Language is something so intrinsic to our daily lives that it seems a truism that its vocabulary would be the "best evidence of the reality of cultures in the sense of a historically transmitted system of 'conceptions' and 'attitudes'" (Wierzbicka, 1997: 21). Both culture and language change, adapting to changing social conditions but some words "hold on" to become cultural artefacts, lexical legacies that still have a place in that culture.

These conceptions and attitudes are reflected in what is known as *keywords,* words that serve "as a key to a code or cipher"[1] to that culture. These words are indicators of certain values and norms of a society and involve the use of other related words and speech acts. That these words exist is plainly shown by the frequent difficulty of finding suitable equivalents in another language. The new, translated word may not quite have the same nuance due to historical reasons, different lifestyles or other factors (Newmark, 1991; Yao, 2004).

People do not think differently because they speak different languages (the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis) grammatical structures being simply coding systems, which vary from one language to another.[2] Actually, it is more how the culture *pragmatically* uses language, that is, how these keywords are manifested in particular speech acts that show how a particular culture regards a concept. There is plenty of evidence that when one is speaking a foreign language, the norms of the native

language are often carried over into it (Feng, 2000).

In this paper, the Chinese language will be used to show the importance of certain keywords to understanding the Chinese culture.

A seven-year residence in Hong Kong and an informal survey on "core Chinese values" was carried out among Chinese colleagues and friends drew out the following concepts. Respondents varied in the actual words used, but they can be summed up in English as the following: diligence, filial piety, tolerance, face, connections, obedience to authority, and avoidance of conflict. A cursory look at various websites will see such concepts as such as *mianzi* 面子/*lian* 臉 (image/face), *guanxi* 關係 (connections), and *liemao* 禮貌 (politeness) mentioned as being crucial to understanding China.[3]

These concepts all have their origins in Confucianism, a philosophy of human conduct that has dominated Chinese thought since the early days of the civilization (Yao, 2000). An ethos that emphasizes personal control, adherence to a social hierarchy and a certain political order, it has many implications for communication, the main ones being "to maintain existing relationships among individuals, to reinforce role and status differences, and to preserve harmony within the group" (Gao, 1996: 96).

Like the symbol for *yin* and *yang*, essential Chinese keywords contain elements

of other concepts making it difficult to hold a linear discussion on them. However, they could arguably be categorized according to three groups: *mianzi* 面子*/lian* 臉 (image, face, feelings, reputation), a kind of "meta-keyword" to general Chinese thinking, followed by *li* 禮 (ritual, etiquette, courtesy) which is a physical representation of the concept of *mianzi/lian*, while the third category, *renqing* 人情 (human nature, human feelings, sensibilities, also etiquette) can be seen to be the "emotional" aspect of *mianzi/lian*. All these three concepts are defined by a group distinction. This may seem a rather simplistic rendering, but it serves to show the overall circularity of these concepts. Examples from the author's personal experience will highlight the pervasiveness of these concepts in modern Hong Kong society.[4]

1. Mianzi 面子/Lian 臉: The Chinese "Face"

The importance of *mianzi* and *lian* in Chinese culture is indisputable. In 1894, an English missionary, Arthur Smith had this to say about *mianzi*, "Once rightly apprehended, 'face' will found to be in itself the key to the combination lock of many of the most important aspects of the Chinese" (Smith cited in Jia, 2003: 23). The intellectual Lu Xun wrote in 1934 that "face is the key to the Chinese spirit and that grasping that will be like grabbing a queue twenty-four years ago—everything will follow." (1934/1960: 129). A recent scholar has even advocated a radical rethink on the place of this word in modern Chinese culture (Jia, 2001: Introduction).

Face or *mianzi* 面子, is simply defined as “reputation, prestige, face, or good name”, in other words, it could be said to be linked to *image*. A related word, *lian* 臉 is more literally “face”: it is the outwardness of how things seem. A common saying, *ren yao lian, shu yao pi* 人要臉，樹有皮 (a man has his face just as a tree has his bark: a man has a sense of shame) is one of many idioms about face in Chinese culture (Ge, 1998: 57). These words relate to the correctness of people’s social and moral behaviour, being the

> …mediating ‘layer’… that is positioned between the inner *lian* and the outer world is the site of the social construction of the self, simultaneously articulated with interior and exterior. (Zito, 1994: 120)

