                          |   | 外域                              | foreign countries                       |
| 海外諸番                             | barbarian areas overseas |   | 西洋各國                            | various countries in the West           |
|                                  |                          |   | 西洋國                             | various countries in the West           |
|                                  |                          |   | 歐美各國                            | various countries in Europe and America |
| 夷船                               | barbarian ships          |   | 洋船                              | foreign ships                           |
| 夷舶                               | barbarian ships          |   | 洋舶                              | foreign ships                           |
| 夷樓                               | barbarian houses         |   | 洋樓                              | foreign houses                          |
| 夷屋                               | barbarian houses         |   | 洋屋                              | foreign houses                          |
| 夷館                               | barbarian houses         |   | 洋館                              | foreign houses                          |
| 夷官                               | barbarian officials      |   | 洋官                              | foreign officials                       |
| 夷商                               | barbarian merchants      |   | 洋商                              | foreign merchants                       |
| 夷兵                               | barbarian soldiers       |   | 西兵                              | foreign soldiers                        |

*Table 1: Examples of the gradual change in the description of foreign people and countries (cont.)*

| <i>Chinese terms before 1860</i> |                           | → | <i>Chinese terms after 1860</i> |                             |
|----------------------------------|---------------------------|---|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|
| 番差                               | barbarian messenger       |   | 洋差                              | foreign messenger           |
| 夷學                               | barbarian knowledge       |   | 西學                              | Western knowledge           |
| 夷俗                               | barbarian customs         |   | 西俗                              | Western customs             |
| 番字                               | barbarian characters      |   | 外國字母                            | foreign letters             |
|                                  |                           |   | 西語西文                            | Western speech and writing  |
| 番銀                               | barbarian money           |   | 洋銀                              | foreign money               |
|                                  |                           |   | 洋元                              | foreign money               |
| 媚夷                               | fawning on the barbarians |   | 譽洋                              | toadying foreigners         |
|                                  |                           |   | 慕洋                              | toadying foreigners         |
| 華夷                               | China and barbarian areas |   | 中西                              | China and the West          |
| 夷夏                               | China and barbarian areas |   | 中外                              | China and foreign countries |

By drawing on reference books and travel reports, I have assembled here diverse forms of expression or syntagmas which relate to the outside world.<sup>18</sup> I have done so guided by the intention to produce a roughly sketched survey of the historic change the expressions were subject to. Before I consider the reasons for this development, I would

<sup>18</sup> With regard to the general change from *yi* to *yang*, *xi* and *wai*, I have consulted the following works in addition to the quoted passages: (1) Yang Bingnan 楊炳南. “Hai lu” 海錄 (Records of the seas); Yao Ying 姚瑩. “Yingjili ditu shuo” 英吉利地圖說 (On the map of England); Zhang Deyi 張德彝. “Hanghai shu qi” 航海述奇 (Description of particular occurrences during an ocean crossing); Zhi Gang 志剛. “Chushi Taixi ji” 初使泰西記 (Records of the first mission to the Far West); Liu Xihong 劉錫鴻. “Yingyao riji” 英輶日記 (Diary kept during a mission in England); Yuan Zuzhi 袁祖志. “Xisu zazhi” 西俗雜誌 (Miscellaneous notes on Western customs); Shen Chun 沈純. “Xishi lice” 西事蠡測 (Humble observations on things Western); all reprinted in: *XFH*, vol. 11. (2) Shen Dunhe 沈敦和. “Yingjiliguozhilüe” 英吉利國志略 (Brief account of England). Reprinted in: *XFH*, Supplement, vol. 11. (3) Hong Xun 洪勛. “Youli Yidali wenjian lu” 游歷意大利聞見錄 (Records from my travels in Italy); id. “Youli Ruidian Nawei wenjian lu” 游歷瑞典那威聞見錄 (Records from my travels in Sweden and Norway); id. “Youli Xibanya wenjian lu” 游歷西班牙聞見錄 (Records from my travels in Spain); id. “Youli wenjian zonglüe” 游歷聞見總略 (General remarks on the records of my travels); Yan Sizong 顏斯綜. “Haifang yulun” 海防餘論 (Explanatory remarks on coastal defence); all reprinted in: *XFH*, Addenda to the supplement, vol. 11.

like to draw a brief interim conclusion, mainly by analyzing the semantic characteristics as well as the associations triggered by the rival expressions: characteristics which accompany (as in the case of *yi*) a word of necessity, which guarantee its semantic distinction, and which are known in the history of philosophy as ‘analytic judgments’.

Due to the insight that the West was in many respects ahead of China (and also in view of a certain admiration for things Western), the word *yang*, which basically denoted ‘overseas’ or ‘oceanic’ and which was of neutral value, assumed more and more positive connotations such as ‘progress’ and ‘modern’—something that still applies to a certain extent even in present-day Chinese. We see here that new perceptions are added to the word. At one time, *yang* was used to refer to all things which came from the West, which were new to the Chinese, and which (very often) they could not describe precisely. Or it referred, as much, to things which betrayed a certain difference from things Chinese. Furthermore, we discover that quite a few travellers before embarking on their travels to the West described certain things by using *yang*, whereas subsequently—when staying abroad—they endeavoured to name the same things in a more precise way, instead of simply referring to them by qualifying them as *yang*. If they did not succeed to be precise, they still used *yang* or perhaps *xi* and *wai* to point out their non-Chinese character.

If Wei Yuan, Xu Jiyu, and their contemporaries found it problematic to use *yi* exclusively, this was also due to an inevitable representational difficulty: how do you refer, in writing about the European or American past and present, to the ‘outside world’ of the West? Or to put the question differently: how would a European or American (in a Chinese work) call his outside world and people from other continents? In this case, neither *yi* nor *yang* would do. Therefore one was often compelled to choose a neutral term like *wai*. Thus we find, in Xu Jiyu’s *YZ*, phrases like:

英國之制相二人：一專司國內之政，一專司外國之務。

In the system of England, there are two Chancellors: while the one is in charge of domestic affairs, the other takes care of foreign affairs.<sup>19</sup>

We may assume that the expressions *guonei zhi zheng* 國內之政 ‘domestic affairs’ and *guowai zhi wu* 國外之務 ‘foreign affairs’ certainly influenced the formation of the later terms *neizheng* 內政

<sup>19</sup> Xu Jiyu 1986, p. 602.