Face is a considered a physical entity. It can be given (*gei mianzi* 給面子), lost (*diu mian* 丟面), saved (*bao quan mianzi* 保全面子) enjoyed (*you mianzi* 有面子) and considered (*liu mianzi* 留面子). A person can also be anxious to save face (*ai mianxi* 愛面子). “If I hadn’t done this it would have made him *look bad*” was how one recent English film subtitle translated the words *diu mian* 丟面 (loose face).[5]

In another example, the Hong Kong version of “The Weakest Link” a quiz show where the host ridicules contestants, drew much criticism from viewers as “being too harsh” on contestants. Eventually the show was toned down a bit, and it had a short run (Lau, 2001, Scott, 2002).[6] This represents sparing someone’s sensibilities

(留面子). Even in more serious conflicts, the "total demolition of others' social image" still makes Chinese people uncomfortable (Ting-Toomey, 1998: 61).

According to Jia (2003: 47-50) there are many ways to combine *lian* and *mian* to form adjectives or verbs make *lian* and *mian* as if it "were a highly flexible and easily manipulatible object." (p. 43).

"Face" influences communication in a number of ways. First, it influences the choice of communication styles. To avoid losing face, a critical or unpleasant message is often communicated in writing rather than through direct oral contact (Chu, 1988: 129). A recent incident is born out by this. A colleague was informed by letter that he would not have his contract renewed. Later on this person was invited to afternoon tea, at which this event was not mentioned at all.[7]

Second, "face" leads to a tendency for indirect communication. If two people know each other very well and if one of them wants to issue an invitation or discuss something important, an intermediary is often found in order to avoid a loss of face if the invitation is refused or a proposed situation rejected (Sun, 1991: 10). Since the two parties are never in a face-to-face situation when refusal takes place, harmony (*he* 和) can be maintained, and friendship between the two can proceed without any hiccups (Chu, 1988: 129, Gao and Ting-Toomey, 1998: Chapter 3).

This non-confrontational approach could be said to be the crux of Chinese

interpersonal communication. For example, a work colleague wanted to communicate to me that they were allergic to the oil burner on my desk, so she asked a colleague that I was particularly close to, to come and talk to me about it. This type of approach means that both our faces were "saved".

Because failure to deliver on promises or saying "no" can led to loss of face by one or both parties in an exchange, "provisional responses" are often used (Gao and Ting-Toomey, 1998; Gao, 1996; Spencer-Oatey & Ng, 2001). Examples include *you xie kunnan* 有些困難 (have some difficulties) *bu fangbian* 不方便 (not convenient). A tentative "yes" is expressed as *wenti bu da* 問提不大 (there is no great problem about it). This is called "making allowances for unforeseen circumstances" (*liu you yu di* 留有餘地) and allows people a convenient way out if things do not work out (Ting-Toomey and Ng, 1998: 65).

"Face" can also relate to the state as a whole, which can as "losing face". There have been many opinion pieces and letters to the editor in the local press saying that people should not criticize leaders but that citizens should "all pull together" in difficult times (such as Hong Kong's recent economic problems), in other words *bie diu za jia de lian* 別丟咱家的臉 (don't make our family lose face). The "Hong Kong face" was definitely lost in the SARS health crisis because the name of the crisis was very much like the name of the disease.[8]

2. Li 禮: Putting Face into Action

Li, which means ritual, etiquette, and courtesy, could perhaps be seen as an attempt to codify the principles of *mianzi/lian*. Jia (2003: 40) says that *li* is a "grammar of social practices that constitute an emergent system of cultural values in action. *Li* is superficial, whereas *mianzi/lian* is substantial." What he means by this is while underlying concept of face is relatively stable in Chinese society over time *li* is changeable according to current norms of that particular society.[9]

Firstly, *li* emphasizes the ways that things should be done reflect *ren* 仁 (benevolence, kindheartedness, humanity). Important tenets of Confucianism include Rectification of Names 正名 (having the correct name for things); Doctrine of the Mean 中論 (follow the middle course) ; The Five Relationships 五倫 (most to do with family), and Respect for Age) (Yao, 2000: Introduction). Since every action affects everyone else, having social norms reflecting tenets desired by society means that you do not suffer confusion in different social situations (Yao: 2000).

Limao 禮貌 (*Politeness*)

Limao, literally "polite face", is the Chinese word for "politeness", which neatly aligns the concept of *mianzi/lian* and *li* together. Politeness is universal concept but culturally bound (Brown and Levinson, 1987). *Limao* is linked to both social role and status, so by following certain norms of behaviour, *one is being polite*. *Zun bei you xu*

尊卑有序 is a common Chinese expression meaning "the proper regard for precedence (or priority in place or rank)" (Gao, 1996: 89).[10]

This gives rise to the address maxim as formulated by Gu (1990: 248) which rules that the other person should be addressed appropriately according to such factors as gender, age, occasion, location, and status. This is done by the use of occupational titles, a handyman will be called *shufu*, translated something like "master craftsman" and then there is *laoshi* 老師 (teacher) as in *li Laoshi* 李老師 or teacher Li.[11]

To be modest *xu xin* 虛心 is to be "polite" (Gao, 1998 and Spencer-Oatey & Ng, 2001), thus appearing "humble" means that one has to follow what Gu calls the "self-denigration maxim" (Gu, 1990: 246). This can be summed up in the expression: *xuxin shi ren jinbu, shiye jiao'ao shi ren lou hou* 虛心使人進步，事業驕傲使人落後 (modesty helps one move forward, whereas conceit makes one lag behind). Thus, the person should put oneself down when praised, and lift the other up when one can (this is known as the generosity maxim) (Gu, 1990: 252). For example, a Chinese, when complimented would use *keqi* 客氣話 "polite talk" and employ set phrases like *nali nali* 那里，那里 (not at all), *bu hao* 不好 (not good), *meiyou shenme* 沒有什麼 (it's nothing) (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 47; Spencer-Oatey & Ng, 2001: 185).[12] In mainland China, if a foreigner speaks even a little Chinese, the Chinese person would

immediately state that “you speak very good Chinese”. In reverse, when you have to ask someone to do something (which could be a face-threatening act) one should immediately initiate the discourse by stating phrases like *Mafan ni* 麻煩你 (sorry to put you to some trouble) *bu hao yisi* 不好意思 (I’m embarrassed to….). These expressions are often used in telephone conversations.

Limao also implies a sense of “refinement”, that is, not making a scene (Gu: 1990: 239). This is aptly illustrated by the following Letter to the Editor about a veteran protestor and Che-Guevara tee-shirt wearer recently elected to the Hong Kong legislature.

> It is about time “Long Hair” Leung Kwok-hung learned what is right and wrong. Raising one’s middle finger is rude. Shouting a slogan in [sic] a celebratory function is insulting. Not following the dress code for Legislative Council meetings is not respecting himself and other members. (Raymond Chan, SCMP, 2004: A16).

Although written in English, this paragraph shows the Chinese concept of *limao* and the fact that native cultural concepts can be used in one’s second tongue.

3. *Renqing* 人情: The Emotional Aspect of Face

Renqing (consisting of the character for human and the character for feeling/emotion), is glossed in the dictionary as “human nature, human feelings, sympathy; sensibilities; and etiquette.” Since interpersonal relations are the basis of

Chinese identity (Gao, 1996 and Ting-Toomey, 1998: 29-34), perhaps it should be more accurately translated as "*proper* human feelings" or "*humanized* emotions." (Jia, 2001: 28).

Knowledge of *renqing* can enable one to avoid this "sense of shame". Proper emotions in the proper contexts would thus seem the best way to maintain smooth interpersonal communication (Jia, 2001: 29) and the correct social order (尊卑有序), as expressed in such classical sayings as *wenrou dun hou, junzi ye* 溫柔敦厚， 君子也. (a gentlemen should be gentle and kind) and *keji fu liwei ren* 克己復禮爲仁 (exercise restraint and return to propriety).

Once these proper human feelings are displayed to another, an immediate debt is initiated *qian renqing bao* 欠人情報. This helps to build a link, a connection *guanxi* 關係 between people (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 29). This is manifested in certain words like *Bao* 报 (reciprocity) and *xiao* 孝 (filial piety).

Reciprocity: Bao 報

The ethical principle of *Bao* 報 (reciprocity) also means "deal with a man as he deals with you." Again this is all bound up with the meta-keyword *mianzi/lian* as demanded by an individual's status in a particular group. The person having *gan en tu bao* 感恩圖報 (a dept of gratitude) wants and should pay it back *hui bao* 回報 as exemplified in the well-known Chinese saying *li shang wang lai* 禮尙往來

"courtesy demands reciprocity", that is, deal with a person as they deal with you: give as good as one gets. If one fails to reciprocate, one is perceived to be *bu dong rening* 不董人情 "ignorant of human feeling" or *meiyou linxin* 没有心爱 (heartless) (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 31-32). When one colleague invites another out to lunch, *huibao zhuren de sheng qing* 回報主人的盛情 (repaying the host one day) becomes important, with an invitation of own soon forthcoming in the opposite direction.