‘domestic policy’ and *waiwu* 外務 ‘foreign policy’, as they can be derived without difficulty from Xu Jiyu’s expressions. Such examples demonstrate how expressions and concepts that were introduced tentatively and beyond previous routines in order to describe foreign things and relationships, could be adopted and integrated into one’s own, eventually ‘secured’ stock of expressions.

Generally speaking, it is possible to maintain that *yang* arrived at obtaining more or less (though not always) evaluative characteristics and that it signalled certain emotions, while *yi* in contemporary discourse—typically in the context of geographic presentations and references to things and facts—ended up being generally perceived as neutral. Probably in order to underline equal status and equal rights in an international context, *xi*—as well as *wai*—became more and more widely used during the final years of the nineteenth century. At that time, *xi* is obviously more object-focused and much less evaluative. If during the period of the Opium War, Western knowledge was regarded as *yixue* 夷學 ‘barbarian learning’, used in a pejorative sense, at the turn of the century *xixue* 西學 ‘Western learning’ was already a popular term with an entirely positive meaning.

Especially in order to counter the objections of conservative challengers who still looked unfavourably on Western knowledge, a new term (that paralleled *xixue*), *xinxue* 新學 was propagated at the turn of the century. If Liang Qichao 梁啟超 in 1896 still speaks of *xixue* in his *Xixue shumu biao* 西學書目表 (Bibliography of Western knowledge), similar publications intending to further innovation and modernization now carried ‘new’ in the title, as in the case of *Xinxue shumu tiyao* 新學書目提要 (Annotated bibliography of new knowledge).<sup>20</sup> If we look at this ‘new knowledge’, it deals mostly with scientific insights received from the West. The replacement of the key term in the title of texts presenting the ‘new knowledge’ occurred as a conse-

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (ed.). 1896. *Xixue shumu biao* 西學書目表 (Bibliography of Western knowledge). Shanghai: Shiwu baoguan; Shen Zhaoyi 沈兆禕. 1904. *Xinxue shumu tiyao* 新學書目提要 (Annotated bibliography of new knowledge). Shanghai: Tongya shuju. The following books on the ‘new knowledge’ must also be mentioned: Timothy Richard (Li Timotai 李提摩太). 1898. *Qiguo xinxue beiyao* 七國新學備要 (Essentials of new knowledge from seven countries). Shanghai: Guangxuehui; Young J. Allen (Lin Lezhi 林樂知) and Timothy Richard. 1898. *Xinxue hui-bian* 新學彙編 (A digest of new knowledge). Edited by Cai Erkang 蔡爾康. Shanghai: Guangxuehui; *Xinxue da congshu* 新學大叢書 (Comprehensive collection of books on new knowledge). 1903–1904. Shanghai: Jishan jiaoji shuju.

quence of a basic consideration: that science is without limits and frontiers and that a division between East and West is hence unnecessary. Therefore, the conservatives were told, there was no reason to fear that someone might try to use Western knowledge in order to eliminate the so-called ‘Chinese essence’.<sup>21</sup> Exactly in the sense that it is not the West alone which can put a claim to new knowledge and science as such, we must understand the alternative concept now introduced, according to which East and West form a unity.<sup>22</sup> We thus note that the change from *yixue* to *xixue*, and then to *xinxue*, represents not only a metamorphosis of the psychic disposition *vis-à-vis* Western culture, but to a large degree a general change of the *vision du monde*.

Defining a concept by contrasting it with another concept is a frequently used procedure. From this point of view, all definitions (or clarifications) of concepts are based on binary oppositions. Whereas *xi* in the 1860s and 70s—in opposition to *zhong* 中 (Middle Kingdom; centre)—still carried a basically negative evaluation and connotation,<sup>23</sup> and *xin*—as in *xinxue*—contained obviously positive elements of meaning (such as recognition and readiness to imitate), we see *wai* emerging without doubt as an entirely neutral term: a word, on the basis of which later a whole sequence of terms was formed.

The instances of communicative ‘interference’ which occurred were, in our case, in the truest sense of the word of a semantic kind. One of the first to object to the specific use of *yi* was an Englishman, Hugh Hamilton Lindsay (Hu Xiami 胡夏米, 1802–1881), an employee of the British East India Company. In order to clarify the genuine sense of the word *yi*, he resorted to the Chinese Classics and in his dealings with the Chinese authorities, he urgently argued that England was not a country of barbarians but only a ‘foreign country’ for the Chinese.<sup>24</sup>

<sup>21</sup> Cf. Cai Pei 蔡培 . 1902. “Xixue yi ming wei xinxue shuo” 西學宜名為新學說 (‘Western knowledge’ should be called ‘new knowledge’), in: *Huangchao jingshiwen xinbian xuji* 皇朝經世文新編續集 (Sequel to the new collection of writings on statecraft). Edited by Chu Guishan 儲桂山 . n.p.: Yiji shuju, ch. 12.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. *Zhong-Xi xinxue daquan* 中西新學大全 (Comprehensive collection of new learning in China and the West). 1897. Edited by Jiuzhizhai zhuren 救志齋主人 . Shanghai: Hongwen shuju; Xu Weize 徐維則 . 1899. *Dong Xi xue shulu* 東西學書錄 (Bibliography of Chinese and Western knowledge). n.p.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Xiong Yuezhi 1994, p. 729.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Chen Xulu 1984, p. 22.

The Portuguese Jose Martins-Marguez (known as Ma Jishi 瑪吉士), the author of the *Dili beikao* 地理備考 (A study of geography, 1847) writes in the preface to his book:

Among the guests from far-away lands, there are those who are well-versed in ethics and practice justice, who know astronomy and geography, who are well aware of the inner laws of things, of the historic past as well as the present—who are outstanding persons of our earth and good friends from afar. How can one characterize them as barbarians—as *yi* and *di*?<sup>25</sup>

Wei Yuan obviously thought very highly of the *Dili beikao*.<sup>26</sup> In *HT*, he quotes Martins-Marguez most frequently and extensively.<sup>27</sup> The fact that Wei Yuan included the Martins-Marguez' preface (which deals mainly with the Chinese term *yi* and which does not really fit, due to its form type and essayistic style, into *HT*), supports the assumption that he was greatly inspired by the arguments that Martins-Marguez had presented. At any rate, the explanations of Martins-Marguez are very visible indeed, and highly provocative, given the prevalent thought of the period. Comparing *HT* by Wei Yuan and *YZ* by Xu Jiyu, some commentators have tried to point out the conservative side of the former author.<sup>28</sup> But by the standards of his time and generation, he was quite progressive. There were only a few writers who blazed a new trail in terms of widening the horizon—and Wei Yuan was one of them. Certainly it is true that the *yi* form still dominates in Wei Yuan's work; and just as certainly, as far as his political attitude is concerned, he is still bound to the traditional mode of thinking which departs from the concept that 'China is the centre'. But the freshness and openness of the approach *vis-à-vis* the outside world that *HT* portrays, as well as the wide horizon of the author, certainly

<sup>25</sup> Martins-Marguez frequently uses *yi* in the *Dili beikao*. But this happens only in a context where he writes about European history and describes people and regions (that is to say, foreigners) outside Classical Rome, i.e. barbarians, countries of barbarians, barbarian mores, etc. The concept here goes back to the ancient Greek attitude which took him who was not Greek for a poor 'bárbaros'.