Xiao 孝(filial piety) is also one such manifestation of *bao*. Although this is often expressed in non-verbal acts, it is frequently shown by the importance attached to the correct address of elders and a general respect for authority). Recently, a widow of a doctor who died of SARS in 2003 was denied compensation from the Hong Kong Government's "Fund for Heroes", addressed the Hong Kong chief executive, Tung Chee Hwa as a "kind father" in a letter to him asking him to reconsider the decision (Lee, 2004).

Chinese people have the tendency to put family relationships before other types of interpersonal relations and to make clear distinctions between insiders and outsiders (Gao, 1996: 85-88). Obviously this has important implications to the application of *renqing* and *bao* in everyday life.

4. The Thread Holding it All Together: Insiders 自己人 and Outsiders 外人

The Chinese family *jia* 家 or *jiating* 家庭 is considered crucial to understanding

Chinese society. The family in its wider sense of a group of individuals bound together by certain ties (being an insider 自己人) is what will be discussed here. Take the author's workplace as an example of a "family":

> 舉辦迎新營的目的，是為了歡迎一年級同學加入翻譯系的**大家庭**。
>
> The aim of the orientation camp is to welcome new students to the Translation Department (literally: welcome first year students *into the large Translation Department family*). [Except taken from text to be placed on our revamped website. This and subsequent translations are my own.]

The text in bold and the words in italics use the actual word for "family". In translation, a literal rendering often sounds odd in the target language so a more idiomatic form is used (see Newmark, 1991). This is used to foster *ganqing* 感情, empathy to the group or "family" to which one belongs.

Ganqing **感情(Feeling)**

Glossed in the dictionary as "feel, sense, be aware" it can also mean "be grateful" and "sense and sensation" and is obviously related to *renqing*. It does not imply "emotions" as such rather good feelings, empathy, friendship, and support (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 29; Jia, 2001: 34). It has to be discussed in context in a particular relationship, and in the case given above tries to inculcate an empathy with the organisation and its norms, so that people can work together in harmony and

without dissension. Thus “nurturing feelings” *shi ganqing* 培養感情（Gao, 1996: 91; Gao and Ting-Toomey, 1998: 26) thus becomes important to any relationship. The following excerpts are taken from the same text quoted above:

> …透過不同形式的遊戲, **培養**同學的合作精神, 增進彼此**感情**。
>
> …through various games, participants learnt to cooperate with others and make firm friends (literal translation: through various games nurture a cooperative spirit and increase feelings for one another).

> …一方面**培養**他們對中文大學的歸**屬感**;
>
> …One aspect is to foster feelings of belonging to the Chinese University;

In the last excerpt, *shu gan* 屬感 which can be glossed “feelings of belonging”, has the same overall meaning as *ganqing.* Actually there is a whole slew of *gan* 感 words in the Chinese lexicon (e.g. *minggan* 敏感 (sensitivity); *beigan* 悲感 (bad impression); *fangan* 反感 (disgust) *guangan* 觀感 (reaction to what one has seen).

The author’s cultural predisposition to the English definition of “feeling” and “emotion” causes her to feel that written Chinese has an emotional element that verbal communication lacks. Most of these *gan* 感 words have the character for “heart” *xin* 心 as part of their components, and the left side of the character 情 is another form of writing the heart radical.

To illustrate further membership to an in-group, my department had a new computer assistant (who resigned after three months) in that time she was always

addressed as Miss X (小姐) than just her personal name with the prefix *a* 阿 which denotes a term of familiarity, also in-groupness. This indicates that she never fitted into the “in-group”. This is not the case with our new computer assistant who became a part of the “family” quite quickly.

***Solidarity* 團結 (*tuanjie*)**

Tuanjie 團結 (solidarity) and *suihe* 和 (harmony) is crucial to the sense of belonging in Chinese culture (Gao, 1996: 85; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998: 49-50). Given that the Chinese emphasize a “we” and in-group affiliation, it is not surprising that this is obviously reflected in the language. For example, in written Chinese, the characters *wo guo* 我國 (my country) is usually translated in English as “China”. In addition, the “joining words” like *tong* 同 (same; identical; alike; similar) as in the compounds *tongbao* 同胞 (fellow countryman), *tongxue* 同學 (classmate), and *tongshi* 同事 (workmate) fosters this sense of “in-groupness”. Other “solidarity expressions” such as *huxiang* 互想 (mutual; each other; one another) find their way in everyday discourse:

> ….成為**同學們互相**聯繫的橋樑，師生交**流意**見的渠道，促使翻譯系更**團結**。
> …becoming a [*mutual] bridge for students* so that teachers and students can exchange opinions enabling the Department of Translation to become further *united*. [Italics and bold added.]

In this except, which has been written for the revamped website mentioned previously, shows the strong sense of belonging engendered by the use of words *huxiang* “mutual”, *tuanjie* “solidarity”, and *jiaoliu* 交留 (exchange).

> 三十餘年來，中大翻譯系**同仁齊心協力**、不斷探索、銳意進取。然追求無涯、完美無界，我們願一步一個腳印，去創造更加輝煌燦爛的明天!
> For thirty years, the Department of Translation of The Chinese University of Hong Kong *has worked tireless as one*, in order to leave its mark in order to create an even better tomorrow! [Italics and bold added].

Tong ren qi xin xieli 同仁齊心協力 means “colleagues are of one mind/working tirelessly together”. *Tong ren* 同仁 (literally one who has same “benevolence” to another, that is, one who knows the norms of the group) is the same as *tongren* 同人/ *tongshi* 同事 also meaning colleague. There is a sense of “putting something out” for the good of the group and society, the cause being better than the individual’s pursuit.

Conclusion

The sense of “face” *mianzi/lian*, reflected through certain actions (*li*) and empathy (*renqing*) as delineated by one’s “family” (*jia*) form a framework upon one can hang the basic tenets of Chinese society. It is harmony (*he*) that drives Chinese interpersonal communication, for without harmony, trust (*xin* 信) cannot be

engendered, face cannot be upheld, reciprocity (*bao*) will not continue and connections (*guanxi*) cannot be established. So it is obvious that Chinese communication is a dance between the "self and the other". Having a basic understanding of these basic keywords gives one a firm foundation in understanding Chinese society.

Notes

---

1 *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language* (2000) by Houghton Mifflin Company, 4th Edition. All other English definitions are from the *Oxford English Dictionary* Online http://dictionary.oed.com subscription service). All Chinese definitions come from *The New Age Chinese-English Dictionary* (2001), published by The Commercial Press, Beijing. Although the major language is Cantonese in Hong Kong, the Mandarin pinyin system is used to romanize text for convenience. The Chinese characters are full-form rather than simplified ones as used in Hong Kong.

2 Apart from reading class notes on the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis, I discussed this issue concerning the Chinese language with Prof. He Yuanjian, a specialist in Chinese linguistics and syntax in the Department of Translation, The Chinese University of Hong Kong. For example, he says that if we divide cultural concepts into ones shared across cultures and ones unique to individual cultures, how one coding system encodes either category of concepts is an arbitrary construct.

3 When doing a Google search on “Chinese culture” many English-language sites discuss these concepts. For Chinese language-only sites” *lian* 臉 (face) there are 1,470,000 hits; *guanxi* 關係 (connections) there are 36,100 hits; *ganqing* 感情 (feelings/empathy) there are 1,900,000 hits; *bao* 報 (reciprocity) there are 8,790,000 hits; *huibao* 回報 (return obligations) there are 589,000 hits; *mianzi* 面子(face/image) there are 363,000 hits; *limao* 禮貌 (politeness) there are 1,330 hits.

[4] A discussion of Confucianism was brought into a discussion on democracy in a recent Letter to the Editor *South China Morning Post,* by Margaret Chu, senior research officer, in the pro-Beijing One Country Two Systems Research Institute, A16, 11 October, 2004.

[5] I noticed this when watching Hong Kong director Wong Kai-wai’s film “2046” released in early October 2004. Films shown in Hong Kong have both English and Chinese subtitles making it easy to compare translations.

[6] There was much discussion in the newspapers on this, with some making the point that the host was simply “role playing” rather than being truly nasty. Somebody actually coined the word “degratainment” to illustrate this effect (Scott, 2002).

[7] This perhaps is not unknown in the West either, but seems to occur more often in my experience living in a Chinese society.