<sup>26</sup> Wei Yuan 魏源 (ed.). 1844b. "Haiguo tuzhi houxu" 海國圖志·後敘 (Postface to the *Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries*). Reprinted in: id. (ed.) 1978. *Zengguang Haiguo tuzhi* 增廣海國圖志 (Extended edition of the *Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries*). 5 vols. Taipei: Guiting chubanshe, vol. 1, p. 9.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Xiong Yuezhi 熊月之. 1996. "Haiguo tuzhi zhengyin xishu kaoshi" 《海國圖志》徵引西書考釋 (An investigation of the Western writings referred to in *Haiguo tuzhi*), *Zhonghua wenshi luncong* 55, pp. 235–58; 253; cf. id. 1994, p. 264.

<sup>28</sup> Cf. Ren Fuxing 1992, pp. 195–7.

questioned the traditional (and thus his own) world-view. Here, a new way of thinking emerges and develops the first shoots of a new reflection on the outside world—and thus, of course, of a new terminology used to refer to it. And for this reason we surely cannot assume the inclusion of and reference made to the explications of Martins-Marguez to be accidental or marginal.

As I have already pointed out, a word like *yi* contained mainly a negative denotation and connotation for a long time. But a negative phenomenon—in addition to brandishing its abominable or even frightening aspect—can (or could) give rise to awe if not admiration—as we also notice, in inverse direction, in the case of a topos current in the West, the ‘yellow peril’ (or *Gelbe Gefahr*). When Feng Guifen 馮桂芬 (1809–1874) in his well-known *Jiaobinlu kangyi* 校邠廬抗議 (Protest notes from the *Jiaobin*-Studio, 1860–61), talked about *yi*, the term in my opinion referred less to uncivilized and insensitive people without culture but rather signified the people and countries in Europe and North America that were in a way to be envied. He seems to have used *yi* only for a rhetorical reason—and also according to the long-standing custom—in order to better ‘sell’ his views. Let us now look at ‘four non-equivalencies’ that Feng lists in his text:

With regard to the fact that talents do not go unrecognized, we cannot rank with *yi*; with regard to the fact that acreage is not left un-utilized, we cannot rank with *yi*; with regard to the fact that ruler and people are not divided by a deep gulf, we cannot rank with *yi*; with regard to the fact that the name corresponds to the reality, we cannot rank with *yi*.<sup>29</sup>

This critique of his own culture and social reality, unusually sharp for the time, is by all means noteworthy, even if the state of affairs attributed to *yi* has evidently been praised in an exaggerated way by Feng Guifen. But it is not the task of this study to analyze a hypothesis of Feng Guifen so charged with emotion. If we direct our attention to the characterization of *yi* and the contents ascribed to it, we immediately recognize that to a large extent *yi* has already lost its original meaning as a term for barbarians. What is (or is to be) understood by the word *yi* is determined through the interdependency of the isolated meaning of the word and its context—and thus depends, in addition to the lexi-

<sup>29</sup> Feng Guifen 馮桂芬. 1998. *Jiaobinlu kangyi* 校邠廬抗議 (Protest notes from the *Jiaobin*-Studio). Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, p. 198. The text was written in 1860/61, circulated only in manuscript form before finally being officially published after the author’s death in 1883.

cal meaning, on the recognizable meaning of the entire statement, as constituted by the author and on subjective perceptions of both the author and the reader. Basically, the transformation of meaning we are dealing with can already be ascertained by Wei Yuan exhorting the readers of *HT* to learn from the *yi*. (Of course, *yi* remained a term connected with negative evaluation, and we can tell only in a concrete context whether the term is used in a purely rhetoric fashion.)

We are now returning to the reasons for the change perceived by the student of the history of these words and concepts. For this purpose, I want to call up a contemporary witness. I will therefore quote a long passage from Song Yuren's 宋育仁 (1857–1931) *Taixi geguo caifeng ji* 泰西各國采風記 (Records on the mores and customs of diverse countries in the West, 1895). The text is in every respect very revealing for my analysis:

The foreign powers are jointly making every effort to divide China among themselves. If they work in the same direction, the reason for this is probably not simply that they cling—by and large—to similar denominations whereas our country sticks to quite different beliefs. The reason for it is certainly to be found as well in the discrepancy between mirage and fact, that is to say, between perception and reality: the reality is our vast country with its rich resources left unused and arousing the envy of Westerners, whereas our perception is based on the strict separation of the Middle Kingdom from the rest of the world, i.e. the world of the *yi*. In other words: China has a noble name; in reality, it is so run down that many people emigrate and that the *yi* are no longer prepared to be content with the noble name of China. Indeed, the *Chunqiu* 春秋 (Spring and Autumn Annals) clearly separate *yi* and *xia*; but the commentaries to the Canon have for a long time missed the quintessential significance of this distinction. These misinterpretations brought it about that China, since the time of the Han dynasty, has been plagued by one *yi* catastrophe after the other—up to this very day. The distinction between *yi* and *xia* in the Canon rests, however, solely on *liyi* 禮義, i.e. the level of ethics and ritual attained, and not on geographic distance. ... In the treaty of 1858, China was specifically forbidden to further apply the term *yi* in government documents and official papers to foreign countries and their inhabitants. The treaty remains in power, but the interdiction arouses scepticism: this creates a deep gulf between China and the foreign countries. Beyond this, it makes clear the following: The emotions of people are by and large the same, and people everywhere do care for their good name, but in the shuffle about names and glory we are ahead of all others. The foreigners only know that *yi* is a derogatory expression, but they are not aware of the reason for this inferiority. The Chinese only know that *xia* is a

great name, but they do not know the reason for this greatness. This is why China, because of its splendid name, has become a target. Starting from misinterpretations of the Canon, this causes great mischief and brings about conflicts and wars between China and foreign countries. ... But the books of the Sages lean neither to this side nor that; and besides, *yi* and *xia* are not achievements gained in battle. It is left to the *dao*. And it is important to know one's limits. Only in this way can we erase distrust and respect famous denominations. China is indeed the home of famous denominations—a country that is to be revered.<sup>30</sup>

Let us start by pointing out that the reason for conflicts and wars between China and the Western powers is represented by Song Yuren in a very simplified way. The great mischief, respectively the intrusion of the West he refers to, certainly cannot be traced back to misinterpretations of the Canon. If we disregard this important point, because it is after all not central to this study, and instead direct our attention to those passages which refer to the historic roots of the opposition between *yi* and *xia* and which—in retrospect—focus on the use made of these terms (including actual usage), then Song Yuren's explications will be seen as indeed relevant and a conclusion can be reached with regard to at least the following points:

On the one hand, we find here an early reference to a historic document which tells us the date when the usage of *yi* in public intercourse with foreign countries was forbidden and which notes to what extent this was attributable to outside interference: After the Second Opium War, two new treaties were concluded in 1858 in Tianjin between the Qing government and England on the one hand and France on the other. Article 51 of the 'Tianjin Treaty' between China and England stipulated that the English may not be degraded as *yi*. In view of the long established discursive practices of Chinese society and culture, with its terms, perceptions and attitudes that degraded inhabitants of the 'periphery' (terms and attitudes not only in official usage but commonly used by the populace as well), it was at least possible to officially draw a line against the use of *yi*. Indeed, since about 1860 *yang* slowly began to be used instead of *yi*—a trend starting out from Guangzhou, which the British had conquered together with the French in 1858.<sup>31</sup> This is the decisive reason why I have taken 1860 as a cae-

---

<sup>30</sup> Song Yuren 1895, p. 40.

<sup>31</sup> Cf. Chen Xulu 1984, pp. 25–6.

sura—the year when the ratification documents of the ‘Tianjin Treaties’ with England and France were exchanged.

If, then, the interdiction of *yi* was more or less a result of Western gunboat diplomacy and if this represents an exterior cause of language change, the cognitive process apparently characterizing the mental development of many intellectuals at the time must be taken as an inner cause of this change. The views of Song Yuren—referred to above—rather ostentatiously render proof of this. As a consequence of the opening of the country, it is quite natural that the expanded and enriched knowledge of the outside world had to be reflected in the use of words and specifically in the choices made with regard to the four words we are concerned with here. As early as 1859, Hong Rengan 洪仁玕 maintained that calling foreigners *yi* was the equivalent of a ‘psychological victory’ which did not even faintly correspond to real facts.<sup>32</sup> Wang Tao 王韜, in the 1870s, phrased it like this:

If we look at the present political situation, trade relations between China and abroad are a fact that will continue to be a reality as much as the earth itself will. In view of this, it is rather unrealistic and anachronistic to go on speaking of driving out and annihilating the *yi*.<sup>33</sup>

And in his *Taoyuan wenlu waibian* 弢園文錄外編 (Addition to the collection of writings from Taoyuan, 1883), we find a brief text entitled “Hua yi bian” 華夷辨 (Differentiating between *hua* and *yi*) which maintains that it is quite absurd to categorically denigrate the Other as *yi*:

Traditionally there exists the differentiation between Inside-*hua* and Outside-*yi*. Therefore the Middle Kingdom is referred to as *hua*, and everything outside this centre as *yi*. Still, this is nothing but an absurd allegation. The chapter *Yugong* 禹貢 [in the *Shangshu*] decreed the nine divisions of China (*jiuzhou* 九州); but in these nine areas, various *yi* were living at several locations. The Zhou-System divided the country into nine regions (*jiu fu* 九服), but half of the inhabitants of these regions were *yi*. According to the norms of the *Chunqiu* 春秋, only those are regarded as *yi* who share the manners of barbarians. If they link up with China and follow the Chinese *li* 禮 (ethics and ritual), they are regarded as Chinese. Even though the *yi-di* areas are large, they have been downgraded. For this region, the *Chunqiu* even refers to the civilized *Wu* 吳 and *Chu* 楚 areas as *yi*. The differentiation between *hua*

---

<sup>32</sup> Hong Rengan is of the opinion that one must see it only as a reflection of victory in a rhetoric contest (unrelated to facts), if foreigners are called *yi* 夷, *di* 狄, *rong* 戎, *man* 蠻, or *guizi* 鬼子 ‘devils’. Cf. Chen Xulu 1984, p. 27.

<sup>33</sup> Quoted from *ibid.*

and *yi* is not a question of some geographical *inside* or *outside* location; rather it depends on the *li*. Having *li*, the *yi* can become *hua*; not having *li*, the *hua* can also turn into *yi*. How, then, can one be so condescending as to regard one's self highly while showing low esteem for others?<sup>34</sup>

Similarly, the obvious aim and intention of Song Yuren was to identify a major error as the cause of tension between *yi* and *xia*—an error which, he suggests, most people are likely to commit. Song therefore endeavoured to correct this error, in the true spirit of *zhengming* 正名, the 'rectification of names', the fundamental concern of Confucius. It is interesting that even an enlightened intellectual and diplomat such as Song Yuren was in the final analysis not quite able to emancipate himself from the old model of thought, according to which China is seen as the home of famous denominations. But we probably have to take this not so much as an indication of his intellectual and moral attitude—but rather of the social position of the author (or of the fact that he was subject to pressures of his political adversaries). To a certain extent, what we are dealing with are also successful strategies of political debate.

No matter whether it was pushed forward by outside forces or an inner urge, the change affecting historically established words and concepts took place slowly but surely, even though many might perceive it as painful. In the following, I would like to give some concrete examples documenting this change:

The term *yiwu* 夷務 'barbarian affairs' originated, and then spread, approximately during the reign of the Daoguang 道光 emperor (1821–1851).<sup>35</sup> It refers to all those affairs which are connected with *yi*, i.e. 'barbarians', for example the interdiction of opium, coastal defence, and other foreign affairs. The term *yangwu* 洋務 'oceanic affairs' makes its initial appearance in the years 1839/40, that is to say, during the First Opium War, but it is hardly known during the subsequent years.<sup>36</sup> The official replacement of *yiwu* by *yangwu* occurs from 1858 onward, after the already mentioned Treaty of Tianjin. As Song Yuren commented, the Chinese side was at that time still not prepared

---

<sup>34</sup> Wang Tao 王韜 . 1998 [1883]. *Taoyuan wenlu waibian* 弢園文錄外編 (Addition to the collection of writings from Taoyuan). Zhengzhou: Zhongzhou guji chubanshe, p. 364.