[8] SARS means “Severe Acute Respiratory Syndrome” sounded very much like “Special Administrative Region of China” which is Hong Kong’s official designation. See Eagleton (2004).

[9] In the old days of the emperors, there were many different ceremonies and rites for different occasions. These are no longer in practice of course, but the Chinese still have ceremonies for most official occasions, witness the elaborate ribbon-cutting and souvenir-presenting opening ceremonies for even minor academic conferences. It would not feel "right" not to have one.

[10] I dealt with aspects of this in my first Ling904 Pragmatics assignment entitled "Request and non-compliance: A cultural or in-group norm?" This concerned approaching people of higher status, academics, to get them to do a particular task.

[11] In Confucius's day, *zhenming* 正名 "rectification of names" was vitally important for the running of the state. A servant would refer to themselves as "slaves" and address their master as *daren* 大人 or "great man" (Gu: 1990: 238).

[12] Spencer-Oatey and Ng (2001) say that rejection of a compliment is "primarily ritualistic (p. 184) they quote another scholar saying that as a social norm, people have to "appear humble, not necessarily to think humbly of themselves" (original emphasis.)

References

Brown, P. and S. Levinson. (1987/1978). *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Chu, Leonard L. (1988). "Mass communication theory: A Chinese perspective" in Wimal Dissanayake, ed., *Communication Theory: The Asian Perspective.* Singapore: The Asian Mass Communication Research and Information Centre.

Council of Chinese Cultural Renaissance. (1979). *English Translation of the Four Books.* Taipei: The Council of Chinese Cultural Renaissance.

Eagleton, Jennifer. (2004). "SARS: 'It's as bad as we feared but dared not say: Naming, managing and dramatizing the SARS crisis in Hong Kong" in *English Today,* Vol. 20, No. 1, pp. 37-45.

Gao, Ge, and Stella Ting Toomey. (1998). *Communicating Effectively with the Chinese.* California: Sage Publications Inc.

Gu, Yuegu. (1990). "Politeness phenomena in modern Chinese" in *Journal of Pragmatics,* 14: 237-257.

Feng, Zongxin. (2000). "Pragmatics of English dialogue in the Chinese context" Paper given at Göteburg 2000, workshop in pragmatics held at Göteburg University, Sweden. Paper accessed at: http://www.ling.gu.se/konferenser/gotalog2000/FinalP/feng.pdf.

Gao, Ge. (1996). "Self and other: A Chinese perspective on interpersonal relationships" in William B. Gudykurst, Stella Ting-toomey, and Tsukasa Nishida, *Communication in Personal Relationships Across Cultures.* California: Sage Publications Inc., pp. 81-100.

Jia, Wenshan (2001). *The Remaking of the Chinese Character in the 21st Century.* Westport, Conneticut/London: Ablex Publishing.

Lau, Shirly. (2001). " 'Niceness' pays off for Weakest Link" in the *South China Morning Post*, 4 September.

Lee, Ella. (2004). "Sick Sars widow in plea to 'kind father' Tung" in *South China Morning Post*, 30 September, C1.

Lu Xun. (1934/1960), "On 'face" in H. Yang and G. Yang, trans., *Selected Works of Lu Xun*, Vol. 4. Beijing: Foreign Languages Press.

Marks, Joel, and Roger T. Ames, eds. (1995). *Emotions in Asian Thought: A dialogue in Comparative Philosophy.* Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Newmark, Peter (1991). *About Translation*. Clevedon/Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters, c19.

Scott, Mathew. (2002). “Let me entertain you” in the *South China Morning Post*, 15 May.

Spencer-Oatey, Helen, and Patrick Ng. (2001). Reconsidering Chinese modesty” in *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* Vol. 11, No. 2, pp. 118-201.

Sun, Lung-kee. (1991). “Contemporary Chinese culture: Structure and emotionality” in *The Australian Journal of Chinese Affairs*, No. 26, July, pp. 1-41.

Yao, Hsin-chung. (2000). *An Introduction to Confucianism.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yao Naiqiang (2004). “Bilingualization: Equivalence and intercultural communication” in *Translation and Bilingual Dictionaries*, ed. Chan Sin-wai. Lexicographica Series Maior. Tubingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, pp. 109-117.

Wierzbicka, Anna. (1997). *Understanding Cultures through Their Key Words.* New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Zito, A. and T.E. Barlow, *Body subject and power in China* Chicago: Chicago University Press. 1994.