<sup>35</sup> Cf. Chen Xulu 1984, p. 24.

<sup>36</sup> Cf. *ibid.*, pp. 24–5.

to forego the use of *yi*. Thus we see *yangwu*—in conformity with the treaty—almost exclusively used in official documents. Internally, *yiwu* continued to be preferred. If in the 1860s, as well as later on, *yangwu* and *yiwu* are interchangeable and appear side by side not only in texts by different authors but even in the same text, this is to be regarded as a characteristic *transitional phenomenon*. (We can explain this by a lack of readiness to accept change, but also by a deep-rooted mentality which constituted an unconscious barrier; we can see it also as proof of the relative permanence and inertia of language and its words and concepts, once they have been securely established.) In addition to *yangwu*—or as a substitute for *yangwu*—two other terms, *waiwu* 外務 ‘foreign affairs’ and *waijiao* 外交 ‘communication with foreign [countries]’ (which in terms of their content can be seen as neutral) are simultaneously introduced.

Language change—as well as the resistance to change—becomes clearly apparent in the monumental collection *Chouban yiwu shimo* 籌辦夷務始末 (Documents on the handling of *yi* affairs). The documents dating back to the reign of the Daoguang emperor were compiled in 1856.<sup>37</sup> Therefore it is comprehensible that the old term *yiwu* is still used—the term *yangwu* not yet being known (at least not during the first two decades of the period in question). But the documents from the reigns of the Xianfeng 咸豐 (1851–1862) and Tongzhi 同治 (1862–1875) emperors were compiled in 1867 and 1880, respectively, when the term *yangwu* was already popular. It was probably more a reflection of the conservative attitude of the editors (Jia Zhen 賈楨 and Bao Jun 寶璽) than concern for the unity of the work that they chose to stick to the old title.<sup>38</sup> But this is tantamount to saying that even after the replacement of *yiwu* by *yangwu*, there were still those who would not or could not reconcile themselves with the new trend and were not prepared to put foreigners on an equal footing and call them by a name other than *yi*. To put it more politely: not a few speakers of

<sup>37</sup> Cf. Qi Sihe 齊思和 et al. (eds.). 1964a. *Chouban yiwu shimo (Daoguang chao)* 籌辦夷務始末 (道光朝) (Documents on the handling of barbarian affairs during the Daoguang era). 6 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Qi Sihe 齊思和 et al. (eds.). 1964b. *Chouban yiwu shimo (Xianfeng chao)* 籌辦夷務始末 (咸豐朝) (Documents on the handling of barbarian affairs during the Xianfeng era). 8 vols. Beijing: Zhonghua shuju; Shen Yunlong 沈雲龍 (ed.). 1971. *Chouban yiwu shimo (Tongzhi chao)* 籌辦夷務始末 (同治朝) (Documents on the handling of barbarian affairs during the Tongzhi era). 16 vols. Taipei: Wenhai (*Jindai Zhongguo shiliao congkan* 60).

Chinese still saw the traditional correlation as significant. *Yi*, for many of them, referred not only to its conceptual semantic characteristics (denotational elements of representation) but also to simultaneously contained ‘indirect’ or ‘additional’ information, that is to say, accompanying or ‘co-information’. The sequel to the mentioned opus, now edited by Wang Yanwei 王彥威 (1843–1904) and his son Wang Liang 王亮, was however—in Wang Yanwei’s view—to be called *Chouban yangwu shimo* 籌辦洋務始末 (Documents on the handling of foreign affairs). Because *yangwu* had in the meantime become obsolete as well, Wang Liang, after the death of his father, eventually chose the title *Qingji waijiao shiliao* 清季外交史料 (Materials on the history of foreign affairs in the late Qing period), published only in 1934.<sup>39</sup> Yet, the term *waijiao* was first used by Xue Fucheng 薛福成 in his *Chouyang chuyi* 籌洋芻議 (My modest views on *yang* affairs, 1879), and in all likelihood this was also the first time that it appeared in the context of the *discourse* on international relations.<sup>40</sup>

It seems to be merely accidental that exactly in 1860—the year the ratification documents of the ‘Tianjin Treaty’ were exchanged—the *Fuyi ju* 撫夷局 or ‘Office for Calming Down the *yi*’ was established, only to be renamed in the following year *Zongli geguo shiwu yamen* 總理各國事務衙門.<sup>41</sup> It is not without interest that the name of the renowned educational institute Tongwenguan 同文館 (established in 1862 in Beijing, 1863 in Shanghai, and 1864 in Guangzhou) was changed as well. Even though the main purpose of the Tongwenguan was to teach foreign languages, the name means roughly speaking

<sup>39</sup> Cf. Chen Xulu 1984, pp. 28–9.

<sup>40</sup> Cf. Wang Ermin 王爾敏. 1985. “Shi jiu shiji Zhongguo guoji guannian zhi yanbian” 十九世紀中國國際觀念之演變 (The change in China’s attitude towards the world during the nineteenth century), in: *Zhongguo jinxiandai shi lunji* 中國近現代史論集. Vol. 7: *Ziqiang yundong—waijiao* 自強運動·外交 (Collection of essays on modern and contemporary Chinese history. Vol. 7: The Self-Strengthening Movement–Diplomacy). Taipei: Taiwan Shangwu yinshuguan, pp. 25–100; 32.

<sup>41</sup> In Justus Doolittle (Lu Gongming 盧公明). 1872–1873. *Ying-Han cuilin yunfu* 英華萃林韻府. A *Vocabulary and Handbook of the Chinese Language*. Foochow, Shanghai: Rosario, Marcal & Co., and later also in Calvin W. Mateer (Di Kaowen 狄考文). 1904. *Technical Terms. English and Chinese*. Shanghai: American Presbyterian Mission Press, the name is translated as ‘Foreign Office’ or ‘Foreign Ministry’ as both dictionaries translate *zongli geguo shiwu dachen* 總理各國事務大臣 as ‘Minister of Foreign Affairs’. We may note that *Zongli geguo shiwu yamen* was frequently abbreviated as *Zongli yamen* 總理衙門, and that it was not only used in a Chinese context. Sometimes, the foreign ministry of another country was also called *Zongli geguo shiwu yamen*. Cf. e.g. *Zhong-Xi wenjian lu* 1992, pp. 295, 316.

‘Institute for the Assimilation of Languages’—a term that obviously refers more to an inclusion and systematization of (foreign) languages than to language instruction. In 1867, the Tongwenguan in Shanghai assumed the new name Shanghai Guang fangyan guan 上海廣方言館—a name which means approximately ‘Institute for the Exploration of Dialects.’ Even though the word *yi* does not appear, the same underlying pattern of thought is still recognizable: It is one that is connected with ‘centre’ and ‘periphery’, a (dominant) culture and an inferior or subculture. The Tongwenguan existed till 1905, only to give way to the Waiyu xueyuan 外語學院 ‘Foreign Languages Institute’.

Up to now, I have tried to trace the replacement of *yi* (and *fan*) by *yang*, *xi*, and *wai*. It is necessary to reaffirm that we are dealing with an historical process of language transformation and that the gradual replacement implies all but an abrupt change. The records featuring historic samples of language use often contain proof of a parallel use of all the four words in question. Exactly because the lexical ‘material’ of a language has developed in the course of history over an extended period of time, its transformation is, as a rule, also a drawn-out process. The example of the *Chouben yiwu shimo* offers appropriate evidence.

We must, however, safeguard against a possible misunderstanding, namely that the processes of replacement during the nineteenth century finished off the term *yi*. On the contrary: at least in this period, it continued to exist and to be in use. When Song Yuren in 1895 felt compelled to focus public attention on the misinterpretation of the Canon, this can only mean that it was necessary to do so. For many speakers, reference to *yi* was most advisable—if only because it was ‘highly encouraging’.<sup>42</sup>

The struggle between an open-door policy and isolationism—conspicuously present in the way *xia* and *yi* were anchored in the language of the period—was a drawn-out one that continued throughout the late Qing period. Some of its currents or tendencies furthered new and more open attitudes towards foreigners while others blocked them. The attacks against the foreign language schools named Tongwenguan (where Western science and technology were taught as well), the vigorous criticism levelled against Guo Songtao’s 郭嵩燾

---

<sup>42</sup> See Chen Xulu 1984, p. 25.

*Shi Xi jicheng*,<sup>43</sup> the struggle against the *Yangwu yundong* 洋務運動 ('Westernization' Movement) under the leadership of Li Hongzhang 李鴻章 (1823–1901), and so on, all show very clearly that the conservative forces—which determinedly pushed for a strict separation of *yi* and *xia*—were not only very strong, they often remained at the helm. It is even possible to say that most intellectuals were never able to completely overcome their traditionalist attitudes.<sup>44</sup>

But in this study I want to point out in the first place the change occurring in the context of the history of words and concepts that affected the four words we are dealing with. I have tried to accomplish this mainly by recalling the reverberations that questioned traditional values and the frame of mind connected with them, by analyzing individual aspects of the four words itself and by studying the psychological reality of the underlying system of categories. Generally speaking it is possible to say that the replacement of *yi* by *yang*, and later on (depending on the context) by *xi* and *wai*, was completed in the second half of the nineteenth century. It is true that in popular diction, Westerners are even today called *guizi* 鬼子 'devils', as in the nineteenth century (and especially during the Boxer rebellion). But this is another story and belongs to another chapter. In this regard, it is interesting to see that in the context of gunboat diplomacy, at the very moment when official documents and the published works of progressive intellectuals break with the tradition and begin to switch from the pejorative *yi* to a more objective and neutral category like *yang*, a contrary tendency becomes apparent, in that the subaltern classes invent the concept of *yang guizi* 洋鬼子 'foreign devils', which they supple-

---

<sup>43</sup> In 1922, Liang Qichao commented on the fate of Guo Songtao's travel diaries: "In the diary of an ambassador called Guo Songtao, who went to England in 1876, there exists a brief paragraph where he says, roughly speaking, that today's *yi* and *di* are no longer what they once were. After all, they can point to a two-thousand-year-old civilization. My goodness! The book caused an outcry of disgust as well as insulting commentaries among *literati* and officials at the Imperial Court in Beijing ... until the destruction of the printing plates was finally decreed by the Emperor." Cf. Liang Qichao. 1922. *Wushi nian Zhongguo jinhua gailun* 五十年中國進化概論 (Outline of China's evolution during the last 50 Years). Reprinted in: id. 1936a. *Yinbingshi wenji* 飲冰室文集 (Collected works from the Ice-Drinker's Studio). Edited by Lin Zhijun 林志鈞. Shanghai: Zhonghua shuju, 39.39–48; 39.43. See also Guo Songtao 郭嵩燾. 1984. *Lundun yu Bali riji* 倫敦與巴黎日記 (London and Paris diaries). Changsha: Yuelu shushe (*Zou xiang shijie congshu* 走向世界叢書. *From East To West—Chinese Travellers before 1911*), p. 491.

<sup>44</sup> Cf. Ren Fuxing 1992, pp. 198–200.

ment by other derogatory terms—metonymies like *hongmao zei* 紅毛賊 ‘red-haired thieves’, etc. By creating *yang guizi*, they ‘re-occupy’ the term *yang* to denote foreigners, in order to invest it once again with a critical meaning. Their inventiveness is no longer attached to traditional terms and categories reflecting an assumed cultural superiority; it is all-out modern. In fact, it constitutes a psycho-social form of resistance of the exploited and debased against the modern imperialism they experience in their immediate lives. It criticizes the agents of a rich and presently superior technical-scientific culture perceived as robbing China and its impoverished masses of their real or potential riches.

As the history of ideas and concepts shows, words and categories do not develop in a day. The terms which figure here are of autochthonous origin, but are used as translated terms, too. Because of the manifold synonymous equivalents in any given language, the boundary between translated and home-grown terms cannot always be sharply drawn. But another problem is of greater significance for this study: What constitutes—in general—language use that is accepted as an equivalent? Or what is—in the context of translations—presented as an equivalent? In order to deal with this question, and at the same time demonstrate an aspect of historic development, once more two examples (‘alien’ and ‘foreigner’; ‘foreign affairs’ and ‘diplomacy’) shall be discussed, even though I have already referred to them above:

‘Alien’ in R. Morrison’s *Dictionary of the Chinese Language, in Three Parts* (1815–1823) is rendered as *yiren* 夷人, *fanren* 番人, *waiguo de ren* 外國的人; and, likewise, ‘foreigner’ is translated here as *yiren* 夷人, *fanren* 番人 and *fangui* 番鬼.<sup>45</sup>

‘Foreigner’ in S. Wells Williams’ *English and Chinese Vocabulary* (1844) is given as *waiguoren* 外國人, *yuanren* 遠人 and *fanren* 番人.<sup>46</sup>

<sup>45</sup> Robert Morrison (Ma Lixun 馬禮遜). 1815–1823. *Wuche yunfu* 五車韻府. *A Dictionary of the Chinese Language, in Three Parts. Part the first; containing Chinese and English, arranged according to the radicals, part the second, Chinese and English arranged alphabetically, and part the third, English and Chinese*. Macao: Honourable East India Company’s Press.

<sup>46</sup> Samuel Wells Williams. 1844. *Ying-Hua yunfu lijie* 英華韻府歷階. *An English and Chinese Vocabulary*. Macao: Office of the Chinese Repository.

‘Alien’ in W. Lobscheid’s *English and Chinese Dictionary* (1866–1869) is given as *fanren* 番人, *waiguoren* 外國人, *yibangren* 異邦人, and *yiren* 夷人.<sup>47</sup>

‘Étranger’ [Alien, Foreigner] in A. Billequin’s *Dictionnaire français-chinois* (1891) is rendered as *siyi* 四夷, *fan* 番, *yiren* 夷人, *yiyi* 夷異 and *yidi* 夷狄.<sup>48</sup>

‘Alien’ in W. W. Yen’s *English and Chinese Standard Dictionary*, 3rd edition (1910) is given as *waiguoren* 外國人, *yibangren* 異邦人, *yuanfangren* 遠方人, *bu shu benguo de ren* 不屬本國的人, *yuanke* 遠客; and in the case of ‘foreigner’ we find as its Chinese equivalents *wairen* 外人, *yiren* 異人, *kemin* 客民, *qiaomin* 僑民 and *waiguoren* 外國人.<sup>49</sup>

‘Alien’ in K. Hemeling’s *English-Chinese Dictionary of the Standard Spoken Language* (1916) is given as *waiguoren* 外國人, *yangren* 洋人, *yibangren* 異邦人, *xiguoren* 西國人, *Taixiren* 泰西人 or *kemin* 客民.<sup>50</sup>

Our brief résumé is that it is certainly not by accident that *waiguoren* and *yangren* have survived the turn of the century, whereas the disappearance of *yiren* points towards more than simply a natural dying away. Rather we have before us a case of selection by speakers who carry out value judgments. Its dying away is a matter of evaluation, in fact, it constitutes an abolition or rather *Aufhebung* (in the Hegelian sense of the word). Thus we find in *Haiguo tuzhi xuji* 海國圖志續集 (Sequel to the Illustrated treatise on the maritime countries, 1895–1896) instead of *yiwu* 夷務 the following replacements: *jiaosheshi* 交涉事, *jiaoshe shiwu* 交涉事務, *yangwu* 洋務 and *waiwu* 外務. It is exactly the abolition or avoidance of a word which constitutes an essential precondition for the genesis of new forms of expression. Whereas the term ‘foreign affairs’ is given as *yangwu* 洋務 in J. Doolittle’s *Vocabulary and Handbook of the Chinese Language* (1872–1873), it is rendered as *yangwu* 洋務, *jiaoshe shiwu* 交涉事務,

<sup>47</sup> Wilhelm Lobscheid (Luo Cunde 羅存德). 1866–1869. *Ying-Hua zidian* 英華字典 *English and Chinese Dictionary, with Punti and Mandarin Pronunciation*. 4 vols. Hong Kong: Daily Press Office.

<sup>48</sup> Anatole A. Billequin. 1891. *Fa-Han hebi zidian* 法漢合璧字典 *Dictionnaire français-chinois*. Beijing: Typographie du Pei-Tang and Paris: E. Leroux.

<sup>49</sup> W. W. Yen (Yan Huiqing 顏惠慶). 1910. *Ying-Hua da cidian* 英華大辭典. *An English and Chinese Standard Dictionary, in two Volumes*. 3rd edition. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan.

<sup>50</sup> Karl E. G. Hemeling (He Meiling 赫美玲). 1916. *English-Chinese Dictionary of the Standard Spoken Language (Guanhua 官話) and Handbook for Translators, including Scientific, Technical, Modern and Documentary Terms*. Shanghai: Statistical Department of the Inspectorate General of Customs.

*waizheng* 外政 and *waijiao* 外交 in C. W. Mateer's *Technical Terms. English and Chinese* (1904).<sup>51</sup> In the *Xin Erya* 新爾雅 (1903), it is likewise given as *waijiao* 外交 — a term which in modern Chinese is generally perceived as an equivalent of 'diplomacy.'<sup>52</sup>

It is especially the translation of the term 'diplomacy' which has undergone a change of the sort discussed in this study. In Lobscheid's *Ying-Hua zidian* (1866–1869), we find the following explanation under the lexical entry 'diplomacy':

[1] the customs, rules and privileges of ambassadors, envoys, and other representatives of princes and states at foreign courts, 欽差總例 *qinchai zongli*; [2] forms of negotiations, 議政規例 *yizheng guili*; [3] a diplomatic body, 朝廷欽差等 *chaoting qinchai deng*; [4] skill or dexterity in managing negotiations, &c., 精於國政 *jing yu guozheng*.

In the Chinese renditions presented, we discover almost no trace of the most significant denotational characteristics of the term, i.e. matters pertaining to outside countries or foreign affairs. Rather, going by the traditional and popular understanding attached to *qinchai* 欽差, we find that in (1) and (3) the conceptual content of the Chinese characters (emperor, the emperor's court, and the commissaries or emissaries sent by him) does not necessarily refer to the outside world. (The first Chinese ambassador Guo Songtao went abroad no sooner than 1876.) And where matters of state are alluded to, in (2) and (4), it is not clear whether one is dealing with foreign or domestic policy. Going merely by the language characteristics, it is justified to interpret the terms as referring mainly to domestic policy. In this case as in other cases mentioned earlier, one possible cause is that the emperor, as the Son of Heaven (*tianzi* 天子), is defined as the ruler of everything under heaven (*tianxia* 天下), a realm which allows for the distinction between *yi* and *xia*, but not between 'within' and 'without.'

In A. Billequin's *Dictionnaire français-chinois* (1891) 'diplomatie' is now rendered as *xingyao* 星輶, *tongshi* 通使, *tongshi zhi xue* 通使之學, *tongshi zhi li* 通使之例.

In W. W. Yen's *English and Chinese Dictionary* (1910) 'diplomacy' is given as *waijiaocue* 外交策, *waijiaoshu* 外交術 and *bangjiao* 邦交.

<sup>51</sup> Cf. Doolittle 1872–1873; Calvin W. Mateer 1904.

<sup>52</sup> Wang Rongbao 汪榮寶 and Ye Lan 葉瀾. 1903. *Xin Erya* 新爾雅 (The new *Erya*). Shanghai: Mingquanshe. Reprinted in: Shen Guowei 沈國威. 1995. *Shin Jiga to sono go-i*. 新爾雅とその語彙 (On the *New Erya* and its vocabulary). Tokyo: Haku-teisha.

And in K. Hemeling's *Dictionary of the Standard Spoken Language* (1916), 'diplomacy' is given as *guoji jiaoc* 國際交策, *waijiao shouduan* 外交手段, *waijiaoshu* 外交術, and *waijiaoxue* 外交學; and under 'foreign affairs' we find *waishi* 外事, *yangwu* 洋務, *jiaoshe shiwu* 交涉事務 and *jiaoji shiwu* 交際事務.<sup>53</sup>

These examples give rise to an important general observation, namely that the terms referred to are in many ways tied to the historical change in the meaning of words and concepts which we have discussed in this study with regard to four specific words. We can point to words and syntagmas which refer to something 'foreign', to 'diplomacy' etc. without any further explanation, in as much as they are—in the last analysis—situated in the context of the changed terminological field of *yi*, *yang*, *xi*, and *wai*. Without this change, many new terms are inconceivable which immediately relate to foreign countries and the world, the phenomenon of the Other (or to foreigners). What is more: there is another, even more important consequence, namely, that the translation of many new terms from the West—no matter in which way they were imported into the Chinese language—is immediately connected to it. Or to put it differently: what we are dealing with is not just a matter of stabilization and standardization of many (translated) terms but rather a concept (though not a premeditated one), a logically constructed system of categories that is formed in the second half of the nineteenth century and that cannot be reconciled with *yi* and especially with the perception and attitudes at its roots. I present the following, concluding examples without any explanation because I am sure that they speak for themselves:

---

<sup>53</sup> In order to illustrate language change, the comparisons of the last paragraph are accidentally based mainly on dictionaries by non-Chinese authors. One may ask perhaps in how far these authors—which certainly did not share the Chinese *yi-xia* concept—were influenced by that concept. The most immediate answer would refer us to the character of a general dictionary which normally should mirror the general language use observed in a given society.

If, in looking for equivalents, one either conformed very much to the language use of the time (Lobscheid 1866–1869, including even *yiren* 夷人) or—on the contrary—did not do so (in Wells Williams 1844, *yiren* does not appear), either case reflects in a certain regard the attitude of the compiler. Above and beyond this, I see a specific reason in the conceptual approach of the compiler—whether he relies on a given stock of expressions or refers to it selectively, or even creates neologisms. In any case, all equivalents given reflect the contemporary language. In so far, the entries given in Hemeling 1916 are a truthful mirror of their times.

*guoji shiwu* 國際事物 ‘international affairs’, *guoji zhengbian* 國際爭辯 ‘international controversy’, *guoji fenzheng* 國際紛爭 ‘international disputes’, *guoji tiaoting* 國際調停 ‘international arbitration’, *guoji jiaoce* 國際交策 ‘diplomacy’, *guoji jiaoshe* 國際交涉 ‘inter-state relation’, *guoji gongyue* 國際公約 ‘international convention’, *guojifa* 國際法 ‘international law’, *liebang tongfa* 列邦通法 ‘international law’, *wanguo gongfa* 萬國公法 ‘international law’, *wanguo tongli* 萬國通例 ‘international law’, *guoji gongfa* 國際公法 ‘international law’, *guoji guanxi* 國際關係 ‘international relationship’, *guoji xiguan* 國際習慣 ‘international custom’, *guoji guanli* 國際慣例 ‘international usage’, *guoji daode* 國際道德 ‘international morality’.

*guojihua* 國際化 ‘internationalization’, *guojizhuyi* 國際主義 ‘internationalism’, *shijie jingshen* 世界精神 ‘world-soul’, *sihaizhuyi* 四海主義 ‘internationalism’, *shijiezhuyi* 世界主義 ‘cosmopolitanism’.<sup>54</sup>

---

<sup>54</sup> The following dictionaries have been consulted in the compilation of these examples: Wang Rongbao and Ye Lan 1903; Mateer 1904; Shimizu Kyoshi 清水澄 . 1907. *Hanyi falü jingji cidian* 漢譯法律經濟辭典 (A dictionary of legal and economic terms, translated into Chinese). Tokyo: Keibunkan; Yen 1910; Huang Moxi 黃摩西 . 1911. *Putong baike xin da cidian* 普通百科新大辭典 (*General New Encyclopaedia*). Shanghai: Zhongguo cidian gongsi; Herbert A. Giles. 1912. *A Chinese-English Dictionary*. Shanghai: Kelly & Walsh; Tanabe Keiya 田邊慶彌 . 1913. *Hanyi Riben falü jingji cidian* 漢譯日本法律經濟辭典 . *Japanese Dictionary of Legal and Economic Terms, Translated into Chinese*. Translated by Wang Wozang 王我臧 . Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan; Hemeling 1916; Tang Jinggao 唐敬杲 (ed.). 1923. *Xin wenhua cishu* 新文化辭書 . *An Encyclopaedic Dictionary of New Culture*. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan; Waijiaobu tiaoyue sibiao 外交部條約司編 (ed.). 1925. *Zhong-Ying-Fa waijiao cidian* 中英法外交詞典 . *Dictionary of Words and Phrases of International Law and Diplomacy in English and French with Chinese Translations. Dictionnaire de Mots et Phrases du Droit International et de la Diplomatie en Anglais et en Français, avec Traduction Chinoise*. Nanjing: Waijiaobu; Fan Bingqing 樊炳清 . 1926. *Zhexue cidian* 哲學辭典 . *Dictionary of Philosophical Terms*. Shanghai: Shangwu yinshuguan; James V. Davidson-Houston (Hu Endun 胡恩敦) and R. V. Dewar-Diurie (Qiu Derui 裘德瑞) . 1935. *Han-Ying junshi cidian* 漢英軍事辭典 . *Chinese and English Modern Military Dictionary*. Beijing: Henri Vetch; Léon Wiegier. 1939. *Locutions modernes: Néologie*. 4th edition. Sien-hsien: Imprimerie de Sien-hsien.

